

BEFORE THE
CALIFORNIA CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

In the Matter of
Full Commission Business Meeting

State Capitol, Room 126
Sacramento, California

Friday, March 25, 2011

9:16 A.M.

Reported by:
Kent Odell

APPEARANCES

Members Present

Maria Blanco, Chairperson
Gabino T. Aguirre
Angelo Ancheta
Vincent Barabba
Cynthia Dai
Michelle Di Guilio
Jodie Filkins Webber
Stanley Forbes
Connie Galambos Malloy
Lilbert R. "Gil" Ontai
M. Andre Parvenu
Jeanne Raya
Michael Ward
Peter Yao

Staff Present

Dan Claypool, Executive Director
Kirk Miller, Legal Counsel
Rob Wilcox, Communications Director
Deborah Davis, Budget Officer
Janeece Sargis, Administrative Assistant

Public Comment

Jim Wright, Attorney, San Jose
Dave Salivari* [ph.]
Rani Woods, L.A. County Federation of Labor
Debra Howard

I N D E X

	PAGE
1. Opening comments (Commissioner Maria Blanco, Chairperson)	4
2. Training	
a. Statement Database Presentation (Karin MacDonald - Statewide Database & Election Administration Research Center)	
i. Report on Database content	
b. Voting Rights Act Presentation (Ana Henderson - Warren Institute, UC Berkeley)	
i. Communities of Interest	
ii. Other Districting Issues	
3. Public Comment	4
Jim Wright, Attorney, San Jose	4
4. Lunch	
5. Advisory Committee Meetings, as needed	
6. Break	
7. Advisory Committee Reports	8
Public comment	
Jim Wright, Attorney, San Jose	103, 191, 195, 298
Dave Salivari	104, 142, 262
Rani Woods, L.A. County Federation of Labor	139, 168
Debra Howard	259
8. Executive Director's Report	
a. Status Update	
b. Adoption of Code of Conduct	
c. Adoption of Conflict Code	
9. Public Comment	
10. Adjourn	313
Certificate of Reporter	314

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 MARCH 25, 2011

9:16 A.M.

3 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: It's Friday, March 25th and
4 this is a meeting of the California Citizens
5 Redistricting Commission. We are in day two of our
6 business meeting in Sacramento. We are meeting in the
7 Capitol Building. If anybody is watching and planning to
8 go over to the Secretary of State Building, we have
9 moved. We were there yesterday and today we're at the
10 Capitol Building in Room 126.

11 Can we do a roll call, please?

12 MS. SARGIS: Commissioner Aguirre - Here;
13 Commissioner Ancheta - Here; Commissioner Barabba - Here;
14 Commissioner Blanco - Here; Commissioner Dai - Here;
15 Commissioner Di Guilio - Here; Commissioner Filkins
16 Webber - Here; Commissioner Forbes - Here; Commissioner
17 Galambos Malloy - Here; Commissioner Ontai - Here;
18 Commissioner Parvenu - Here; Commissioner Raya - Here;
19 Commissioner Ward - Here; Commissioner Yao - Here.

20 You have a quorum.

21 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Thank you. Our first item
22 on the agenda is public comments on items not included in
23 today's agenda.

24 MR. WRIGHT: Good morning, Commissioners, staff,
25 and public. I am Jim Wright, a lawyer from San Jose. I

1 had an interesting experience this week and I thought
2 maybe I'd share it with you. I went to the Redistricting
3 Service Center in Berkeley and was cordially greeted by
4 Nicole Boyle and Bonnie Glaser, Karin MacDonald, who run
5 the Center. After about 10 minutes of training on the
6 computer, in order to get familiar with what *Maptitude*
7 can do, they turned me loose and let me play for a while.
8 And it was kind of fun. I spent a little over an hour,
9 created two districts, one of them was minus 9 on
10 population and the other minus 3, it was a little tricky
11 to do that, but it can be done, it takes a bit of work.
12 I've got to admit, my districts weren't balanced, they
13 didn't have all the demographics the way they should, but
14 at least I was able to create districts.

15 *Maptitude* is complicated, but it's not difficult,
16 okay, I've got to make that point. It's got an awful lot
17 of capability, an awful lot of information in it, and a
18 great many statistical things that need to be balanced in
19 order to do the proper job. The hard part is that
20 balancing, getting the demographics right, you need to
21 know your geographical information, you need to know
22 political and societal boundaries. Societal boundaries
23 are something you're working on with the communities of
24 interest. I'm going to visit the site again and explore
25 some more capabilities to the program, but need to

1 realize that the line drawing is not a simple exercise,
2 it does take some intelligence, it does take some
3 information and some skill, some training, some
4 background, but anybody can use it and create a district.
5 I would strongly recommend anybody who has got a strong
6 interest in how the process is going to proceed that they
7 go to the centers and try it for a while. It's actually
8 kind of fun.

9 The second item. In reference to drawing again,
10 I would recommend that you start with the District 5, or
11 Section 5 counties. Those are going to be the hardest to
12 do, the hardest to get balance correctly, the hardest to
13 get approved, okay? And then proceed throughout the rest
14 of the state. So, as a strategy, perhaps that's
15 something you should consider.

16 Then, I had a phone call during the week, too,
17 from Tracy, a Reporter from the *Mercury News*, thanks to
18 Commissioner Barabba and Commissioner Ancheta, who had
19 had a chat with the Editors of the *Mercury News*, and
20 apparently stimulated an editorial yesterday, favorable
21 to the Commissioner, which was great. Tracy wants to
22 chat with me for my experiences and I'll do that pretty
23 soon, as soon as we can get together. Thank you very
24 much. Let's get on with the day.

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Thank you. All right, so

1 let me just walk us through what we're going to do today,
2 even though you have your agenda, and also for the
3 public.

4 We're going to spend the bulk of the day on
5 hearing back from the advisory committees, and I think
6 all of you have your memo that we approved about the
7 report, how we should report back from our advisory
8 committees. I don't need to go through it. The essence
9 of it is that we don't need to recreate a discussion,
10 that you should report back briefly, and tee up the
11 recommendations for us to vote on.

12 Because the most crucial item that we have,
13 really, in terms of recommendations to deal with is the
14 adoption - well, recommendation and then potential
15 adoption of the calendar for the remainder of our
16 business from here until August 15th, that's going to be
17 the first report out. Just to clarify for everybody,
18 this calendar has been put together with a combination of
19 technical considerations, considerations about logistics,
20 considerations about demographic concentrations,
21 transportation, as well as, after the first Census Data
22 came in, an eye towards where we think there are greater
23 concentrations of populations, potential for biggest
24 changes, we've looked at where the population has grown,
25 and I say all that to say that what you're going to look

1 at has all of this included in it. And it also has been
2 reviewed by Q2, even though they aren't formally working
3 for us yet, they've generously - because of their
4 experience in the past on these issues, they've reviewed
5 it and have given us recommendations, and we've made some
6 changes from the last one that staff circulated at the
7 previous meeting. So, I say all that just to say that,
8 rest assured, a lot of that thinking is in there, which
9 is not to say that we can't all have our own opinions
10 about it. So, we'll go with that first. And who is
11 going to report out on that?

12 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I think I'm going to get
13 the summary going, the discussion, just to give you an
14 overview of what we had decided on. And then, because it
15 was combined with Technical and Outreach, in terms of the
16 action items, Commissioner Ontai will take some of the
17 action items that were related to the Outreach and I'll
18 take one that is related to Technical.

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Great.

20 COMMISSIONER DI GULIO: So, first of all, just to
21 kind of give you a summary, I think in some of the
22 discussion for action items we can go into more detail of
23 the summary. But just to say that the action items, or
24 some type of recommendation that will be required, will
25 be the issues surrounding the calendar, as Commissioner

1 Blanco had mentioned. We had a discussion which was a
2 result of the combination of the Q2 recommendations and
3 staff's hard work. Next will be some recommendations
4 surrounding the operational structure of the input
5 hearings, and that responsibility currently will be
6 coordinated by staff in terms of things just - when we
7 show up, what do we expect in terms of how the actual
8 meeting will be run. Then, we will have some
9 recommendations for the technical structure of public's
10 actual input, and that will be coordinated by Q2, who
11 will be providing a framework for those in the various
12 elements, including worksheets for the actual public, and
13 the methodology for collecting and reporting on that
14 information. Lastly, it would be our recommendations for
15 adopting a policy related to electronic submissions of
16 public input. So, again, we'll go into those details
17 more a little bit later on.

18 But before we go into the action items, let me
19 just summarize the other aspects of your discussion that
20 are not going to require any action at this time. One is
21 we had a brief discussion about Commissioner preparation
22 prior to the input hearings. This was in relationship to
23 the Commissioners' desire to have some feel for those
24 regions in the communities prior to our arriving there,
25 and so at this point we have asked staff to be able to

1 provide Commissioners with - it was mentioned even
2 something similar to the Chamber of Commerce website, or
3 something that would give us some demographics, some
4 background of the communities so we're not coming in
5 completely cold, but, at the same time, without
6 prejudicing us in terms of what we'll be hearing for that
7 input. So, staff will provide that to Commissioners
8 before we arrive at our hearing locations.

9 We also did discuss initially, as you recall, the
10 public access to redistricting, the options that the
11 Legislature has asked us to provide them so that they can
12 consider for funding. This was originally the line item
13 that was removed so that we could ask the Legislators
14 their preference. So, staff, Mr. Claypool, has been
15 collecting some of that information which, again,
16 includes the options related to the Redistricting
17 Assistance sites, some of the software. Also, Mr.
18 Claypool has been in contact with some organizations,
19 particularly in San Diego's Neighborhood Housing
20 Association, they provided an example of a proposal for a
21 regionally based approach to assisting and redistricting.
22 So, those types of examples will be provided to the
23 Legislature once those are finalized and they will be
24 able to provide an option as to whether or not which
25 aspects, or any they'd like to fund.

1 A Census Data update, just to inform you, we did
2 not have an opportunity to go into discussion about this
3 at the time, this would include things about prison
4 population adjustment, or the definitions of community of
5 interest, so that will be a rollover for the next
6 meeting.

7 And lastly would be, we had a discussion about
8 the in line process review, IFB, and Mr. Claypool had
9 given us an update on that, and actually I should say
10 maybe this is a good time to punt it to Commissioner
11 Ontai because this is when I was gone doing my video, so
12 I will let Commissioner Ontai finish the summary of that,
13 and then he can go into the action item starting with the
14 calendar.

15 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: What was that question,
16 again?

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: What you guys discussed
18 about the inline peer review process for the -

19 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: The inline peer review
20 process, yes. We did have a discussion on that and we
21 had somewhat of a disagreement as to the function of what
22 that inline review would be. We could not decide - the
23 issue evolved around whether we should independently
24 contract with an inline reviewer that would respond to
25 the Commission's questions as we go through this process,

1 or should that inline reviewer be a subcontractor under
2 Q2. So, we decided, well, maybe this is an item that we
3 should have a full discussion, again, before we give
4 staff direction. So, that's something we'd like to put
5 at this dais.

6 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Is this an action item for
7 us today?

8 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Maybe I can defer to Mr.
9 Claypool. The reason this was on our original agenda is
10 because, if we do go for an IFB, we are on some - knowing
11 the process that happened before, there is a time element
12 to getting this process, the discussion started, so that
13 if we could provide that structure, if that is the route
14 we want to go, we needed to provide staff with what we
15 envision an inline process peer review would be, so that
16 they could get the ball rolling.

17 MR. CLAYPOOL: Exactly. Good morning. The
18 thought out of the Advisory Committee yesterday was that
19 we have time right now to do a more thorough job on this
20 processing to make sure that it is worded in the Scope of
21 Work exactly as this Commission wishes it to be. We
22 would think that we probably have at least two months if
23 we were considering that this function had to be in place
24 by the time that we were issuing our first draft maps.
25 So, if we need to do it before that, we still could get

1 this process done within a month, but this depends on
2 what you want this process to be and, so, with that, we
3 were hoping to get direction as to how we could structure
4 that scope of work so that we could bring it back next
5 week for refinement by the Commission, and then we could
6 put it in play and then we could get it approved and move
7 forward with it.

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Any questions for Mr.
9 Claypool on that?

10 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: So, again, the question is
11 -- the issues are, should this line reviewer be someone
12 that works directly with the Commissioners when we have
13 questions, or should this line reviewer be a technical
14 consultant, a reviewer of the work that is being done by
15 Q2?

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Filkins Webber.

17 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: My understanding in
18 the process of this discussion is that it would be a
19 technical expert, first of all, and that they would have
20 absolutely no association with our technical expert, so a
21 suggestion that they would be somehow a subcontractor to
22 Q2 defeats the purpose of what we are looking for as far
23 as a peer review. What my understanding is, is that
24 there would be a recognition that the individual, again,
25 like I said, would have no association with Q2. As far

1 as the actual process, I also envisioned as I thought
2 about it, not necessarily somebody that would be
3 following Q2 along, I didn't see that, because it would
4 be far too expensive. I saw it a circumstance where they
5 may come in and look at the first draft maps and make
6 their recommendations to the Commission as to the work
7 that was done by Q2, and then come in at whatever stages
8 that Tech has figured out. So, you know, if we're
9 putting out a second draft map, and then the final map, I
10 see that as a three-step process for them, not that they
11 would be working side-to-side, but, again, an independent
12 organization and technical expert similar to Q2.

13 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Barabba.

14 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes, I would concur with
15 the comments by Commissioner Filkins Webber. And the
16 other part of our initial discussions, we would have them
17 available on an as needed basis because, if we felt
18 everything was going along, then we wouldn't need to
19 bring them in, and we could save that money. So, and I
20 think Mr. Claypool identified that we could write the IFP
21 so that the person would know that they may not be
22 called. But that would be our judgment whether they get
23 called or not.

24 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Di Guilio.

25 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: And to follow-up on

1 Commissioner Barabba, this was a clarification that this
2 wasn't a second line drawer that was going to provide a
3 full set of maps, this was more of as needed in the
4 process, in fact, there may even be other elements - we
5 could have various options, someone to review the entire
6 map, we could have someone just looking at a specific
7 issue, maybe we're looking at a sociological issue and so
8 we're looking for a Sociologist, maybe we're looking at a
9 technical person. We could get a pool of individual
10 experts for which we could pool from based on the need as
11 we go through this review, just for a clarification
12 point.

13 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Dai.

14 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes, I think you've addressed
15 my concerns, but I just wanted to clarify that this would
16 not be an opportunity for a second line drawer to produce
17 an alternative set of maps. I think it needs to be
18 narrowly focused on methodology and process. So, that
19 would just be my input.

20 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Aguirre.

21 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: And also, we talked about
22 the purpose of this and some comments have already been
23 made in regards to that, but ultimately it would help us
24 enhance the quality of the output, so it's not anything
25 adversarial, or anything like that, it is for us to come

1 up with a product that is the very best that we can do,
2 given our collaboration with all of our consultants.
3 That might be one of them.

4 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Thank you. So, Mr.
5 Claypool, does that give you enough to begin drafting the
6 scope?

7 MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes, and I think that we can come
8 back with a good scope of work that, then, you can work
9 with it and edit it, and we'll have what we need, then,
10 to go out and secure someone for the services for the
11 inline process.

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Di Giulio.

13 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: On a technical note,
14 too, I think with the incoming chair and vice chair being
15 both Commissioner Ontai and Commissioner Aguirre, having
16 knowledge in the discussion would assist staff in this
17 interim as they're developing the IFB.

18 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Great, thank you.
19 Commissioner Filkins Webber.

20 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: We - I don't know
21 if we're going to come back to the issue of what we -
22 that Mr. Claypool had asked that this Commission consider
23 as far as policies and procedures for communication and
24 decision-making. And I do recognize how I was involved
25 as the past Chair in some of the draft changes of the IFB

1 for the Technical Expert. I would like to see the Scope
2 of Work before it's issued, I don't - and, again, this is
3 a process issue, it's a communication issue, and I know
4 we need to function efficiently, but I just have, I guess
5 because I was involved a little bit with the IFB before,
6 I don't want this to be simply a decision of a drafting
7 by Mr. Claypool that would be approved with the
8 designated Chair or Vice Chair. I just wanted to make
9 that clear, I don't know if it's something that would be
10 brought to the full Commission for approval before it is
11 final.

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, so let me just say a
13 little bit about that. We are going to have a
14 recommendation coming out of the Legal Advisory Committee
15 about our process of communication, which you'll all hear
16 and hopefully - but is there anybody here that disagrees
17 with what Commissioner Filkins Webber just said? Okay,
18 so then I think that's right, that the charge is to draft
19 it and then bring the scope back to the full Commission.

20 MR. CLAYPOOL: And I fully understand that we
21 will be working with Commissioner Ontai and Aguirre to
22 just craft the scope, but this lead time that we're
23 asking for now in the two months will give us the time we
24 need to bring it back so this Commission know exactly
25 what they're approving.

1 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Yao and then I
2 really want to move on to the calendar, was have a lot to
3 do.

4 COMMISSIONER YAO: I don't know whether this is
5 an opportunity to have one contract that would encompass
6 hiring any experts that we may need in the future to
7 address any and all the needs that we have because I
8 know, in addition to the inline or in-process review, we
9 also have considered - we also have put aside money to
10 consider bringing experts as needed and we can maybe have
11 one contract covering all the experts that we want to
12 bring in, including the review of the line drawing, and
13 that will save us from having to repeat this process for
14 every expert that we bring in.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I would tend to agree, but
16 why don't we get the scope from Mr. Claypool for this and
17 then we'll see whether it's something that can be
18 translated to other potential consultant experts.
19 Commissioner Dai.

20 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, I wonder if Mr. Claypool
21 can explain the difference between the IFB process and
22 the IFP process. I know that, and I've had some
23 experience with municipal contracting where it's
24 essentially an opportunity to create a list of pre-
25 approved vendors that the hiring body can draw from.

1 MR. CLAYPOOL: Well, first, I'm most familiar
2 with the IFB, having just gone through it, and we were
3 thinking about this as a vehicle for this particular
4 contract because we wanted to have people come and give
5 us their proposal as to what they would offer. Now, we
6 could use an IFP, as I understand it, to gather proposals
7 for people who would offer different services, but we're
8 also looking at possibly just establishing contracts with
9 individuals that you identified as your technical
10 experts, that we could do up to a \$50,000 limit, and that
11 way you could select them without necessarily having to
12 vet them, you could just say, "This is a person that we
13 think can do this job," and we would go out with it.
14 That was the route we intended to take for your technical
15 experts. But this particular -- the inline process peer
16 review -- seems to be something that you would want to
17 have people provide their bids so that you could select
18 amongst them and we could have a competitive bid, if you
19 were.

20 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, in summary, you'll come
21 back with the scope on this particular position, and then
22 you will proceed with the other system that you were
23 considering for the other experts under \$50,000?

24 MR. CLAYPOOL: And we will come back with the
25 report on both.

1 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Thank you. Okay.
2 Commissioner Ontai, how do you want to handle this? Then
3 hear the recommendations from Outreach, and then
4 altogether?

5 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: No, those were - I
6 provided the summary; Commissioner Ontai is now going to
7 talk about a couple of the elements for the actual
8 recommendation, those first four that I mentioned for the
9 recommendation. So, he's going to start off with the
10 Calendar.

11 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, so this is just now
12 going into the recommendations.

13 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Yes, this is -

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right, thank you.

15 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Okay, on to the big top
16 shell [ph.]. Aloha kakahiaka aku, everybody, and to the
17 public. I have to translate that to the transcriber
18 later on. Okay, I think you all have a copy of the
19 schedule in front of you, so what happened was we had
20 asked staff to go back and work with Q2 yesterday to try
21 and merge together those dates and activities that made
22 sense not only for us and staff, but also because we
23 wanted to make sure that the schedule flowed in such a
24 manner that Q2 could take that information, digest, and
25 then present it to us based on their experience in San

1 Diego and San Francisco.

2 So, what you have in front of you is a revised
3 schedule, essentially the same dates, we did add on some
4 minor changes, but the big issue is that, if you turn to
5 the month of June and July, you'll notice not so much in
6 June, but certainly July, you'll notice that we have a
7 lot of To Be Determined dates in places, we have more of
8 those, and that's because we felt that, after the release
9 of the initial maps, we needed more time to be able to go
10 to different regions, or maybe to repeat our input
11 hearings at a certain location, depending on the
12 controversy, or the response we get back from the various
13 regions. So, we built in more flexibility for that to
14 happen.

15 Other than that, the critical dates in terms of
16 the initial release, the second, and the third, all
17 remain the same. So one of the comments that came out
18 from Q2 is that, how they operate in San Diego and San
19 Francisco, and that we try to incorporate into this
20 schedule, is that they would have a hearing and that
21 hearing, the Commissioners, of course, would be asking
22 questions from the proposed audience who is making a
23 presentation, questions like, "How did you arrive at that
24 map? What were the reasons?" Things of that nature.
25 So, from the dais, the Commissioners would have to take

1 that critical role in asking the right questions. The
2 Mapper at that time is taking it, categorizing, and
3 inputting that data. There might be some questions
4 between ourselves and the Mapper and the presenter at
5 that time, so there's an interaction that's going on at
6 that point. There might be a few questions or issues
7 that cannot be resolved at that setting, in which time
8 the Mapper has to go back and maybe take a day or two to
9 digest all of that, and then come back and give us a
10 report. That was the dynamics that they had experienced
11 in the San Diego and San Francisco experience. So, we
12 tried to build that in here, so some of that time for the
13 Mapper to go back and digest complex issues that may come
14 up with VRA issues, things of that sort, and then report
15 to us. So, this is their best shot on how they think
16 this would be operational.

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: A couple things, one,
18 Commissioner Di Guilio, do you want to add something to
19 this?

20 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I was only going to
21 mention the Q2 aspect. There was - the one that you had
22 originally seen, I think, the last version that had been
23 circulated from staff, is very similar to this. Q2 also
24 gave the recommendations and staff merged these, there
25 were only a few slight modifications, differences, in

1 particular, that was actually the second week of April,
2 which is the one we've already approved, but they made -
3 I'm trying to find my last version - you'll notice some
4 of those locations are different, and what Q2 recommended
5 was, if you recall, they have staff that are regionally
6 based in terms of handling sometimes just one, in the
7 case of L.A., and this one is actually Region 5, 6 and 9,
8 so what they've recommended is that you bundle those
9 areas together so that the annual notice on April 16th, it
10 says here, with the asterisk, "CRC provides regional wrap
11 up." So, at the end of that region, our technical
12 consultants will be able to provide us a wrap-up of that
13 region and it gives us an opportunity to digest what
14 we've just heard. Instead of going into one region, then
15 going to the next, kind of we forget which region we're
16 discussing, so that was one of those changes. They've
17 incorporated that throughout, so you see on April 16th,
18 they'll provide a wrap-up of Region 6, 7 and 9; on May
19 1st, they've provide a wrap-up of Region 4, which is
20 pretty much the greater L.A. area, and then, on May 14th,
21 they'll provide a wrap-up of Regions 1, 2 and 3, and so
22 on. I think also in the end of May, it's the wrap-up of
23 Regions 7 and 8. So, that was the incorporation they
24 made, which we felt as a Technical Advisory Committee,
25 outreach was a good way for us to approach this. I think

1 the only other - where there might have been one other
2 suggestion based on the appropriateness of the actual -
3 I'm trying to remember, maybe Commissioner Ontai would
4 mention that, but I think all in all, Q2's
5 recommendations and staff merge very well with this
6 calendar. I think there's an option for some discussion
7 points. I think some Commissioners may have some
8 suggestions that might increase the flow of some of
9 these, so I think this would be a good opportunity to
10 hear those, so that staff could have a finalized version
11 of this. But we do need to recognize that, if we approve
12 this, there are some slight modifications on that second
13 week of April that we have already approved, so as long
14 as that is all right with the Commission.

15 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yes, right.

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Before I start calling on
17 folks, Ms. Sargis handed out a sheet titled "Criteria
18 Used in Selected Public Input Hearing." Does the public
19 have this, as well? And is it posted online? Yes, okay.
20 So, staff took the time and I guess some consultation
21 also with some Commissioners to come up with criteria so
22 that our discussion today focuses on all these key
23 criteria, rather than going in a million directions
24 about, you know, how do I get here? And will we all get
25 there together? And what's the airport like in that

1 region? So, I just want you to look at it carefully for
2 a few moments before you begin your comments, and perhaps
3 when you address your questions or comments about the
4 recommendations, we can look at it in light of these
5 criteria if that makes sense. Okay, so I'm going to
6 start taking questions, comments -

7 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Can I just add a third piece
8 to that? We're not talking about the format itself, the
9 actual program, but we will get to that.

10 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Thank you, yes, I know there
11 will be questions about time and time of day and all
12 that, and you're saying let's hold off on that now and
13 this is really about regions and order of regions and the
14 built-in wrap-ups and the long stretches of time that
15 we've built in for map drawing. So, let's not go there
16 to the actual format of the meeting.

17 Okay, I have Commissioner Yao, Commissioner
18 Ancheta, and Commissioner Filkins Webber - and
19 Commissioner Parvenu.

20 COMMISSIONER YAO: A comment on the philosophy of
21 these regional meetings. We are basically going to
22 accept public input only from that region. And what if
23 we have an organization that wants to talk about the
24 overall state of California? How would we handle those?

25 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Again, that's a format issue

1 that -

2 COMMISSIONER YAO: Oh, that's a format issue,
3 okay.

4 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, great. Commissioner
5 Ancheta.

6 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: So, I had raised in the
7 committees that San Jose and Santa Clara County areas
8 should have a hearing prior to the first draft maps and I
9 thought we had agreed, and maybe this is just an
10 omission, but I thought that we had agreed that the May
11 23rd meeting would not be in San Ramon, but would be in
12 San Jose or thereabouts. I thought that was what came
13 out of the discussion, but...

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Can somebody address that,
15 please? Yes.

16 MR. CLAYPOOL: I remember the discussion around
17 that, I didn't mark it as a specific change, but I think
18 if it needs to be a change, discuss now.

19 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yeah, I just thought it
20 came out of the committee, but it's fine to - I'd raise
21 it here, of course, anyway, but I thought we had agreed
22 in committee that that was a change.

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, the recommendation for
24 this calendar, we should replace San Ramon with San Jose.
25 Is that correct? That's what the committee's intent was?

1 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: That's correct.

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, so we'll note that
3 change. Commissioner Filkins Webber.

4 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: In looking at
5 April, I was wondering if the Committee actually had
6 taken a look at what areas of Los Angeles - in
7 particular, I'm looking at April, the last week, Region
8 4, the 27th through the 31st - or no, excuse me, through
9 May 1st, and looking at your criteria, minimize
10 Commissioner, staff travel expense, or best efforts to
11 minimize total time from one venue to the next. Antelope
12 Valley being in the middle of that is tremendously
13 complicated. We do need to be there, I would recommend,
14 given my familiarity with that entire Region 4, that it
15 be at the beginning or the end of the region, it's not
16 really practical, it's not going to be fun or convenient
17 for anyone, but to go from L.A. to Antelope Valley and
18 back to L.A. again. The other interesting issue about
19 Antelope Valley, the Lancaster-Palmdale area, is that the
20 timing of this meeting is going to be problematic; most
21 of those individuals, they take van pools from that area
22 down into Los Angeles, and if they don't take a van pool
23 at 4:00 or 5:00 in the morning, they're driving
24 themselves at 3:00 or 4:00 in the morning, which means
25 they're not going to be around for a late evening

1 meeting. So, if you were to consider pushing Antelope
2 Valley to Wednesday, the 27th, you're not going to have
3 people attending. It's just not practical for that area.
4 There are a lot of retirees up in that area, as well, so
5 you might be able to get some of them, but as far as
6 working people that have an interest. So, this is just -
7 everything else looks great, because I did notice that it
8 had the same flow issues when you're talking about
9 traffic flow in Southern California, and how to get, for
10 instance, in week two in May, Riverside, Temecula, Santa
11 Ana, that flows. San Diego, Oceanside, into Palm
12 Springs, that flows. And as far, again, just traffic and
13 convenience and getting to all of these regions. So, I
14 also wanted to know if the Committee had discussed any
15 specificity on where to be in Los Angeles, Los Angeles is
16 a big place. Anyway, that's just - and I wanted to bring
17 your attention to this because we're talking about April,
18 and so it's more probably of a priority.

19 The only other question that I had is the
20 recommendation from the Committee, are we looking at
21 probably not finalizing - or not voting on July yet
22 because we're going to fill in the to be determined dates
23 as we go along through this process, to see what would be
24 more important - what area is more important to come back
25 to?

1 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Okay. I do want
3 the Commission to at least approve April, May and June,
4 and then we can revisit July as we start to get into the
5 process?

6 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Is that correct, is that the
7 recommendation that we just vote on the first three?

8 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I think the
9 recommendation is that we vote on this calendar and
10 concept, knowing that those to be determined - I think
11 there are two elements here, there may be some minor
12 changes, let's say it's a venue change, in the same
13 location. I don't believe the Commission needs to review
14 those things. But if a location is changed from even one
15 day to the next, I think those things should be brought,
16 and as we go through, there will be a periodic review
17 that is required, so I think that is to approve this
18 entire calendar, knowing that we will be reviewing it
19 throughout and those open dates we can have discussions
20 about what should be there. But I also want to make sure
21 we don't miss Commissioner Filkins Webber's point about -

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: No, I'm going to go back to
23 her right now and ask her to make a suggestion for
24 Antelope Valley.

25 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: My suggestion would

1 be - yeah, we're in this week, but more likely Saturday
2 or Sunday. But, see, you can't put it first because it's
3 Wednesday, and that's a weekday and, again, I don't see
4 those people coming out at a 6:00 meeting when they have
5 to get up at 3:00 in the morning. So, I would suggest
6 either Saturday, the 30th - well, yeah, if the Los Angeles
7 is on Saturday, it could be in the Valley if that's what
8 the intent was, then going to Antelope Valley. And it's
9 going to be a bit of a stretch to hike back down to Long
10 Beach, but - on the weekend, it won't be a problem, you
11 just shoot right down the -

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, can you work with
13 staff to just tweak that last - I mean, I think we all
14 agree, we'll take Commissioner Filkins Webber's word for
15 the fact that this is something that we need to deal
16 with. Hold on. Is it on this, on Antelope Valley?
17 Okay, Commissioner Parvenu.

18 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: That was one of my points,
19 too, and exactly, I completely agree with Commissioner
20 Filkins Webber, it should be either Saturday or Sunday.
21 But, regarding this last week of April, I had mentioned
22 yesterday in our committee that Los Angeles meets on
23 Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, so Thursdays are the
24 better day for Los Angeles. I'm speaking with the
25 Mayor's office there now and making arrangements to use

1 the Civic Center Complex in downtown L.A., so that's a
2 very strong possibility, and I would recommend that we
3 move the Los Angeles date here from the 27th, Wednesday,
4 to the 28th, perhaps starting off. And secondly, I'd like
5 to substitute San Gabriel for Whittier, Whittier for San
6 Gabriel, and move that date possibly if Commissioner Raya
7 would agree, to Wednesday, the 27th in San Gabriel, if
8 arrangements can be made, or if we as a -

9 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Well, but that region is
10 already on the calendar - am I doing that? I think it's
11 my air card, I'm sorry.

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Can I just get a point of
13 procedure here? How does the Technical Outreach
14 Committee want to proceed right now with these - what's
15 clearly becoming a lot of suggestions about, you know,
16 switching dates or adding places?

17 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: I would rather make a final
18 conclusive decision today on these dates, at this time.

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: At this time. So, for April
20 or for the whole -

21 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: At least for April.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, so do you want to now
23 - shall we - do folks want to hear from everybody on
24 these dates and then make a list of changes, and then go
25 through them, instead of - we'll note them, you can

1 discuss them, and then maybe at the end, if you can hold
2 on to your change, remember it, and we'll vote on it? Is
3 that -

4 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I think it's inevitable
5 that we have to hash out these details, and so I think if
6 we could go through and the input from Commissioners, I
7 think, is very valuable in terms of that, and as we go
8 through, again, to the extent possible, knowing we could
9 revisit this again down the road, but I thought it would
10 be helpful for staff and for Q2.

11 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay. I'm going to - a
12 queue - I have Commissioner Ancheta, Commissioner
13 Barabba, and Commissioner Parvenu - are you done?

14 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: No, I'm not.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, so Commissioner
16 Parvenu hasn't finished.

17 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: So, those are my
18 recommendations and, also, I'm in communication with the
19 California Endowment, who has a facility next to Union
20 Station and I'm waiting for a call back and perhaps we
21 can ask them to use that facility, as well, it is
22 centrally located and that's a possibility. I just
23 wanted us all to know that that's in the works and I'd
24 just like to get some solidification here in terms of
25 dates.

1 Secondly, in the month of June, it is, on the
2 third page, again, with the City of Culver City, it's
3 better in terms of staff time with City staff to have
4 meetings during the week, and Thursday would be a better
5 day. Culver City is an every Friday, alternate Friday's,
6 they're off, so Friday the 17th, would not be a good day
7 for Culver City, but the 16th would be, so essentially I'm
8 asking to reverse the order here in June, instead of
9 starting South and working north, to start north and work
10 south.

11 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, I'm hoping that the
12 technical and outreach chairs are making a note of all
13 these?

14 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I think in conjunction
15 with staff, I think it would be helpful, instead, to go
16 through on almost a week-by-week basis, just so we're not
17 jumping around, let's look at it, a week, let's take
18 comments and finalize that week, and then move on to the
19 next one if that's okay with the chairwoman.

20 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: That's terrific. So, now,
21 we are on the last week of April, we've got a proposed
22 change on Antelope Valley. We've got - anything else on
23 the last week of April? Commissioner Filkins Webber, I
24 haven't forgotten you, Commissioner.

25 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Did the committee

1 discuss the actual locations of what you mean by "Los
2 Angeles?" Based on Commissioner Parvenu' suggestion to
3 use downtown, if you agreed on San Gabriel, then
4 downtown, again, I'm thinking flow here for traffic
5 because, trust me, I know every freeway. San Gabriel,
6 down into downtown, and then the Friday looks open right
7 now, unless you were thinking of some other area in Los
8 Angeles, then getting back up to Antelope Valley, unless
9 you stayed in Long Beach and did Antelope Valley on
10 Sunday, that actually would flow better. But did you
11 think of any other locations instead of just calling it
12 "Los Angeles?"

13 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I'm going to -- Mr. Ontai
14 has an over-arching comment on this. Commissioner Ontai.
15 This level of conversation.

16 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Again, let's just focus on
17 April. We'll discuss the other ones later on. But, we
18 would like each of the Commissioners here to recommend a
19 specific venue on where you think in your region these
20 hearings should be. Commissioner Parvenu just mentioned
21 possibly the Irvine Foundation and L.A. City Hall, that's
22 the kind of thing we want from each of you, so we can
23 feed that to staff. But let's not talk about that now,
24 let's just talk about the actual City or Region in which
25 that's going to occur on the calendar, and then, later on

1 come back and advise Staff on where you think - and that
2 might be just a private call to staff as to what you
3 would recommend the specific venue should be because that
4 is something that is specific, that you will probably
5 know best as to where that site should be.

6 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, is this on this point,
7 Commissioner Forbes? Because I've got Commissioner
8 Barabba.

9 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Just a quick comment that
10 occurred at the meeting is that we're also going to build
11 an assessment capability following each of these
12 activities so that we learn from what worked and what
13 didn't work at any of the sessions, so that when we start
14 going to the next ones, we've learned from our
15 experiences, so that we make the latter ones better than
16 the initial ones.

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, so I understand,
18 Commissioner Ontai's comment, I do think that when you
19 talk L.A., it's almost like you have to decide which City
20 in L.A., so it is one of those areas where it's really
21 not about the practicality of the meeting or the
22 logistics, it really is kind of a decision what part of
23 L.A. So, I would recommend that we do settle on what we
24 mean by L.A. in the last week of April. Can we do that?

25 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: To answer your question,

1 Q2 recommended L.A. and I think they left that up to the
2 Commission to decide, so I think this is a point of
3 discussion for us, knowing if we're looking at that full
4 week, as well as that first Sunday in May, that this is a
5 point of discussion to include in this.

6 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Forbes, did I
7 miss you?

8 COMMISSIONER FORBES: My comment is not about Los
9 Angeles, it's just - I want to get it out there, though,
10 is I didn't see Sacramento listed for a meeting.

11 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right, so let's finish
12 on this and then we can take your point. Commissioner
13 Forbes?

14 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I'm sorry?

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: We'll finish this L.A.
16 discussion and then we'll come back to you?

17 COMMISSIONER FORBES: That's fine.

18 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right, Commissioner
19 Barabba?

20 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Having been raised in Los
21 Angeles, unless things have changed, City Hall is pretty
22 accessible transportation wise, public transportation
23 wise, from any place in the City. So, that sounds like a
24 pretty good location.

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: How do people feel about

1 that, City Hall for a L.A. site?

2 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Well, as he said,
3 on Thursday, oh, yeah, you've got the red line, you've
4 got the blue line coming up from Long Beach, and you've
5 got all kinds of public transportation, which would be
6 great. I don't have a problem with that. It's the
7 Friday the 29th, if we kept it in L.A., and then I think
8 the 30th should be Long Beach, a flowing kind of downward,
9 and then back up to Antelope Valley on the May 1st.

10 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I agree completely.

11 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So your recommendation is
12 that one of the L.A.'s should be Long Beach?

13 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: No, no, it's
14 already on there. It's already there, I just need to
15 move those around.

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I see, move it around in
17 terms of the flow.

18 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Yeah, so we need to
19 fill in what the City would be for Los Angeles for the
20 29th, that's what - I agree with San Gabriel, I agree with
21 downtown on the 28th, then Los Angeles, you know, whatever
22 City, I'm trying to pull up a map right now, as well,
23 what's a different Los Angeles designated City for
24 Friday, and then Antelope Valley - or, excuse me - Long
25 Beach on the 30th, and then Antelope Valley on the 1st.

1 That's my recommendation.

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, so suggestions for that
3 L.A. site? Not site, but what City? I have Commissioner
4 Yao, I have Commissioner Aguirre, and I have Commissioner
5 Ancheta.

6 COMMISSIONER YAO: I think that we simply think
7 of the L.A. County in terms of north, south, east, west,
8 and I think West L.A. is probably the region that someone
9 may be missing, maybe somewhere around the beach cities
10 would be appropriate. West Los Angeles, someplace in
11 West Los Angeles.

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Aguirre, you
13 had your hand up.

14 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yes, I would agree with
15 that, certainly Santa Monica College, UCLA, Loyola
16 University, those have the technical capabilities, we
17 just need to outreach to them, but I think West L.A., the
18 north, south, east, west, is a good way to think about
19 L.A.

20 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, I have Commissioner
21 Ancheta.

22 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: I tend to agree with that,
23 although I think it depends how you're looking at
24 Lancaster-Palmdale, Antelope Valley, because if that's
25 sort of northern L.A. County, there's still sort of the

1 Valley area, which is, I don't know, if you treat the
2 Valley as a southern part of this northern County, then
3 that's okay, if you're treating - I lived in L.A. for 10
4 years, so west side probably would be okay because it's
5 not great to go downtown, but it's not far from - by L.A.
6 standards, it's not that far to go from the west side to
7 L.A. downtown. But I get a sense that there's -- sort of
8 the northern area is not quite getting as much as it
9 should. You know, the Antelope Valley is not - I
10 shouldn't say that because I know how the population -
11 there's significant population growth, but Antelope
12 Valley is way up northern L.A. County, it's far, so if
13 you're counting sort of the county as a region, it seems
14 the Valley is sort of what's missing, that's my take.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I have Commissioner Parvenu.

16 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I concur with Commissioner
17 Ancheta and one advantage that I have, being an employee
18 with the City of Los Angeles in direct contact with the
19 Mayor's office, is that part of the Civic Center Complex
20 includes a satellite facility in Van Nuys as an option, I
21 know we'll be in Northridge the next month, the following
22 month, so Northridge will be on our calendar in May, but
23 I want to offer the Civic Center Complex with the Van
24 Nuys City Hall as an option for that Valley area,
25 Commissioner Ancheta.

1 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I'm going to Chair's
2 Prerogative before I go to Commissioner Raya. I support
3 strongly the idea of trying to do something in the San
4 Fernando Valley, or that captures -- if it's not there,
5 that captures the San Fernando Valley, that was a huge
6 area of dispute during the last redistricting in terms of
7 growth and districts, and I suspect there's a lot of pent
8 up demand for conversation in that area that we would be
9 well served to hear early. So, I think we should do
10 something in the Valley. Commissioner Raya.

11 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Looking to the west side,
12 let's not forget we've had some very interested people
13 from the Santa Monica area, in particular, Santa Monica
14 City College, and you would really pull in - you could
15 pull in South Bay people, as well if you did something in
16 that - and Santa Monica is pretty accessible, bus-wise
17 and so on. San Gabriel is going to pull in - you can
18 pull in people pretty far east and down into, you know,
19 Whittier, and going south along the 5, the 60, it's not
20 that far to get to where we are. You'll pull in people
21 north of us, too, Pasadena, Arcadia, that area, even
22 parts of L.A., Highland Park, you know, those parts of
23 L.A. would also be close to San Gabriel.

24 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, what is the
25 recommendation?

1 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Well, I go along with
2 Commissioner Filkins Webber to, you know, put San Gabriel
3 in place of where it indicates Whittier and then -

4 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: This goes to the Whittier
5 issue?

6 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Well, whatever day it is, but
7 crossing off Whittier and putting in San Gabriel, and
8 then using the west side on Friday.

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Comments on that? I mean, I
10 think we can't leave out the Valley. I really think
11 that's a problem to leave the San Fernando Valley out of
12 this round. Commissioner Di Giulio?

13 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Am I mistaken that the
14 Northridge - we are having meetings in Northridge, and
15 although that's - maybe we should consider - it was meant
16 to be an organized group engagement, but is there an
17 option to have public input, as well? That would cover -
18 and that's a pre-map meeting, so would that not get the
19 Valley a little bit?

20 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: That's on May 25th,
21 Northridge Input.

22 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I know, but I'm saying
23 your argument for this week is that we need to reach that
24 area, but are we not going to at another point? I mean,
25 we only have limited days, and this is not my area of

1 expertise region, so I'll defer, but I want to throw that
2 out to just highlight for Commissioners.

3 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I think that would work, I
4 just don't want to overlook it, as long as it's somewhere
5 in the pre-map period with some intentional outreach to
6 that community because I just know that this is a big
7 issue in L.A. Commissioner Raya.

8 COMMISSIONER RAYA: My question is, was Long
9 Beach selected for a particular reason, or could you move
10 Long Beach and put one Valley hearing in that day?

11 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Q2, I believe, chose it
12 based on its population density, I think it was really
13 necessary. I hesitate to speak for them, but as I
14 understood that - is that correct, Mr. Claypool?

15 MR. CLAYPOOL: Actually, we selected Long Beach
16 because it's on the east, west, your staff did, but it
17 was confirmed by Q2.

18 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, so I want to move off
19 - we've got four more months and we're in the last week
20 of April! It is L.A., so more on this week.
21 Commissioner Yao.

22 COMMISSIONER YAO: Actually, it's not quite this
23 month, but if we take a look at May 4th, you know, that
24 could be a day that can be assigned to the Valley. It's
25 an open day at this point in time and, since we're going

1 to be in Riverside, Temecula, and so on -

2 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: That's not
3 practical, not practical - I've done it, I drive that,
4 but not -

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Di Giulio.

6 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Just to make sure we
7 don't do this, just to remind you, the reason we set
8 these up is Region 4, we were going to get the final
9 report on May 1st from that region, so we if bump it into
10 the next one, that takes it out of consideration, so
11 let's just keep that in mind as we're looking at this.

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Right. So, Commissioner Di
13 Giulio and Commissioner Ontai, how would you suggest that
14 we proceed with the discussion about the San Fernando
15 Valley?

16 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Well, if we're going to do
17 Northridge on the 25th of May, would that give them an
18 opportunity to cover the pre-map discussion for that
19 region up there? Is that too late?

20 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Comments.

21 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I think this Commission
22 has to make some decisions as to locations. I think,
23 based on what I just said, if we do Northridge, it will
24 provide an opportunity to be included prior to the first
25 draft, but it wouldn't be included in that first summary

1 of L.A., as I just mentioned, so I think this Commission
2 has to decide the balance; if Northridge is enough to
3 cover that area, because we will hit it and it will be
4 incorporated in the pre-maps, not in the regional
5 summary, first is other locations in L.A. because, as I
6 see it right now, we have the - correct me if I'm wrong -
7 Wednesday the 27th is Downtown L.A., we agreed on San
8 Gabriel for Thursday, is agreed upon - oh, I'm sorry,
9 Wednesday, so those two are switched? Okay and the
10 Downtown L.A. on Thursday, I apologize. And then,
11 skipping Friday, but we have Long Beach is acceptable on
12 Saturday the 30th, and Antelope Valley, Lancaster is
13 acceptable for May 1st. So, we're talking about Friday in
14 L.A., and what is needed for there. And for that, I
15 would just ask for the Commissioners who are familiar, or
16 have some input to provide some additional clarification.

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Galambos
18 Malloy.

19 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Just an
20 observation as we consider whether to have a hearing in
21 West L.A. While I recognize that the Coastal communities
22 have their unique concerns and demographics, if we're
23 thinking about - and I believe the feedback that we
24 actually got from our Technical Consultant was the goal
25 is not necessarily to have a hearing in every single

1 place, it's to have hearings in the places that are most
2 accessible. So, just geographically speaking, if we have
3 a hearing that's on the coast, people that live east of
4 that are likely to drive to it, but there's nobody west
5 of them that can drive in. So, to me, if we're aiming
6 for central locations, having a meeting in Downtown, even
7 not having lived in Southern California for many years,
8 there is the option that people who live west of that can
9 drive to it. So, again, I feel more compelled around
10 needing to have something in the Valley and having it in
11 a way that it can feed into our summary of the region, as
12 opposed to having one in West L.A. So maybe we think
13 about using the 29th for that reason.

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right, on this issue.
15 Commissioner Barabba has - is it on this issue?

16 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yes.

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay.

18 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I'm seeking to have one in
19 the west part of Los Angeles. Everybody I know who lives
20 in the west says it's virtually impossible to get outside
21 of the western part of Los Angeles from a traffic flow
22 point of view - getting from West L.A. into L.A. is just
23 a horrendous traffic -

24 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: It's the same in the other
25 direction.

1 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I'm just saying it would
2 be very difficult for them to get to downtown, even with
3 public transportation. And it is really a different part
4 of the City.

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, Commissioner Filkins
6 Webber. And then I have Forbes and Parvenu. Anybody
7 else? Okay.

8 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I'm looking at it
9 for flow, that's all.

10 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, do you have a comment
11 on the San Fernando Valley -

12 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Yes, I do. I think
13 that Commissioner Galambos Malloy is correct. It is
14 difficult, but you can pull people from Santa Monica into
15 downtown L.A., so you could consider taking that out for
16 the 29th as far as Santa Monica. We're stuck with
17 downtown for Thursday because of facility. One
18 possibility could be if we did Long Beach on the 27th,
19 flow upward into Downtown L.A. on Thursday, flow into
20 Friday into San Gabriel, over on 30th into the Valley
21 Northridge, and then on Sunday to Antelope Valley. That
22 is a good flow all the way through there.

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Sounds great to me. What do
24 we think? Okay, repeat.

25 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I think I said Long

1 Beach on the 27th, which is the furthest south point of
2 Los Angeles, then into Downtown on the 28th, then into San
3 Gabriel on the 29th, on the 30th into Northridge, that
4 Valley area, and then on Sunday in Antelope Valley. That
5 gets you all the way up and you're not backtracking back
6 into the region, you're flowing it all the way back up,
7 and that's your final destination.

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Agreed? Do we need a vote?

9 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: You would have to
10 come back into Burbank to fly out, but -

11 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: We have to be kind of
12 mindful of the fact that we have to get from that area to
13 probably the nearest airport is Burbank, flying up, so we
14 have to be mindful of the time.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay. Mr. Claypool.

16 MR. CLAYPOOL: Just two points of clarification.
17 First one, Northridge, and then come back to Northridge?
18 Or somewhere else -

19 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I meant the Valley.

20 MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay, the Valley. And, secondly,
21 we'd like to also have you consider putting a business
22 meeting - we just forgot it here, but we're going to have
23 a lot of time and we just hadn't considered it, so we'd
24 like to place a business meeting on the 28th, no matter
25 where it's at.

1 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I'm sorry, I had
2 one other question. Somebody threw in - they said Van
3 Nuys.

4 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yes, the Valley.

5 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Well, I think of it
6 as further north than Van Nuys when you're talking Valley
7 because, technically, the Van Nuys people can get into
8 the San Gabriel meeting, so I'm thinking further north
9 into San Fernando Valley up the 5, I'm looking at a map.

10 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I think that's right. So,
11 that's - our instruction is for it to be in the Valley
12 north, the north San Fernando Valley. Okay, I have
13 Commissioner Aguirre and then Commissioner Parvenu.

14 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I got cut out.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Oh, I'm sorry, Commissioner
16 Forbes. Speak up, yeah!

17 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I agree with one in the
18 Valley and cutting out the west side, but I would have it
19 at the intersection of the 405 and the Ventura Freeway.

20 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Excuse me?

21 COMMISSIONER FORBES: At the Intersection of the
22 - as close as we could to the intersection of the 405,
23 which is the freeway that comes over the mountain from
24 Santa Monica, and the Ventura Freeway, as a way of
25 getting to the Valley from the Beach cities.

1 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Yeah, that's kind
2 of where I was thinking.

3 COMMISSIONER FORBES: That's it.

4 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Facilities might be
5 the only issue there. You pull everybody from Morro
6 Park, Simi Valley, right across the 118 at that junction,
7 which is good.

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay. So the sentiment here
9 is the flow and that we need something in the Valley, and
10 that's accessible to other people that can come to the
11 Valley, but that we would prefer for it to be in the
12 Valley, itself. Correct? Is that the sentiment? Okay.
13 Commissioner Parvenu, and then I have -- Commissioner
14 Aguirre, I think I overlooked you.

15 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: I'll go after.

16 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I agree with the Valley
17 determinate on here. Some of our partners have
18 encouraged us to have sessions in areas that have been
19 areas of difficulty in the past and certainly the Valley
20 qualifies for that. My first option would be Van Nuys,
21 City Hall because of the ease of coordination, because it
22 is a City facility, and I'm looking at cost, and I'm
23 looking at convenience, and I'm looking at logistics,
24 however, as Commissioner Yao has also stated, Santa
25 Clarita would also be another good option further north

1 in the Valley if we do not choose Los Angeles Satellite
2 City Hall Office in Van Nuys.

3 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Do we feel that we need to
4 decide the facility here? Or can we leave that to the
5 staff's discretion? Okay, we'll leave that to staff's
6 discretion with the caveat that we should go into the
7 areas that have had some of the biggest issues in the
8 past redistricting and that's one of them.

9 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: And if they are individual
10 sites, the specific sites, that the Commissioners from
11 that region would like to recommend to staff, you know,
12 let them know.

13 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: And the public, as well. If
14 the public has some suggestions for good locations in
15 that region, and access, I would ask the public to
16 contact the Commission, as well. Commissioner Aguirre.

17 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Great discussion, let's
18 move on.

19 MR. CLAYPOOL: Just so - we're going to read this
20 off. So, we have the 27th in Long Beach, the 28th in Los
21 Angeles, but the City Hall, the 29th in San Gabriel, 30th
22 in the San Fernando Valley at a location, and the first
23 in Lancaster, Palmdale, with a business meeting proposed,
24 if needed, on the 28th. Correct?

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Correct.

1 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: That's good.

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: And when we're done with all
3 of this, we will get an edited calendar, correct? And
4 soon so that we can make all our reservations?

5 MR. CLAYPOOL: It'll say "Final."

6 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Chair?

7 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yes.

8 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: May I ask to go back to
9 a point in April before we move on?

10 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yes.

11 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: There are two issues
12 that I want to talk about on April 16th, Stockton, there's
13 a typo, and then there's a bigger issue I think I need to
14 ask the Commission what they feel. First, it says Region
15 7, and based on the original map we got, it should
16 actually read Region 9, it was a typo. But that brings
17 up my larger question, that I noticed this actually when
18 we first received in Claremont, and I probably should
19 have done something then, but San Joaquin County, which
20 is where Stockton is, is included in Region 9, and it
21 should be included in Region 6, which is the Central
22 Valley. I mean, it gets its namesake, San Joaquin Valley
23 from - I mean, it's just understood culturally and
24 academically as being part of the San Joaquin Valley,
25 this was my issue of the Central Valley. So, having said

1 that, if the Commission is willing to first, for our
2 overall regional discussion, would be moved into Region
3 6, and as a result, I would still keep the integrity of
4 that week and, although there were three meetings, two of
5 those counties are Section 5 and this would allow for the
6 northern part of the valley. So, if that is acceptable
7 to the Commission.

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: It is acceptable. I do know
9 and we can move on to May, I know that, in speaking with
10 Commissioners, there is a sense that the Valley, the
11 southern part of the Valley isn't picked up here -
12 Fresno, Bakersfield.

13 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Fresno is picked up at
14 the end, it's - and Hanford for the beginning part is
15 actually half way between Fresno and Bakersfield, so it's
16 not - it reaches actually - I know there's an issue with
17 Bakersfield and Hanford is close to Bakersfield, the
18 problem with Bakersfield is like similar to Santa Monica,
19 it's at the very bottom and, even though you could pull
20 from L.A., it's a grapevine, it's a geographical
21 boundary, but yes, Fresno is in here on June 25th.

22 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Commissioner Di
23 Giulio, I guess we're jumping a little bit ahead -

24 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Maybe we should - I'm sorry,
25 should we just keep going? I shouldn't have interjected

1 that.

2 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: But is that okay if we
3 make those changes?

4 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yes.

5 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: All right.

6 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, so we're in April - I
7 mean, May. We are in April, but we're looking at a May
8 Calendar. Okay. The first week, Riverside, Temecula,
9 Santa Ana. Comments. Commissioner Galambos Malloy.

10 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I really
11 appreciate the work that the committee in working with
12 staff has done to be conscious in creating this calendar,
13 also of potential holiday conflicts or, you know, just
14 what's going on in people's lives at the time that we're
15 trying to plug them into our redistricting efforts. As a
16 mother, and just someone who has a young family, I've
17 noticed that, in May and June, we are conflicting with
18 Mother's Day weekend and Father's Day weekend,
19 significantly, and I say that because I think, for
20 working families, oftentimes Mothers Day and Fathers Day,
21 they're on the weekend, but they're kind of family
22 holidays, and so I want us, if we do choose to move
23 forward with hearings on those days, to be very modest in
24 our expectations around participation. I think, for May,
25 for Mother's Day, you know, we don't actually have

1 anything scheduled on Sunday, we do have a hearing
2 scheduled on Saturday, I can't anticipate what attendance
3 would or wouldn't be like, but I think, as we move into
4 June, we've really got ourselves stacked that weekend of
5 Father's Day weekend. We have Region 4, a hearing that
6 day, we have a hearing the next day, and a hearing the
7 day before. So, I know we're trying to pack a lot into a
8 small period of time, but I just wondered if the
9 committee considered those conflicts and what your
10 determinate was. Is this the determination, that we just
11 have to do it, no matter what? Or whether there's some
12 flexibility there.

13 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Can I defer to Mr.
14 Claypool on this one?

15 MR. CLAYPOOL: We did and we consciously made
16 sure that those two dates were open, but we're just -

17 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I'm sorry,
18 Father's Day does not appear to be open.

19 MR. CLAYPOOL: Oh, I'm sorry, is Father's Day -
20 we had it open originally. Which day is it?

21 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: The 19th of June.

22 MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay, this was a change. I mean,
23 we're just really kind of out of time. The only thing we
24 could do would be to move - we butt up against the public
25 review period, we can either move the draft maps back and

1 arrange San Bernardino forward, and so we could make that
2 consideration, but it will require moving the draft maps,
3 which is certainly your prerogative and then - and going
4 like that - but we're not going to be able to squeeze a
5 lot of time because we really need that public review
6 period.

7 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So here is what I would
8 recommend. Hold on to that thought, Commissioner
9 Galambos Malloy. And as we work through the weeks that
10 we're going to work through now, let's see, keeping that
11 in mind, whether there's any way that we can open that
12 up. Okay? All right, week two in May. Any comments
13 about San Diego, Oceanside, Palm Springs and Indio?

14 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: I would have a slight
15 adjustment for San Diego. In looking at the Census Data,
16 the growth in that county has been, over the last 10
17 years, has been significantly in the north county, so I
18 would recommend that we do a venue either in San Marcos
19 or Escondido, somewhere in there, to start off with. So,
20 Region 1 on May 12th, I would recommend Escondido or San
21 Marcos, and then work our way down on the 13th in San
22 Diego. In that order.

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, I have Commissioner
24 Filkins Webber, I have Commissioner Yao, Commissioner Di
25 Guilio.

1 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: This is the hard
2 part about taking it week by week because now what you've
3 just suggested might impact the week before. And
4 practically speaking, I can't see why we would be doing
5 Escondido and Temecula, or even San Marcos altogether.

6 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yeah, that's -

7 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Temecula in the
8 week prior, which is going to pull everybody from San
9 Marcos, almost Temecula could pull Oceanside technically,
10 Escondido, San Marcos, Rancho whatever it is down there -

11 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Bernardo.

12 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Rancho Bernardo -
13 huge area in Rancho Bernardo, just my comment, we can
14 work it out, I guess.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay. Commissioner Yao.

16 COMMISSIONER YAO: Is there a preference for San
17 Diego to be on a Saturday as compared to being on a
18 weekday? When I look at Palm Springs, I don't think
19 there are any really any commuting issues in Palm
20 Springs, compared to, for example, San Diego, so if we
21 move Palm Springs to Wednesday and give either a longer
22 day or at least a weekend date in San Diego, wherever you
23 decide San Diego to be in North San Diego County, or
24 otherwise -

25 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: What traffic

1 pattern are you referring to?

2 COMMISSIONER YAO: Well, I'm comparing San Diego
3 with Palm Springs, for example, okay? I see less of a
4 traffic issue with Palm Springs than I do with San Diego,
5 what is North San Diego County, or otherwise.

6 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Well, which way are
7 you talking - if you put Palm Springs on Thursday, you
8 switch those?

9 COMMISSIONER YAO: Correct.

10 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yeah, it would be Thursday,
11 shift everything down, maybe San Marcos, Escondido on the
12 13th and the City of San Diego on the 14th, that would make
13 sense.

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Say that again?

15 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: To move Palm Springs, Indio
16 to the 12th, and then shift the San Diego to Saturday and
17 San Marcos, Escondido on Friday.

18 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I have an
19 additional consideration for that, I just had a quick
20 conversation with Mr. Claypool to try and figure out how
21 we deal with these Mothers and Fathers Day weekends. So,
22 there is a possibility of taking Santa Ana and grouping
23 it in the following weekend, again, as we're considering
24 the San Diego, Palm Springs, San Marcos cluster,
25 depending what day we have left in the mix. It sounds

1 like then we would have a free Sunday.

2 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Actually, you can
3 take Temecula out and move Santa Ana on to Friday, and
4 then you've got your Mother's Day weekend, because
5 there's no reason to do Temecula the week before and then
6 go into San Marcos and Escondido the following week.

7 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Got you.

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, so what we've got is
9 Temecula as a city and venue, we're talking out
10 completely, correct? Temecula, all right. And then
11 we're making that Santa Ana?

12 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Are there any traffic
13 implications with Santa Ana on a Friday?

14 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: No, not from
15 Riverside - well, again, the timing that you're talking
16 about, you're going to be leaving Riverside - I do this
17 trek every day - Riverside into Santa Ana won't be a
18 problem for Friday, you know, mid-afternoon, I'm
19 thinking, because we're going to be doing a Friday
20 evening type of meeting for Santa Ana. No, no problem.

21 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right, so we've -

22 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Let's make sure we've got it
23 right. So, we're going to take out Temecula on the 6th,
24 and in its place we're going to move Santa Ana on Friday,
25 May 6th. Correct?

1 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Correct.

2 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Then, the following week on
3 May 12th, we're going to have Palm Springs, Indio.

4 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Right.

5 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: The following day, Friday,
6 the 13th, it'll be Escondido, San Marcos. And then,
7 Saturday, it'll be the City of San Diego.

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Correct. All right, good.
9 Commissioner Ancheta. Okay, good, all right, we're
10 moving. Commissioner --

11 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Hold on, I just had a
12 question in terms, if we are taking away an input day
13 that we've designated, do we feel a need to add one to
14 like the 11th? I mean, I know regionally we have it
15 covered, but we've had a certain number of days
16 scheduled. Do we feel it necessary to add one or not?
17 We're okay with just losing one. Okay, I just wanted to
18 make sure.

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right. Commissioner
20 Ancheta.

21 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: So, just looking at the
22 May 19th through May 23rd sequence and, again, I think
23 we're definitely substituting San Jose for San Ramon.

24 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So that's done, right?

25 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: That's firm. I think to

1 minimize our driving around the region, we may want to
2 re-order these. I think Santa Rosa and Rancho Cordova
3 are sort of interchangeable. I would then go to Oakland,
4 then to San Jose, then to Salinas, and you've got to
5 figure out where you're leaving from, I guess.

6 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Can you repeat that?

7 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Okay, so, again, Santa
8 Rosa and Rancho Cordova are sort of - I'm indifferent
9 about where you start there, but starting on Saturday, I
10 would substitute in Oakland on Saturday the 21st, San Jose
11 on Sunday the 22nd, and Salinas on Monday, the 23rd, and
12 that's just sort of a driving thing. Again, if there are
13 certain priorities for certain cities, that's different,
14 so we will want to see if that's an issue.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Right. Does that affect the
16 other criteria that might have gone into choosing Salinas
17 on a weekend?

18 MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes, the original consideration,
19 just a pattern on farm work.

20 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Right.

21 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Now, if that's the case, I
22 would certainly want to start in Oakland earlier anyway,
23 but if Salinas is okay on a Sunday, if that's okay -

24 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yes, I think if we do an
25 afternoon.

1 meeting. So, comments on this section. Commissioner
2 Ancheta.

3 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: And just for the
4 Commissioners' information, I brought this up in the
5 Technical/Outreach Committee meeting yesterday, and asked
6 this of the Q2 representative, which was, given - and we
7 don't know the volume of sort of state maps, but I asked
8 how many minutes might you recommend for each one, and
9 how should we balance that. And this is a
10 recommendation, of course, not necessarily for a be all
11 and end all, but she actually suggested something shorter
12 in terms of an oral presentation, so maybe nothing more
13 than 15 minutes, you know, it's a full-blown state map,
14 but that we, in anticipation that we might put together
15 some pretty significant guidelines for those kinds of
16 maps, and that the burden be placed on those submitting
17 the maps to put a pretty thorough written report
18 together, rather than sort of spending like an hour going
19 through all of the details. And we would suggest that
20 maybe we could probably get it all done in one day,
21 because one consideration I had was making sure we
22 actually got all that taken care of, just for a point of
23 information.

24 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, let me see if I
25 understand this correctly. The recommendation is that we

1 set some kind of date for submission of written
2 materials?

3 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: We didn't get that far.
4 The main point I was making is that we could rely on
5 shorter presentations at a hearing because we would
6 expect, I mean, we hadn't talked about timing or format
7 or anything, but that the expectation would be, however,
8 that there would be considerably more information in a
9 written report that would accompany those kinds of maps,
10 which would substitute for a longer presentation at a
11 hearing. But we didn't get into the detail of what
12 exactly should we ask for those submissions and when -
13 and it's a very good set of questions - when would they
14 be due, we hadn't gotten to that point.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I think -

16 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Just to be sure I understood
17 you, you're saying that we should take shorter public
18 testimonies. Is that -

19 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yeah, and I don't know,
20 you might have left the room for videotaping, but that's
21 what I got from the Q2 Rep at that meeting. I mean,
22 again, it's simply her suggestion, we don't have to
23 follow that, but I think it makes a lot of sense.

24 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Comments.

25 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I think the point of

1 that - can I clarify, too? Because I think you need to
2 discuss this, too, Commissioner Ancheta, you did raise a
3 good point that the reason it impacts the calendar,
4 because if we have a large number of groups, because
5 we're looking at this as our organized group, even our
6 statewide approach, there may be - correct me if I'm
7 wrong, Commissioner Ancheta - you mentioned here may be a
8 need actually to have more than one day, depending on how
9 long we allow them, and how in-depth we want to get with
10 an engagement. So, having said that, I think it was just
11 in relationship - we can have that discussion later, but
12 in terms of the calendar, if there's anticipation that
13 we'd actually have two days of organized input.

14 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yeah, and I think that's
15 been my concern that I've raised previously, and I think
16 - I can't remember which meeting or if it was yesterday,
17 but I think I raised that, at some point, we might want
18 to get some - we should send some signals out to the
19 public that you should let us know if you're going to be
20 doing that, so we could get some sense of how many days
21 we might need to allocate. But, again, in light of this
22 conversation we had yesterday, maybe we don't need more
23 than - but I don't know, again, if there's several dozen,
24 even one day for 15-minute testimony may not be enough.

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: And I would just say that we

1 may want to ask questions. So, a 15-minute presentation
2 doesn't include, really, our participation in trying to
3 get an understanding of what they're presenting to us.
4 So, it could be more, but just - Commissioner Dai?

5 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, I was just going to say,
6 once we publicize the schedule, I mean, I assume that we
7 anticipate sending out a call for sign-ups so that, you
8 know, if you want to present a statewide map, that here's
9 your opportunity, and that way we would get a good sense
10 of how many people.

11 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: And maybe it's worthwhile
12 to just allocate two days, I don't know. Again, we
13 should decide what we're doing in terms of that
14 particular set of inputs, but maybe as a safety measure
15 we should allocate -

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: My suggestion would be that
17 we keep it, that we do, as we move forward, figure out
18 what we're going to do in order to solicit the written
19 comment, and talk to Mr. Wilcox about how to get out the
20 information about this meeting in the most broad-based
21 way as possible, so that we do, in turn, have a sense of
22 what the participation may be. I don't know if we can -
23 for example, we could do what we did that first general
24 meeting here where we asked people to sign up, and
25 therefore we have - you know, it doesn't mean that we

1 don't hear from people that didn't sign up, but it gives
2 us a sense of the participation. And so, I think we
3 should think about all those details, but maybe for now
4 leave it the way it is. Is that - Commissioner Galambos
5 Malloy? Did I see a hand over here? Yeah, and then -

6 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I believe we've
7 also been getting public feedback around really what a
8 key moment in the process this is, for getting that state
9 feedback before we go into giving direction to the line
10 drawer and how, when you think of California, Northridge
11 is not a central location if there are groups that are in
12 the northern parts of the state who are wanting to give
13 feedback. And I note that the next week, we go into our
14 business meeting and direction for the line drawer in
15 Sacramento. I was wanting to throw out the idea, do we
16 consider doing two parts, having a Southern California
17 opportunity for statewide feedback, and then a
18 Sacramento-based one, which would allow Northern
19 Californians better access.

20 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Reactions.

21 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: That's a good idea.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yeah? I think so, too. I
23 think it makes a lot of sense.

24 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yeah.

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Staff, given your thinking

1 that's gone into these six days in Sacramento, how -
2 what's your reaction?

3 MR. CLAYPOOL: Well, originally, we had it ending
4 on the 6th and the maps going out there, this was actually
5 pushed forward by Karin to gather this extra time and to
6 leave some space for them to work, so there's plenty of
7 time to have that venue. Now, I would just ask the
8 Commission, where would you like to have it? Well, I was
9 thinking, besides date, where? Oh, so we would have it
10 in Sacramento, okay.

11 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, the 31st? Or could we
12 take one of those business - could we do it on the 2nd and
13 then meet the 3rd and the 4th?

14 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And I'd also suggest,
15 I'm not sure because I'm looking at some of the original
16 allotted amount of time we had for Commission Directs
17 Line Drawing, and since this is our first map, some of
18 them have gotten really compact here, and I'm not sure
19 how that happened. I would maybe, to build off of
20 Commissioner Blanco's suggestion, is to have the
21 Sacramento-based statewide input hearing on the 2nd, and
22 go into our Commission Direct Line Drafts on the 3rd
23 through the 10th. I mean, I think we're going to need -
24 I'm not sure why those extra dates - not that I would
25 like to lose another weekend, but I think we're going to

1 need it.

2 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Mr. Claypool, if
3 you can chime in here, I had thought that the reason for
4 the gap between the meetings on the 1st and the 2nd, and
5 then starting from the 7th to the 10th were also to give Q2
6 an opportunity to take that first iteration of feedback,
7 go back, work on some options, and then come back to us
8 again? So, we might need to build in some sort of break.

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Is that correct, Mr.
10 Claypool?

11 MR. CLAYPOOL: I think that's the correct
12 assumption. We originally, when we did it, had no gap,
13 and they placed a gap, and so I think that's why they
14 have it there.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, well, could we explore
16 with them whether they would feel comfortable with a
17 statewide hearing on the 2nd, and then two days on the 3rd
18 and 4th, and then a break of the 5th and 6th, whether that
19 still gives them enough time?

20 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Because I think -

21 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: And then Commissioner
22 Filkins Webber, okay.

23 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: I'm sorry. I'm looking at
24 what Q2 gave us at the Committee meeting yesterday and I
25 think the gap that they suggested was a gap between our

1 last meeting with them and the day they released the
2 maps, they want a couple days, they leave us alone, we
3 need to work on the maps, told us everything you need to
4 tell us, give us some time to actually implement that.
5 So, I think that's not the same as what we're seeing on
6 the proposed map because there is no sort of lead - some
7 time for them to actually work on their own. So, perhaps
8 it means pushing back some of the meeting - moving them
9 three days earlier so it's maybe 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th,
10 6th, or so, and then giving them three days to work on the
11 maps and then release the map.

12 COMMISSIONER BLANCO: And then - okay.

13 MR. CLAYPOOL: I was just wondering if that
14 wasn't the time that they needed, Commissioner Ancheta,
15 from - I'm trying to go back to the month before at
16 Northridge - because, after Northridge, there's the 28th,
17 29th, 30th, and 31st, when there's no activity. And then
18 we come to the 1st, 2nd - I think this gap, the 3rd, 4th,
19 5th, 6th, was something they just didn't know what to do
20 with, and we had put the six days in, and so they had
21 just put it that way.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I think that's right.
23 Commissioner Barabba.

24 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I would like to make sure
25 we have a meeting before the - the day before the maps

1 are released so that we can look at them.

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Absolutely.

3 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Rather than have to
4 release them on that day.

5 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: But I do - and, again, I'm
6 making some assumptions here, but I agree with that, but
7 I think, also, they need time to process all that we've
8 given them, and I think we need to give them a couple
9 days just to do that, then come back and say, "Okay, here
10 we are, I think we captured everything, and we're going
11 to go in the next day or so with the drafts."

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay -

13 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: And make sure we've got
14 everything right.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, what we're talking about
16 is, after the meeting on the 27th in Northridge, we have
17 the 28th, 29th, and 30th and the 31st with no meetings. And
18 this is where I think Mr. Claypool is saying that they
19 had requested some time to put stuff together for us
20 before we reconvened. So, then, they would do that and
21 we would reconvene, and we could have another statewide
22 input hearing, and then meet in a concentrated manner the
23 next few days? Is that what we're talking about here?

24 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: One extra comment based
25 on that.

1 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I have Commissioner Barabba,
2 Commissioner Di Guilio, and Commissioner Yao.

3 COMMISSONER BARABBA: Yeah. My only suggestion
4 of having that meeting here in Sacramento with the input
5 meeting on the 31st, the Tuesday, the 31st, is that that
6 will give - we may hear something that's quite different
7 than we heard down in Northridge -

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: That's true.

9 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: And we want to give them
10 some time to work that over.

11 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: That's true.

12 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I just thought we might
13 want to make sure they had plenty of time to react to
14 whatever we might hear.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yeah. Commissioner Yao, is
16 it on this point?

17 COMMISSIONER YAO: If we can refer to the package
18 that the Q2 gave us yesterday, I think they are
19 requesting for the few days before the release of the
20 first draft map to do what they have to do, and on our
21 latest staff recommendation, we got basically business
22 meeting tying up those days. I don't know whether we're
23 meeting their expectation or not, I guess, Mr. Claypool,
24 I welcome your input on it.

25 MR. CLAYPOOL: Well, they - first of all, they

1 drafted that map very very quickly and I think their main
2 focus was to - what I asked them to do were to leave a
3 three draft map concept, and to honor the review periods
4 for the public, but then to do whatever else they felt
5 they needed to do in order to get the days in, and they
6 literally did that in about 45 minutes. I think we have
7 some latitude with that, as long as we capture the dates
8 that they wish and, as Commissioner Ancheta said, give
9 them those time periods in between to work with the
10 information you're giving them.

11 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, so following up on
12 Commissioner Barabba's comment, which I think is very
13 important, here's what - let's see how people feel about
14 this - we take the 27th, which was supposed to be a
15 business meeting, line drawing day, and we have the
16 Northern California - in other words, I think it's true
17 that we have to, if we're going to take testimony in
18 Northern California, then we have to give them time to
19 process it. So, we have to move that up as early as
20 possible, the Sacramento statewide meeting, and then give
21 them time. So, with that in mind, where should we put
22 the Sacramento meeting - the hearing?

23 COMMISSIONER YAO: The 31st.

24 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: The 31st.

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: The 31st, and then we think

1 that that gives them - that's a Tuesday, and then what
2 happens after that?

3 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Yeah, I guess the point I
4 want to make is that we're going to hear a lot on the 25th
5 because a lot of the groups are coming at really
6 statewide organizations and they are pretty well prepared
7 to deal with the whole state. So, the issue I think that
8 we were reacting to about having a meeting here was
9 Commissioner Malloy's point that not everybody can come
10 down there, so this might be more supplemental
11 information.

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay.

13 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: So, the fact that we would
14 - we could have our meeting down in Northridge and give
15 them some direction based on what we've heard, and then
16 have a meeting up here, and then we could complement what
17 we direct them to do based on that information.

18 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Mr. Claypool, and then
19 Commissioner Di Guilio.

20 MR. CLAYPOOL: The only thing that I would say, I
21 agree completely with what Commissioner Barabba said, we
22 do need to also think about the 27th, it's going to jam us
23 right into Memorial Day weekend, and so perhaps it would
24 be better to then swing around, have that meeting on the
25 1st or the 2nd here, have a business meeting afterwards for

1 you to speak with your line drawer, give them time to
2 digest the new information the same way we've done across
3 Memorial Day, and then have your meetings leading up to
4 the release of your first draft, where you can speak to
5 them about the final corrections.

6 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, Mr. Claypool, can you
7 walk us through what that would look like, the days? We
8 have the meeting on the 25th, and then walk us through.

9 MR. CLAYPOOL: All right, so we would honor the
10 Northridge days, we would then come to -

11 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All three of them.

12 MR. CLAYPOOL: -- all three of them. Then, we
13 would come to Sacramento and, I would think, have our
14 statewide meeting on the 2nd, and then we would have a
15 business meeting on the 3rd, we would break until the 7th,
16 and then we would meet back to meet with our line drawers
17 and possibly release our maps on the 9th or 10th, depending
18 on how you wanted to do it, get three more days to work
19 with the Line Drawer.

20 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Mr. Claypool,
21 could I ask you, you had an idea on how to accommodate
22 just the one day of Father's Day, how would that interact
23 with these dates you've lined out for the second week of
24 June?

25 MR. CLAYPOOL: If we push the release to the 9th,

1 and then we make the review period from the 11th, 12th,
2 13th, 14th, and 15th - oh, I see - 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th,
3 14th, now we move the entire schedule back, now Mesa,
4 Anaheim, and Culver City now go the 15th, 16th, 17th, and
5 then we move Temple City and San Bernardino up to be the
6 20th and 21st, you accommodate the weekend for Father's
7 Day, that's the -

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right, so I would like to
9 hold that part of the discussion for now and finalize
10 this issue of the Sacramento meeting and how to do the
11 work that leads up to the release of the first maps, if
12 possible. Commissioner Di Giulio.

13 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: This is very important.
14 I think there are two breaks that Q2 has requested, and
15 although they - one is right after we get with our
16 Southern, now if we add a Northern California, but I
17 think they're asking for a little bit of time. And they
18 did say this, even though this calendar they submitted
19 yesterday might have been done quickly, they did mention
20 verbally that they would like to have a few days before
21 that release of the first map, and I think we could come
22 back and also review it with them, but they're telling us
23 they need some time to actually do the physical work.
24 So, having said that, they suggested, and staff
25 incorporated, moving that release date to the 10th. So, I

1 would suggest we keep the integrity of that date, but
2 knowing we need to give them a couple days to process
3 this, what we've directed them, and knowing they need
4 some time to process some of this input. I think we need
5 to look at this in terms of that, that we need to give
6 them two gaps, and I'm not sure how - if we move this gap
7 from the release of the first draft, you're going into
8 the gap that we left them for the post-meeting. So, even
9 though the second abuts with Memorial Day weekend, if we
10 did the Sacramento input on the 31st, that would give them
11 - I know it's not much, maybe two days, maybe three, and
12 then we could give the 1st and 2nd off and maybe come back
13 on the 3rd for at least some business meeting we could get
14 out of the way, and then start in on line drawing for
15 Friday, Saturday, Sunday, Monday, maybe Tuesday, and give
16 them - you know -

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Let me see if I've got it.
18 We meet on the 31st here, we give them now two straight
19 days to just dive into the data and start doing their
20 work, and then we come back for a business meeting on the
21 3rd or 4th? No? Not until the 5th?

22 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Not that far, we have to
23 do it sooner.

24 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, repeat the sequence.

25 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So, the intent - I guess

1 the integrity is, to back up, if we do the Northridge,
2 they do have that weekend to digest that material, so
3 they're really only doing the Sacramento input, I'm
4 assuming without the duplication of hearing the same
5 groups again, so it would be a short amount of
6 information they have to digest, so maybe then we could
7 come back on Friday and include a business meeting and
8 start the directing the line process, it might not happen
9 until the end of the day, so it will give them some more
10 time. So, Friday, Saturday, the 3rd, 4th, 5th, 6th, 7th, at
11 least, I would say, that only gives them - well, it gives
12 them two days, and then we would have to come back on the
13 10th to - would that give us enough time, Commissioner
14 Barabba? So you're saying we should come back on the 9th
15 to review, so maybe could only go to the 6th?

16 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: And then let them go work
17 - but they come back to us on the 9th.

18 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: On the 9th, okay.

19 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: And then we can see the
20 maps and then we release them on the 10th.

21 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Sounds good.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Yao, and then
23 let's see if we can summarize that so that we all know
24 what we're talking about. Commissioner Yao.

25 COMMISSIONER YAO: You know, I think it's

1 probably good if we can let Q2 have all the input and
2 give them a solid block of time to draw the first draft,
3 as compared to waiting a week, and then getting the
4 Northern California input, and then shortening up that
5 schedule. So, what I'm proposing is perhaps utilize the
6 day of the 24th of May so that we have two solid days of
7 organizational input, and then leave the rest of the
8 schedule alone so that they now have all the input, they
9 can put all their attention to drawing the first set of
10 draft maps, and then proceed in that manner because I do
11 think that they need a solid block of time in order to
12 come up with that first map. And by injecting the North
13 California input into the process, we basically shorten
14 up that block of time that I think they would appreciate.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I have a recommendation.
16 How about we add the Sacramento meeting on the 31st, and
17 then we ask Q2 to look at all the days after that,
18 leading up to the 10th, and tell us what they want?

19 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Excellent idea.

20 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Thank you.

21 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: How's that? Instead of
22 trying to guess what they want and they need.

23 MR. CLAYPOOL: If I might point out for
24 Commissioner Yao, we are in Northridge right in the
25 middle of their graduation week, and so they are

1 accommodating us, but the further we go into the end of
2 the week, the more accommodating they can be, so that's
3 why we are on the 25th, 26th and 27th, and then we would
4 work with Q2 as Commissioner Blanco suggested, but also
5 in that pattern, would you like staff to fit a Northern
6 California meeting in so that we could have that in front
7 of a block of time, so that we can also give that
8 information to Q2, as well?

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yes. Tell them that we've
10 decided that we want a Northern California meeting - it's
11 a statewide one - of course, people from Sacramento can
12 come present on Sacramento issues, obviously, and that we
13 want to have that obviously before we go to the process
14 of line drawing, and ask them, given that additional
15 meeting that we have, and we'll vote, that we voted to
16 add, what do they want - how do they want to structure
17 the remaining time? Commissioner Forbes, then
18 Commissioner Di Guilio and Commissioner Barabba.

19 COMMISSIONER FORBES: My question is, we have six
20 days for us doing line drawing. What is the purpose of
21 the gap - we have two days, and then there is a four-day
22 gap. What is the purpose of that four-day gap between
23 the two blocks of our line drawing?

24 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: This is why I'm suggesting
25 that we talk to Q2 and hear from them what they want to

1 do with those blocks of time. I think this is partially
2 just us reacting and say we need time between, but I'd
3 say let's nail it down with them.

4 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Okay.

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Di Guilio, then
6 Commissioner Barabba.

7 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I totally - I very much
8 agree that we need to just put our concepts down and let
9 them run with it. I like the idea of giving the option
10 for the 31st for Sacramento input. Could I also suggest,
11 since we're asking Q2 to also review another option, that
12 only because if we do it along those lines, it would give
13 us only about four days to review - I mean, to do the
14 line drawing for the first map - I can't imagine four
15 days, or something along that line if we incorporate
16 breaks. So, if we were trying to maximize our time,
17 could we throw out another option to them? This would be
18 a lot for the Commission, but to have one day in
19 Northridge at the end of May, one day in Northridge for
20 public input, and then we would have to fly to Northern
21 California to take one day in Sacramento of public input,
22 organized groups, and then that would give them the
23 weekend to digest all of that, and then we could start
24 right in that following week and give ourselves the time.
25 So, is it possible for them to consider both options of -

1 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I would love it, that was my
2 original proposal, that we do that hearing that 27th, and
3 that really builds in a lot of time so that they can look
4 at both options and tell us what they really need and
5 what we need, because they'll have a sense of what we
6 need to do, as well. So, does that make sense, Mr.
7 Claypool?

8 MR. CLAYPOOL: Absolutely. So, we'll ask them -
9 essentially, if I'm hearing this correctly, look at the
10 block between the 25th and the 10th, and let's get two
11 regional meetings that we wish to have in the time that
12 we've allotted at Northridge, and tell us how it works
13 best for them and best for us.

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Correct. Commissioner
15 Barabba.

16 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: And we should always ask
17 them if it would be better if we had these second set of
18 meetings in Oakland rather than up here because they're -
19 we're not having them waste time driving up and down,
20 trying to come up here to talk to us. And we've been
21 wanting to go to Oakland for another meeting, anyway, so
22 it would just seem to me to be easier for them to be
23 closer to their facility, and if they would want to, we
24 should be able to find a place to stay in Oakland.

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: That's a really interesting

1 suggestion, if all their stuff is there, and their map
2 drawing, it might be - can we explore that, Mr. Claypool,
3 not only if it's better for them, but where we would hold
4 our meetings. Commissioner Galambos Malloy, Commissioner
5 Yao.

6 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: In the interest of
7 getting this finalized today, is it possible that we
8 could get a hold of Ms. MacDonald over the lunch break,
9 or just direct staff to get that quick feedback so we can
10 go ahead and lock this in?

11 MR. CLAYPOOL: We'll see what we can do.

12 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay.

13 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay. Now, my
14 recommendation is, we have a substantive, I think, Legal
15 Advisory Committee report out. We can either stop now,
16 and say that we've done up to the first release of the
17 maps, and that's good enough, or we can try and go
18 through the rest of June.

19 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: I would recommend -- our
20 subcommittee would recommend -- that we hold it right
21 here, and then come back and complete the schedule later
22 on.

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Does that present problems
24 for scheduling flights, hotels, all that stuff?

25 MR. PARVENU: It presents a problem for me with

1 Culver City. I'd like to lock the date in for Thursday
2 the 16th with Culver City, if you don't mind.

3 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: We can do that.

4 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, so let's look, then,
5 at the last two weeks, okay? Well, let's just finish
6 June. So, Commissioner Parvenu, do you want to comment
7 on this?

8 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: That's simply my comment
9 because Thursday, Culver City, the offices are open, the
10 city facilities are available. Culver City is closed on
11 Friday, and Culver City does not have facilities on
12 Saturday.

13 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, so I have Commissioner
14 Galambos Malloy on this, Commissioner Forbes.

15 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, so three
16 points. One is looking at the 25th of June, which
17 Commissioner Di Guilio referenced earlier. This is
18 designated as a Region 9 meeting and it's designated for
19 Fresno, but as I'm reading our initial information, I
20 think what we approved as a framework for the regions -
21 I'm just trying to clarify - is this a Fresno meeting?
22 Because Fresno is in Region 6, I believe, so is it a
23 Region 6 meeting or a Fresno meeting?

24 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I believe it's a Fresno
25 meeting, it's a typo, and the typo is in Region 6, not

1 Region 9.

2 MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes.

3 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Thank you. And
4 then the second two points, one was, on the 22nd, we have
5 Region 9 listed, is there any thought as to what the
6 actual location would be for that?

7 MR. CLAYPOOL: That was just put in very quickly,
8 as Commissioner Yao actually has that map from Karin, she
9 just put Region 9 in there, so we need to pick a Region 9
10 location.

11 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Okay, and I think the
12 point has been made that we haven't actually had a formal
13 input hearing in Sacramento for the public input,
14 especially if we go to San Jose for the statewide, so I
15 think it just gives us the flexibility to go back to that
16 - recognition that we need to go back, it just hadn't
17 been determined where.

18 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, and the
19 third point is, as we get the feedback from Ms.
20 MacDonald, then we can decide how much flexibility, if at
21 all, we have to free up Sunday the 19th.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Forbes.

23 COMMISSIONER FORBES: That was my comment,
24 regarding Sacramento Region 9, there is no formal meeting
25 at any time in Sacramento for public input or comment,

1 and so I would make the 22nd a Sacramento meeting.

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Comments. Commissioner
3 Raya.

4 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Not on that, sorry. But, I
5 mean, I do have a comment on the week, in general, but do
6 you want me to wait?

7 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, I think Culver City, we
8 need to settle on that. We're moving it up?

9 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: I'd like to switch that with
10 San Diego. Since Culver City, I think, is available on
11 Thursday -

12 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Yes.

13 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: -- so I'd like to switch San
14 Diego to Saturday, the 18th, and Culver City to the 16th.
15 And I would just say San Diego, not Mira Mesa North.

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay.

17 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I had a follow-up for
18 Commissioner Ontai on that, not that this is a big issue,
19 but we - that would - since we changed back in May, San
20 Diego from the 12th, which is a weekday to the weekend,
21 the 14th, and if we switch again, that means two weekends
22 for San Diego, is that acceptable?

23 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yes, it's a big city and so
24 we want to get as many people -

25 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: As opposed to a need for

1 a weekday.

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, Commissioner Raya
3 first and then Ancheta.

4 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Okay, I'm going to free up
5 the 19th of June, Sunday, because you're covering those
6 communities when you go to San Gabriel, so unless there's
7 something else in mind, that's all included.

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Second phase.

9 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Is there a better
10 recommendation for - now we're kind of looking at the
11 regions again for - this is the second look, so do you
12 have a recommendation - that placeholder is for Region 4.
13 If you notice the purple, this is the only time - well, I
14 take it back, Culver City, so there are two touches in
15 Region 4, which is L.A., so we've said that we want to go
16 to Culver City and this area, those are the two most
17 important regions in Region 4 for this touch.

18 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay. I'm going to try and
19 wrap this up. Commissioner Galambos Malloy.

20 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I would defer to
21 Commissioner Ontai on this, but I had wondered, since we
22 will, if I'm remembering correctly, we will be in San
23 Diego earlier on, but what the possibility is about
24 having that meeting in the Imperial area?

25 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: No. I would not recommend

1 that.

2 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Can you say a
3 little bit more about why? I am deferring to you, but I
4 would like to know your thought process.

5 [Laughter]

6 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: This is going to be the
7 post-map review, the first time San Diego will be able to
8 respond back to that map, and you look at the Census
9 Data, San Diego County is like four times larger than
10 Imperial County.

11 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, so, we've made the
13 Culver City switch, there is a suggestion that I think
14 has not been accepted that we eliminate the Region 4
15 meeting on the 19th -

16 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Well, I guess the way I'm
17 looking at it is, are you intending us to take in a
18 really broad range for that post-map hearing, not just -

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So maybe - let me try this -
20 for the post-map set of dates we're looking at, what is
21 the criteria? Let's talk criteria again.

22 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I think the post-map, it
23 was simply an opportunity to go back and have a second
24 touch at these different regions, and Region 4 being the
25 largest, it has two touches, and all the other ones have

1 simply one. So, I think we need to prioritize what we
2 feel will be the basis for going back into those areas
3 and where we need to touch the most people because there
4 are only two places, and we have to maximize the amount
5 of places in that greater L.A. area where we can have
6 them review the map.

7 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, I have a question before
8 I take other questions. So, in the post-map phase, first
9 post-map phase, the L.A. is covered by the Culver City
10 meeting and by this Monterey Park meeting, and that's it?

11 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Correct. All the other
12 ones have only one touch. Part of the problem is we have
13 only, what, 10 days or so? Ten days, we have one day
14 off, and then we begin the next line drawing, so for the
15 next release of the maps. So there will be one more
16 opportunity to comment after the second draft.

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Right.

18 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: But this is the - if you
19 wanted to add one more day and just go straight, if there
20 was a justification to add three days, then you have a
21 discussion about the other regions having only one, and
22 L.A. having three, or if you have another large
23 Metropolitan area, you'd like to have two touches, so...

24 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: My question is not so much
25 about how many, it's why do we change locations from

1 where they were at the first touch.

2 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Oh, I think to get the
3 most input, I'm sorry, I didn't understand what your
4 question was. We're not going back to the same exact
5 location because the regions are so large and they're so
6 - we need to go to different spots each time to maximize
7 the amount of public option to be able to have an input
8 at some point.

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Right, even though it's the
10 second -

11 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Correct.

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: It's the release of maps -

13 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And they have the
14 ability to comment on the release of the first - for some
15 people, it might be the first time providing input at
16 all, so it's an opportunity for them to -

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right, sorry,
18 Commissioner Raya, Commissioner Yao.

19 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Okay, then if we're looking
20 at covering as much territory as possible, I'm not sure
21 we want to go back, and maybe Peter could - Commissioner
22 Yao could chime in on this - but as far as going back to
23 an area in Region 4, you know, there may be some other
24 kind of central point that we want to select where you're
25 going to draw in from some of the areas we might not have

1 reached in L.A., in Region 4.

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, Commissioner Yao was
3 next.

4 COMMISSIONER YAO: I just felt that a second
5 meeting in the Los Angeles County would be appropriate
6 and I haven't given enough thought on exactly what a
7 region is at this point in time, but we could certainly
8 work that out.

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: We have some interference,
10 whose phone?

11 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: It is Commissioner
12 Parvenu's Verizon thing, we had that problem over here.

13 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Ah, all right, so, let me
14 see if I understand your comment, Commissioner Yao, you
15 are saying, in addition to Culver City and the Sunday
16 meeting, wherever that may end up, there is a need for
17 yet another?

18 COMMISSIONER YAO: No. I would not want to give
19 up the second meeting in Region 4, as Commissioner Raya
20 has proposed.

21 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, got it. So, I have
22 Commissioner Ancheta.

23 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yeah, I would agree with
24 Commissioner Yao about having a second Region 4 meeting
25 and I would rather just - if order does not matter, I

1 would simply ask staff to sort of calculate the mileage
2 because there's generally a lot of back and forth, up and
3 down, going from San Diego to San Bernardino and I don't
4 want to try to calculate it right now, but if the order
5 is not critical, you should try to get these so that the
6 mileage is minimized. Because right now, because of the
7 switching of Culver City and San Diego, you're doing
8 quite a bit of travel with this order.

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Correct.

10 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: And not wanting to
11 calculate exactly, I think you can do that with Google
12 Maps, actually.

13 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: It's about 100 miles.

14 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: So it's quite a bit of
15 money if we're talking about individual driving.

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So the instruction to staff
17 is that, in this chunk of the 16th through the 20th, that
18 knowing that Culver City has to be on Thursday, can you
19 look at the flow for those five days?

20 MR. CLAYPOOL: Certainly, and do we have
21 agreement on Region 9 as being Sacramento? The 22nd of
22 June?

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: The 22nd - Commissioner
24 Parvenu.

25 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: That's fine, but I have a

1 comment, I want to remind the Commission that we did
2 receive some correspondence from the Greenlining
3 Institute and the Dolores Huerta Foundation with regard
4 to Bakersfield, as Commissioner Di Giulio mentioned
5 before, they would prefer to have a pre-map meeting,
6 earlier, but in lieu of them not having that, we may want
7 to consider Bakersfield on the second go-round, early,
8 that's a high growth area - 41 percent over the last ten
9 years, so let's not leave Bakersfield out if we possibly
10 can avoid it.

11 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Discussion.

12 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yeah, I think we lost
13 Bakersfield because I think it was on the previous
14 version, so I'm not sure what happened to it.

15 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I think we put Hanford
16 in as an option for the southern part of the San Joaquin
17 Valley, particularly since it's related to the Section 5
18 and Kings County. And then, again, I think the issue of
19 Fresno vs. Bakersfield, Bakersfield is just similar to
20 the coast, you are blocked up - of course, you can come
21 over the mountains from the east or from the south, but
22 that's a big barrier. I just think you have more
23 attendance of a pool if you're in Fresno.

24 MR. CLAYPOO: We also, if I might add, lost
25 Bakersfield when Q2 re-did the map, and Bakersfield

1 became a to be determined, so it could still be
2 determined to be Bakersfield, but that's where it
3 disappeared.

4 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: And just - I would note
5 that, having spent a fair amount of time in the Valley,
6 Fresno and Bakersfield are not really seen as, you know,
7 substitutable, or whatever the word is. You know, I
8 think there's a big difference between saying we're in
9 Fresno and we're in Bakersfield, I think it captures two
10 very different populations and, also, urban, rural,
11 Bakersfield has become very urban, and I think you miss
12 some stuff there. So, I don't think that you can swap
13 them out.

14 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I think it's a matter -
15 this will be an issue for us as we go into those to be
16 determined because there are very good justifications for
17 a lot of areas that we will have to make a choice at some
18 point when we go back, because there will be some areas,
19 geographically, that may be more isolated, or have a
20 legitimate claim, but we have to make some hard
21 decisions, so that might be for a little bit later.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, where are we on this?
23 Commissioner Filkins Webber.

24 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Keeping in mind
25 Commissioner Galambos Malloy's point about Father's Day,

1 I'd really hate for us to, I guess, waste an entire day
2 on a holiday where we're not going to get a lot of public
3 input, so I think our first means by which we could fix
4 this difficulty with this week, because I have other
5 comments, but we need to make a decision whether we're
6 going to hold the meeting on Father's Day and whether we
7 really feel that it would be good for the public. I
8 don't know. So, I think once we make a decision on that,
9 then we can work on a flow because Commissioner Ancheta
10 is correct, you know, Culver City into Anaheim is okay,
11 but then down to San Diego and back to San Bernardino is
12 impractical, so we should probably decide Father's Day
13 first.

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Forbes.

15 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I think Father's Day - I
16 think we're twisting too hard to accommodate Father's
17 Day. I think we could, if there weren't the San
18 Bernardino meeting after it, but I don't see - you
19 basically have to pick up two days, I think, and I think
20 that's really hard, so, I mean, and frankly, just as a
21 father, Father's Day, you know, I mean, it's okay, but
22 it's not like Mother's Day.

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I want to do a time check.
24 It's 11:30. We have, I think, from having talked to the
25 different advisory committee leads, the one committee

1 after this that has some things substantive is legal, I
2 think the others will move fairly quickly. So, when
3 we're finished with this conversation, I think we then
4 need to go to brief public comment because I think there
5 will be public comment on this, and then lunch. So -

6 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Madam Chair, we still have
7 to talk about the format.

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Oh, yeah, that's what I'm
9 saying, so I'm trying to get us to move back our schedule
10 and still incorporate a lunch period. So, it looks to me
11 like we won't be done with this conversation, with this
12 discussion, or this item, however we want to call it,
13 until at least 12:30. Is that correct? What do people
14 think? 12:30? Can we finish this calendar discussion,
15 including -

16 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: The format.

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: -- the format, by 12:30? If
18 not, then we'll break in the middle of this discussion
19 and come back to it after lunch.

20 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I would consider
21 maybe 15 minutes we might be able to work out the next
22 two weeks, do 15 minutes for public comment, then have
23 our break, come back, and deal with either legal or
24 Commissioner Ontai's input hearings.

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: How long is your item, the

1 logistics?

2 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Well, our presentation,
3 itself, is probably 10 minutes, 10-15 minutes.

4 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: But the discussion. All
5 right, let's finish June, go to public comment, go to
6 lunch, come back, and in the mean time, I'll sort of
7 figure out - oh, then whether we hear first from Legal,
8 and then go finish this part of the conversation, or
9 whether we go all through the calendar. Okay? All
10 right, so let's continue this and let's try and wrap up
11 in 15 minutes. Commissioner Filkins Webber.

12 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: So, Father's Day,
13 does everybody agree that it would be okay to have a
14 hearing on that day, then?

15 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: It's okay with this
16 father.

17 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: It's okay with you.
18 Oh, "fodder," I thought it was.

19 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: And to all the dads
20 listening in, forgive us.

21 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: In that case, I did
22 hear Commissioner Yao's suggestion about getting back to
23 that area, but when you're looking at Region 4 and you're
24 looking at the Greater Los Angeles area, we have a
25 tremendous number of other options to really spread

1 ourselves out; in other words, you're going back to the
2 same area as Commissioner Raya had said, the San Gabriel
3 Valley, and although it's a second look, I have to
4 recognize that we're doing a pre-map in Riverside and a
5 post-map in San Bernardino. Again, to me, I think you
6 can move out of San Gabriel. In that regard, you could
7 go further south and maybe ask staff to consider areas in
8 the greater central area of Los Angeles, which includes
9 Norwalk, La Mirada, again, now here is Whittier, again,
10 that would be, you know, we could take a look at Whittier
11 again, we took them off the map before, but that puts you
12 in Central Los Angeles and pulls all the areas, and gets
13 you back out of the Valley and considers that, so I would
14 consider that, if we keep Father's Day on there, then
15 we're back into Central L.A., but if that's the case, we
16 need to look at mileage and flow. Culver City, first,
17 might be okay, then if we moved Friday into that Central
18 L.A., you know, Whittier area, then go to Santa Ana,
19 Orange County area on Saturday, and San Diego on Sunday,
20 again, just for flow and traffic. Alternatively, moving
21 San Bernardino, from going from Santa Ana to San
22 Bernardino on Sunday, and then San Diego on Monday,
23 that's a possibility too, for flow.

24 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Right. Commissioner Raya.

25 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Going along with that, I

1 would suggest to staff, there is a beautiful facility in
2 Cerritos, Cerritos Performing Arts Center, that would
3 have everything we would need if it could be made
4 available.

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yes, Mr. Claypool.

6 MR. CLAYPOOL: Do you have a contact?

7 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I don't off the top of my
8 head, but I can see if I can find one.

9 COMMISSIONER YAO: I'll provide you the contact.

10 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Okay, great.

11 MR. CLAYPOOL: Excellent.

12 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: If we're making that
13 suggestion, I'd like to have the Commission look at - if
14 we're ending with San Diego with the flow, if you look at
15 the next week, we start with Sacramento and work our way
16 down, but then the 27th, were back in Sacramento for a
17 Commission meeting and I would suggest maybe reversing
18 that to the extent possible, that we start maybe in
19 Oxnard, Santa Paula on the 22nd, particularly if we're in
20 San Diego, we just head straight back up to Oxnard, Santa
21 Paula, and then reverse it with Fresno, San Jose, so you
22 end -- we had suggested the 22nd, with that region now
23 would be Sacramento, you would end in Sacramento and go
24 straight into your Commission line drawing.

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, can you tick that off

1 for us?

2 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Okay. And there may be
3 some adjustments based on weekend/weekday requirements,
4 but let me just throw it out, just reverse it. The 22nd
5 would be Oxnard, Santa Paula, the 23rd would be Fresno,
6 the 24th would remain San Jose, the 25th would be San
7 Francisco, and the 26th would be Sacramento, and which
8 would lead us straight into our line drawing.

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, and then what do you
10 have for the week before that?

11 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I'm sorry, I was just
12 going off the last proposal - and I didn't catch exactly,
13 but I heard that it ended in San Diego.

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: And then for the 16th
15 through the 20th, what do we have?

16 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I'll repeat it if I
17 wrote it down right - Culver City on the 16th,
18 Cerritos/Whittier - we were wondering if Cerrito
19 Performing Arts Center would be available on a Friday
20 night, we were just chatting about that, so that might be
21 a problem, so going back to, again, Central L.A.,
22 Whittier, then into Santa Ana on Sunday - or Saturday?
23 Saturday. Then Sunday is -

24 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: San Diego?

25 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: -- no, San

1 Bernardino, and then San Diego.

2 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: That's fine.

3 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Is that right?

4 Okay.

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, do you have that, Mr.

6 Claypool?

7 MR. CLAYPOOL: I do.

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, all right.

9 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: The San Diego one would have
10 to be in the evening, though. Make sure it's in the
11 evening.

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay. Any more comments on
13 the June calendar? I'll give time -

14 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: The only other
15 question I had is where is the summary, or does this even
16 matter now? I guess, because - does the Line Drawer need
17 any more time like we provided for before the first
18 release of the maps when they were doing those summaries?
19 Now that we're past the first draft, did your Line Drawer
20 give you any suggestions as to what would need to be
21 done, let's say, at the end of the 26th? Because now I
22 don't see that summary again on changes, maybe, that
23 we're going to anticipate from the 16th to the 26th, number
24 one, number two, does the Line Drawer require a few days?
25 And then we come back here on the 29th, 30th? I don't see

1 any gap like we saw earlier.

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Right.

3 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: That's a good point, we
4 should ask them.

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Yao. Is it on
6 this point? Because I think this is an important point
7 we need to clear up. If it's not, let me --

8 COMMISSIONER YAO: Yeah, go ahead and finish the
9 point.

10 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Should we recommend that
11 we could have staff work with that premise and then come
12 back after they've talked with Q2 about the other issue
13 and this one, too?

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Right. What I would
15 recommend is we've got the flow, we like the flow, and we
16 can give them the flow, but as we did with the previous
17 item, ask them what they need and tell us, because we've
18 got the flow and the cities, and I think that's okay,
19 it's more a question of what happens after we're done
20 with the hearings, how much time, okay? So if staff can
21 give them this changed schedule and ask them what they
22 need as soon as we're finished with the last hearing on
23 the 26th?

24 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Great.

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay. Commissioner Yao.

1 COMMISSIONER YAO: Let me read the flow again.
2 Culver City, Cerritos, Santa Ana, San Bernardino, San
3 Diego, now, we can simply pick up Fresno and Oxnard, then
4 the following block of activity including Sacramento, San
5 Diego, San Jose, and this series of Sacramento meetings
6 can all happen in Northern California, as compared to
7 having Sacramento on the 22nd, San Francisco, San Jose, on
8 the 23rd, 24th, and then have to drop back down to Fresno
9 and Oxnard, and then come back up to Sacramento again for
10 that last four meetings in June.

11 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: We already flipped it.

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, we already did that.
13 So that was the flow that we're shifting and then it's
14 really a question of what's left afterwards. Okay?

15 COMMISSIONER YAO: All right.

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right. Commissioner
17 Ontai, are you satisfied that we're done with June, and
18 Commissioner Di Giulio, and that's as far as we need to
19 get on the dates and the cities, so far, in terms of
20 approving it?

21 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yes.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay. It is a quarter of
23 12. What I would recommend is that we do public comment
24 now on this portion, and then, like I said, we will come
25 back and deal with the issue of formatting and then go to

1 Legal Advisory Committee. Yes? All right. Is there any
2 public comment on this issue?

3 MR. WRIGHT: Good morning, again. Jim Wright.
4 I'm missing something here. My concept of your input
5 meetings, I want to confirm that it agrees with your
6 concept of an input meeting. What I'm thinking of is
7 that you're listening intently, politely, that you're
8 making notes, that you're asking questions, but you are
9 not making decisions. So, in the red meetings, the red
10 days and the gray days, you're listening, basically.
11 When you get to the green meetings, you're starting to
12 review the information you've collected, discuss it, and
13 decide what to do, and then inform the Line Drawer what
14 action they need to take. The Line Drawer is there
15 during the red meetings and the gray meetings, red days
16 and gray days, helping you collect information to
17 validate that you got good information, but they don't do
18 anything until you tell them what to do in the green
19 meetings. I hope that agrees with your concept of the
20 two meetings.

21 A couple of things I think are very important
22 about the input meetings, is that you specify a time
23 period for the meeting, and I think you need to stay in
24 session for that entire time period on the basis that
25 somebody might walk in five minutes before it's over.

1 Okay. You're probably going to have to allow yourselves
2 time beyond the scheduled time because it might go over,
3 you've got to listen to everybody that shows up.

4 And the other thing is that, if you're in San
5 Diego and somebody comes down from Redding and wants to
6 give you input, you really ought to listen to them, they
7 made the effort, and that's fairly important.

8 I did notice when I was looking at some of the
9 Census Data that is coming in that Riverside County, in
10 particular, is one that has grown substantially - 41
11 percent growth in the last ten years. I suspect that
12 there's going to be a lot of turmoil there, a lot of
13 suggestions as to what needs to happen because that
14 county is now going to have to get split, where in a much
15 different way than it was split before. That should be
16 very interesting. Thank you. Let's go to lunch.

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, we will reconvene at
18 1:00 - oh, more public comment, excuse me.

19 MR. SALIVARI: Yeah, hi, sorry, Dave Salivari
20 again. Just really quick, the Northern California
21 statewide meeting, my assumption from hearing you, but I
22 got a little confused, is that will have equal weight
23 with the Northridge public meetings? Okay. And so I
24 guess it will go on the public calendar as a green
25 meeting, also, where you're going to be directing the

1 Line Drawer? Is my understanding correct? I just wanted
2 to make sure that the Northern California kind of, you
3 know, got the same kind of weight that you guys give to
4 Southern California. Thanks.

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Thank you. Anymore public
6 comment? Hearing none, we will reconvene - sure? No,
7 no, go ahead.

8 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I don't want to re-open a
9 can of worms, but I'll just say this -

10 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: No, no, go ahead, this is
11 important.

12 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: -- but on the 21st of
13 June, since we're on a roll, that day is open, we're in
14 San Diego on the 20th, I'd like to have Oxnard on the 21st
15 and Bakersfield on the 22nd, and Fresno on the 23rd, just
16 to have - at no time do we go to Bakersfield, and I just
17 don't feel comfortable leaving that area out. That's my
18 suggestion.

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Let's discuss this. You
20 know, you raise a good point, you have a way to do it, I
21 don't think anybody wants to exclude Bakersfield, so I
22 urge that if there is a way to do it, that we do it.

23 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yeah, and we can talk
24 about this but, again, I think what happened is the July
25 8th through 12th block, which had a number of cities built

1 in, including, I think, Bakersfield, went to be
2 determined. And we should decide, well, is that
3 appropriate, this is much later, and is that appropriate
4 because that is post second draft map, but that's where
5 they were and, again, it's a good point, maybe they
6 should come earlier, but there are some blocks left where
7 we can fill in cities, so I think, if we get to that
8 today or after lunch, we can do that.

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Di Giulio.

10 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Just for consideration,
11 I think this is a legitimate issue, but I won't speak to
12 the Bakersfield necessarily, but I'll speak to the
13 logistics of the suggestion, that to get from San Diego
14 to Ventura/Oxnard, like Commissioner Aguirre mentioned,
15 it's going to be a good three plus hour - I was going to
16 say four, but I was being conservative, it's not a short
17 drive, and also, if we are going 15 days straight, I was
18 just wondering if we need a break at some point. So, for
19 everyone and for our groupies who are following us on the
20 road, but that's just my suggestion about the
21 implications of that. I think the issue of Bakersfield
22 is legitimate, it's just the implications of logistics.

23 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Madam Chair?

24 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yes, Commissioner Raya,
25 thank you.

1 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Just to throw something more
2 into it, but if we really wanted to consider Bakersfield,
3 then I would suggest thinking it over lunch, but we have
4 two Section 5 - that's two different counties, though,
5 right?

6 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Correct.

7 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Okay, so there's no way to
8 adjust that.

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right, here would be my
10 suggestion. We've tentatively agreed on this. Over
11 lunch, people take your calendar with you and see if you
12 can figure out a creative way to include Bakersfield in
13 the calendar. Yes, Commissioner Di Guilio?

14 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Commissioner Forbes made
15 a very good point and Bakersfield is in Kings, am I not
16 correct?

17 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: No, Kern.

18 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Kern County.

19 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Oh, you're right, of
20 course, that's right.

21 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: That would have been nice,
22 but...

23 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: You notice the two
24 Central Valley representatives are like, "We should
25 know."

1 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, please, especially those
2 representatives, please take a hard look at it. We'll
3 all take a hard look at it, and we'll reconvene at 1:00.
4 Thank you.

5 (Recess at 11:49 a.m.)

6 (Reconvene at 1:07 p.m.)

7 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Good afternoon, it's a
8 little bit after 1:00 on March 25th. This is the
9 afternoon portion of the Citizens Redistricting
10 Commission. We're meeting at the Capitol Building. And
11 we will be completing a discussion that we commenced in
12 the morning, which is the decision to - the discussion
13 and hopeful decision to adopt our hearing schedule, at
14 least through June of this summer, which will take us
15 through two sets of hearings that are input hearings,
16 leading up to the drawing of the lines. So, we've gotten
17 as far as the end of the month of June and we're about to
18 discuss, actually, the logistics of these meetings,
19 timing, transportation, etc. But before we do that, I
20 have a request that I'd like to honor from Commissioner
21 Di Giulio, that we just recap briefly, region by region,
22 everything that is scheduled for Round 1 and Round 2, so
23 we at least have a sense of coverage and whether we're on
24 task with our regional coverage.

25 So, do you want to go through that, Commissioner

1 Di Guilio?

2 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Sure. And I apologize,
3 I just had to write this out, so I can't refer to
4 anything, but what I had done is I had gone through those
5 first three months and pulled out all the locations that
6 we had designated, to the best of my memory and notes.
7 So, as Commissioner Blanco mentioned, I thought it might
8 be helpful just to review the region, locations that
9 we've suggested, to see if we've covered every base and I
10 think you might see there may be one or two duplications,
11 but that could be okay, but just wanted to point that
12 out. So, in Region 1, and I will go by region, by phase,
13 so Region 1, Phase 1, there are two meetings,
14 Escondido/San Marcos and San Diego; for Phase 2, it's San
15 Diego, so there are two meetings in Phase 1, one meeting
16 in Phase 2; in Region 2, during Phase 1, there are two
17 meetings, one in Riverside and one in Palm Springs/Indio;
18 in Phase 2, there is one meeting in San Bernardino; in
19 Region 3 - this is what I have written down, in Phase 1,
20 the suggestion was Santa Ana, and Phase 2, the suggestion
21 was Santa Ana. In Region 4, Phase 1, there's five to
22 six, depending on how we want to look at this, there is
23 Long Beach, Downtown L.A., San Gabriel, San Fernando
24 Valley, and the Antelope Valley/Lancaster with Northridge
25 technically being in there, as well, so that's actually

1 six if you look at it that way; and in Phase 2 of Region
2 4, it's the one that - all the other regions have just
3 one touch, and Phase 2, Region 2 has two, and I have
4 Culver City and Cerritos/Central L.A. For Region 5,
5 there is one meeting in Phase 1, it's San Luis
6 Obispo/Santa Maria, and one meeting in Phase 2, which is
7 Oxnard, Santa Paula. In Region 6, Phase 1, you have
8 three meetings, one in Hanford, Section 5, one in Merced,
9 Section 5, and one in Stockton. In Phase 2 in Region 6,
10 you have one in Fresno. In Region 7, there is one in
11 Phase 1, Salinas, which is Section 5, and one in Phase 2,
12 San Jose. In Region 8, there are three or four,
13 depending on how you want to count this, but it's Santa
14 Rosa, Oakland, and San Jose, with the addition of Oakland
15 as a suggestion for the Northern California community-
16 based input. And in Phase 2, there is one in San
17 Francisco. In Region 9, there are three scheduled for
18 Phase 1, that would be Redding, Yuba City, the last
19 Section 5 county, and Rancho Cordova. And in Phase 2,
20 there is one meeting in Sacramento. So, I'm not sure, my
21 only points of clarification, in addition to if I got
22 that correct, is maybe Region 3 with two meetings, one in
23 Santa Ana scheduled for both Phase 1 and Phase 2.

24 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Thank you so much.

25 Commissioner Filkins Webber.

1 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Precisely on that
2 point, I think I misspoke on the Santa Ana week, June,
3 the second one, because we did have it identified as
4 Anaheim, Irvine, and I was - again, my philosophy is
5 still the same with the Orange County being a wide range,
6 just like Region 4 for L.A., if we went further south
7 into Irvine, that's where I would probably substitute
8 that Santa Ana. Like I said, I think I misspoke.
9 Because we used Santa Ana previously in Phase 1, and if
10 we're going to do another Orange County, but certainly I
11 will defer to Commissioner Ward since that's his place -
12 and then I do have a suggestion, Commissioner Aguirre,
13 Raya and I worked out Bakersfield for the week of the
14 20th, or at least we looked at it over lunch, and so we'd
15 like to make that suggestion when the time is
16 appropriate.

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, we'll take comments on
18 the regions. Commissioner Ward, and then we'll go back
19 to that.

20 COMMISSIONER WARD: Thank you. Yeah, just the
21 same comment as Commissioner Filkins Webber was saying
22 with the second round being Anaheim/Irvine, was kind of
23 the idea, we had previously kind of discussed this,
24 kicked it around with staff a few weeks ago, and we
25 identified Fullerton as a potential site, and had a

1 facility worked out and things like that. So, believing
2 that Santa Ana being closer to Irvine in South County
3 would suffice with Oceanside and things like that, so it
4 seems like if we were to consider Fullerton/Anaheim,
5 they're sister cities, bordering cities, it would be a
6 more appropriate venue for that Round 2 site.

7 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And this is - correct
8 me, too - this would be on June 18th, is where we placed
9 this, correct? That Saturday? So the Fullerton/Anaheim
10 area is what you're thinking of, okay.

11 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Rather than Santa Ana.

12 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Correct. I just wanted
13 to make sure.

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Any - yes, Commissioner
15 Parvenu.

16 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: My only comment, and I
17 guess I need clarification here with this first round,
18 Phase 1, in May, on May 20th, we have Region 8, Rancho
19 Cordova, isn't Rancho Cordova a suburb of Sacramento?

20 COMMISSIONER WARD: Yes, it is.

21 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: So what is the rationale
22 for going to a suburb that we have to secure another
23 location or venue, as opposed to meeting in a larger
24 city, Sacramento, for example? I don't understand,
25 that's only like five minutes away, right?

1 MR. CLAYPOOL: It actually - it's below the river
2 and it has a far greater diversity than Sacramento as a
3 whole, so that was just the thought, and there is also a
4 tremendous amount of growth in Rancho Cordova, although
5 by, say, Riverside standards, it's not tremendous, but
6 it's still a lot of growth for Sacramento.

7 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Thank you for the
8 clarification.

9 COMMISSIONER FORBES: I'll suggest just a - the
10 big areas of growth in Sacramento County are in the
11 Sacramento region of El Dorado County and Placer County,
12 which are up toward the foothills, which - this is more
13 towards the Foothills.

14 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Thank you.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Di Giulio.

16 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I do think this is a
17 point that Commissioner Parvenu raises, and I know
18 Commissioner Forbes has provided a little bit of input,
19 that in Region 9, if you recall, Region 9 is basically
20 the top third of California, and we're trying to balance
21 - we have the first three meetings, which are Redding,
22 then Yuba City, which is a Section 5, then Rancho
23 Cordova, which is kind of considered a suburb of
24 Sacramento, then Commissioner Forbes was mentioning
25 Sacramento is the State's Capitol, it's important to be

1 here to some degree, I mean, it is, but that leaves us
2 one touch left in Phase 3. I guess the Commission has to
3 make some determination as to where it wants to go one
4 more time; because it's so large, there are issues if we
5 try to go to a real remote place, and if it's really -
6 it'll have any impact, so to speak, in terms of there is
7 just not much that can happen, we've had this discussion
8 in terms of population, and the logistics of going to
9 someplace that really is in the very top of California,
10 vs. using these condensed areas in Region 9 that are more
11 populace. So, I think we have to look at Region 9 as to
12 where - if two Sacramento/Rancho Cordova are very close
13 because of the population base, it could be - it's
14 justified, but it could also - the implications are that
15 we're really not going to go any further than Redding.

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Could I suggest that we
17 leave some of those decisions for Round 3, until we see
18 what happens with the drafts of the maps? I think my
19 sense is that everybody has let us know that that is
20 going to be information that's, you know, when we see
21 reactions and everything, that that's going to help them
22 form the last and final round. So, I don't know that we
23 need to make that decision right now.

24 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: It was just the
25 implications of keeping Rancho Cordova and Sacramento on

1 the map and improving it for Phase 1 and Phase 2, for
2 now, which is what we're considering.

3 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Does that answer your
4 question, Commissioner?

5 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: It does. I mean, I'm
6 flexible to go with what the Commission, in general - but
7 size, I mean, it's just -- Folsom is even further. I've
8 taken the light rail from Sacramento to Folsom and we
9 went through Rancho Cordova, it's like 10 minutes away,
10 I'm just thinking in terms of cost, venue, and some of
11 the other logistics. I just - whatever we decide, that's
12 fine. I just didn't see the rationale there.

13 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: No, I mean, those are
14 important points. I mean, we have the criteria that
15 we're looking at and if cost-wise and population and all
16 of those, this doesn't make sense, then we should talk
17 about it.

18 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Well, I think that Rancho
19 Cordova and Sacramento are going to make sense because
20 they're close. I mean, they're easy to get to from here.
21 I think the issue is going to be when we want to have one
22 more meeting in Region 9, because everywhere else in
23 Region 9 is hard to get to, whether it's Eureka, or
24 Ukiah, the smaller communities. And there has been a
25 question of population issues, to some degree it's a

1 little bit of a show of the flag kind of trip, but the
2 population is really here in Sacramento for Region 9.

3 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, let me see if I
4 understand this correctly. Commissioner Parvenu, your
5 question is whether locating this meeting in Rancho
6 Cordova, if it's really going to capture all of
7 Sacramento, not just the residents of Rancho Cordova,
8 whether it shouldn't be in Sacramento. Is that - no?

9 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: No, I'm thinking that we
10 meet enough here to have input meetings at least
11 somewhere to invite the public to speak at one of our
12 business/input meetings here in Sacramento, to allow the
13 residents of Rancho Cordova to attend these sessions
14 here, and not have to - I guess - take the extra effort
15 to move to a satellite location that has probably less
16 than a population of 5,000 or so.

17 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Actually, Rancho Cordova
18 has about 50,000, but I think the comment is well taken,
19 that, I mean, I understand the diversity issue with
20 Rancho Cordova, but that's not where I would have picked.
21 If we are going to have one in the greater Sacramento
22 Area, that's not the place I would have picked. I would
23 come directly to Sacramento.

24 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Or Davis, perhaps.

25 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Sacramento will get Davis,

1 and Woodland, as well as Auburn and Roseville, all the
2 outlying areas.

3 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, can both Commissioner Di
4 Giulio and staff who went through the criteria and landed
5 on Rancho Cordova give us your thoughts about whether
6 Sacramento itself wouldn't be a place for this regional
7 hearing?

8 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Well, I think the issue
9 - we do have Sacramento on there. Commissioner Forbes
10 would like to have Sacramento, it is a question of do we
11 get rid of Rancho - well, it's kind of the chicken before
12 the egg - the other option, as Mr. Claypool and I were
13 saying, Auburn/Placerville was on the calendar at one
14 point, and that was moved back down to kind of capture
15 more of Sacramento. Rancho Cordova was chosen as a
16 location to capture Sacramento, not as, you know, I
17 understand Commissioner Forbes' passion that Sacramento
18 be listed, not passion - perspective - that Sacramento be
19 listed, but I do think there's an element that we have
20 been meeting here very many times and there's a lot of
21 opportunity for input to some degree that maybe we should
22 spread the wealth, so to speak.

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Mr. Claypool and then I will
24 make a comment.

25 MR. CLAYPOOL: Just a point of clarification.

1 Rancho Cordova, we had it in Auburn and we moved it down
2 to Rancho Cordova because there was a suggestion that
3 Sacramento wasn't being serviced at all. And then, in
4 this round, we've added Sacramento, and so Auburn is the
5 corridor in Placer County with probably the greatest
6 amount of growth in the foothills going toward Tahoe, so
7 that's why we had thought about Auburn. It could be
8 switched back out to Auburn and we would at least pick up
9 an area that's further away that has that growth.

10 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I think the intention
11 was that Rancho Cordova was Sacramento. I know there's a
12 linguistics about that, but...

13 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, so we did add
14 Sacramento, per se, you know, and we've got it, I think,
15 on a good cycle and a good flow, that we spent some time
16 on, so it does seem to me that if Rancho Cordova really
17 was trying to capture Sacramento, and we now have added
18 Sacramento, per se, that we could switch this out for
19 something further north, more rural, populations that we
20 hadn't captured up until now in this region. How does
21 that - yes? Okay.

22 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And one last question -
23 where would you like to place that, in the Phase 1
24 meeting spot? Or Phase 2?

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Wherever Rancho Cordova was.

1 Phase 1.

2 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Okay, so we're going to
3 keep - so you'd like to have Auburn, Placerville and
4 Sacramento? So you'd like to move Rancho Cordova to
5 where Sacramento was in Phase 2?

6 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: No, we want to have an
7 additional non-Sacramento site in Phase 1 that is in
8 Region 8.

9 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: And is that to
10 replace the meeting on May 20th that is the Rancho
11 Cordova?

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Correct.

13 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, I think we are
14 on the same page, but you were listing the full grouping
15 of that region and we were looking at the actual sequence
16 for that week. But it is swapping those out.

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Mr. Claypool.

18 MR. CLAYPOOL: So, I'm confused. So we are
19 keeping Sacramento in Phase 2 because - and you're asking
20 that staff, and working with Technical Committee, select
21 a different site for the 19th of May in Region 9?

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: We actually have Sacramento
23 in Phase 1 now, on June - what's the June 1st -

24 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I thought we said we're
25 going to Oakland because it would be easier for Q2.

1 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Oh, okay, all right, so we
2 don't have Sacramento in -

3 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: We do not have
4 Sacramento for that Line Drawing.

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: We have the statewide here.

6 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I thought that we had
7 made the decision that the statewide in Northern
8 California would be in Oakland.

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: That's what I was talking
10 about, that's what I meant to say.

11 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Yeah, so I see the
12 issues, we have three options for two spots, so the three
13 options are Sacramento, Rancho Cordova, and
14 Auburn/Placerville. So, I thought I had heard
15 Commissioner Blanco say that it was Rancho Cordova and
16 the Auburn/Placerville, one could be in one phase, and
17 the other could be in the other? No?

18 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: No. I think I was
19 suggesting, really listening to the comments, that we
20 would not do Rancho Cordova -

21 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: You would do Sacramento?

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: We would do Sacramento and
23 we would do Auburn, you know, Placerville.

24 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Okay and I think the
25 only thing with Rancho Cordova was trying to capture some

1 of the ethnic population and Rancho Cordova vs. that and
2 Sacramento. That's fine.

3 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: My sense about that is that
4 we should do really cracker jack publicity and get folks
5 to turn out to Sacramento.

6 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And do you have a
7 preference as to Sacramento vs. Auburn/Placerville in
8 Phase 1 or Phase 2?

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Mr. Claypool.

10 MR. CLAYPOOL: I would just suggest, if we're
11 going to switch it out, Auburn in Phase 1, Sacramento in
12 Phase 2.

13 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Does that make sense?

14 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Let me just make one
15 suggestion. Rather than Auburn, I think Roseville has
16 had a lot more growth than Auburn has. I mean, Auburn
17 has probably fewer than 5,000 people, Roseville has over
18 100,000. Auburn is not big.

19 MR. CLAYPOOL: And when we're looking at Auburn,
20 we're looking at, really, the 50 corridor, going out into
21 the foothills.

22 COMMISSIONER FORBES: But Auburn isn't up 50,
23 Auburn is up 80.

24 MR. CLAYPOOL: I'm sorry, the 80/50 corridor
25 going toward Lake Tahoe.

1 COMMISSIONER FORBES: They're two complete
2 separate corridors.

3 MR. CLAYPOOL: I understand, but it's still the
4 Foothills, it's something that's going to the east of
5 Sacramento where we're not going to go, except for one -

6 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Okay.

7 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Right. That was the spirit
8 of my suggestion, I mean, Roseville is still in some ways
9 an outer suburb of Sacramento, I was trying to get us
10 really into sort of a different geography by suggesting
11 that area. Yes? Okay. All right, so, I want to hear
12 the suggestion on Bakersfield.

13 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: As requested, we
14 took a look at this and we're looking at June 22nd,
15 Oxnard, June 23rd, Bakersfield, June 24th, Fresno, June
16 25th, San Jose, June 26th, San Francisco. And that takes
17 you straight up from Oxnard, right through the central
18 part of California, I mean, Bakersfield, just location-
19 wise, not geographic - Fresno, cutting over to San Jose,
20 and then up to San Francisco.

21 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So could you repeat that
22 one more time?

23 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Sure. June 22nd,
24 Oxnard, June 23rd, Bakersfield, June 24th, Fresno, June
25 25th, San Jose, June 26th, San Francisco.

1 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Ancheta.

2 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yeah, I think that's a
3 good order. I did have something specific to San Jose,
4 or that region because I think what happened was that San
5 Ramon was a Region 8, San Jose was a Region 7, so on
6 Commissioner Di Guilio's list, I think it's listed under
7 two different regions, but it's a Region 7 City, so San
8 Jose. But I think if you had - you had San Jose under
9 both 7 and Phase 2, and then 8 in Phase 1 because we took
10 out San Ramon, which was a Region 8 City and put in San
11 Jose in its place.

12 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: What should it be?

13 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: No, it's correct, you can
14 just move San Jose up to - it's coming up twice in Region
15 7 is the point, if you're sticking by the region, using
16 your chart that you put together, or the one you've
17 written out, San Jose is in Region 7, not in Region 8.
18 But the reason it might have been on your list is it's
19 San Ramon - we switched San Ramon and San Jose, and San
20 Ramon is Region 8. Now, functionally, I don't think
21 that's a problem because San Jose sort of straddles two
22 worlds anyway, so Bay Area folks can go to San Jose and
23 that's fine. I do have a concern, though, when you're
24 looking at Region 7, that you know, you're really going -
25 that's San Jose South, so you could still use San Jose,

1 you might look at southern - it's a big area, too, sort
2 of like L.A. - you could look at Southern San Jose, you
3 could go further south maybe to Gilroy or Santa Cruz,
4 there's a lot of ways you could go there, but I think you
5 need to sort of move southward on the Phase 2 hearing
6 somewhere. That would be my suggestion.

7 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I do like what is
8 proposed, with only one caveat, is that if you put Oxnard
9 on June 22nd, that was actually a placeholder for Region
10 9, so that means Region 9 does not have a touch in that
11 last - in that second phase. Even though it didn't have
12 an actual designation, which is what Commissioner Forbes
13 had mentioned, that would actually be where Sacramento
14 was. I'm sorry, that's why we switched, right?

15 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Yes.

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Filkins Webber.

17 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Because, and we'll
18 maybe need to hear from staff if they were able to reach
19 Q2, but after the 26th, I had a little note here that we
20 would consult with Q2 on how many days we need to push
21 out, so I suspect that, if Q2 needs some days in between
22 to capture this post first draft map input, then we could
23 probably consider Region 9 on Monday from San Francisco,
24 because then you're still going straight up, right?
25 Region 9 is Northern California. So, you could consider

1 that and then we would have, what, two or three days
2 before we come back, so we're pushing the green meeting
3 and the business meeting probably based on Q2's
4 anticipated input, probably to like Thursday, Friday,
5 Saturday. If they need two or three days like they've
6 told us before, in between, so you could move back for
7 Phase 2, Region 9, on Monday, and you'll still be in the
8 flow of transportation.

9 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Would you like to hold
10 the spot for Region 9? Because -

11 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: For the 27th?

12 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: For the 27th. I'm just
13 looking at the point of view where Region 5 doesn't have
14 an actual designated day yet, so -

15 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Well, yeah, Region
16 5 would be the 22nd, that's -

17 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Region 9.

18 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Oh, Region 9 would
19 then be the 27th.

20 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: So we should put that
21 there for the 27th, okay.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Let's put a placeholder
23 there for that since we were going to clear those days,
24 depending on what we hear from Q2, I think that's a great
25 suggestion. Okay, before we move on, can somebody just,

1 starting with the 16th through the 27th, read off the
2 calendar?

3 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: June?

4 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: From the 16th to the 27th.
5 Yes, June.

6 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Okay, June 16th,
7 Culver City, June 17th was Whittier/Cerritos if Cerritos
8 Performing Arts is not available, 18th is Fullerton, June
9 19th, San Bernardino, June 20th, San Diego, 21st, we're
10 dark, 22nd, Oxnard, 23rd, Bakersfield, 24th, Fresno, 25th,
11 San Jose, 26th, San Francisco, 27th, Region 9, wherever
12 city that that might be, more likely 28th, dark, 29th,
13 dark, maybe 30th dark, depending on Q2's input, or that
14 would be the first day of Sacramento business meeting,
15 then considering Friday, and then that's 4th of July
16 weekend, isn't it? But moving into Friday, Saturday for
17 the Commission meeting, so just pushing it back.

18 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, I think - Mr. Claypool,
19 you have a quizzical look on your face.

20 MR. CLAYPOOL: Are we then not releasing a second
21 set of draft maps, which would have been July 1st, which
22 the 27th through the 30th were all lead-ups to?

23 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I would suspect you
24 could still do it on Friday. What I'm thinking of is
25 that Q2 still needs those two or three days again, maybe

1 two days here since we're already in Phase 2, so the two
2 days for Q2 would be the 28th, 29th, then we can come back
3 together on the 30th, to work - you know, look at the maps
4 or - well, I see what you mean, where would our input be
5 if we're planning to release on July 1st, right? But,
6 see, they still need those gaps, they need those days, so
7 -

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Can we still stick to -
9 let's stick with this, let's stick to our plan that we
10 communicate with Q2, that might really clarify this. One
11 other thing before - and I guess this kind of slips into
12 the logistics discussion - but one thing that I've been -
13 numerous people have asked me to repeat, is that we
14 really think about these business meetings when we're
15 drawing the lines, to really think about that they might
16 take place in the Bay Area where the Consultants are,
17 rather than in Sacramento, to save costs. So, as we get
18 into the logistics discussion, if we can keep that in
19 mind? Okay, so take it away, Commissioner Ontai.

20 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Okay. Do you want to talk
21 about the format first, or the logistics?

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Let's do format since we've
23 just done a lot of logistics.

24 [Laughing]

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: We can use another part of

1 our brain for a few minutes!

2 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Switch from your creative
3 side to - well, creative side.

4 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yeah, whatever.

5 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Okay, the format, what
6 actually happens at this input hearing? What is
7 tentatively the scenario? Typically, if we use the San
8 Diego and San Francisco model, what happened there,
9 according to Karin, is that the Chair at the time does
10 the general introduction, you know, welcomes everybody,
11 introduces everybody on the dais, says some brief
12 statements about what the Commission is all about, what
13 this hearing is about, sets out some guidelines and rules
14 and procedures on how this input will be conducted, and
15 then the Mapper is sitting somewhere, ready and prepared
16 to take in public testimony. So, at this time, staff is
17 lining up speakers and giving them handouts in advance.
18 One of those handouts will be the toolkit, which
19 instructs the public on exactly the type of information
20 that needs to be presented. This toolkit will also be
21 posted on the website as soon as possible, so that the
22 public knows what are the items that we would propose
23 being presented to us. That piece needs to be continued
24 to be perfected. We need to get that on the website,
25 however, as soon as possible because our input hearings

1 are coming up very shortly.

2 So, Rob has prepared a toolkit, and I'm not sure
3 if you've all received it, but I'd like for Rob to
4 briefly go through that.

5 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR WILCOX: First, I want to
6 thank our partners and specifically Redistricting
7 California, for their great help in putting this
8 together. They put a lot of time, a lot of hours, Kathay
9 Feng with Common Cause and Redistricting California, has
10 just been an incredible resource because, when we reached
11 out to these groups that have been living Redistricting
12 and the issue of Redistricting for a very long time,
13 knowing the ins and outs, they were incredible help.

14 So, this is a starting point as far as being able
15 to - not having our Technical Advisor and line drawing on
16 board to bring the technical aspects to this, this is
17 what we have so far and, as you look through this, it
18 kind of sets up - because we want to answer the question,
19 why should people care, what is this thing called
20 Redistricting? Why is it important to them? And then to
21 talk about the Commission, and what the Commission is
22 about and the mandate, and then talking about, well,
23 setting up why they should care and, then, how they can
24 participate. We talk about the criteria that you're
25 going to be considering, talking about the Voting Rights

1 Act and why it is important, and we presented this to two
2 committees, the Public Information Advisory Committee,
3 and Outreach, and there are some additions that I'm
4 working now with the partners on talking a little bit
5 more about why personally it's important about the Voting
6 Rights Act, and also on communities of interest; in
7 describing communities of interest, we're putting
8 together sort of a mock, as it were, someone describing
9 just a regular community so that they can see how someone
10 else might describe a community to help. And then, where
11 can they get outside help to come up with some of the
12 other areas of where you can go to draw maps, and some of
13 the redistricting centers and all of that, and then the
14 Commissioners will frequently ask questions, and then
15 Commissioner Bios. So, this is what we would like to be
16 able to put up on the Web so that our first hearings have
17 an ability to at least have something to really help
18 them, and knowing that we are going to be adding more in
19 the coming days, working with Q2, and then having this
20 available in a printed form for certain groups, and also
21 for redistricting centers, but also having it on our
22 website and also giving it to the outreach partners, and
23 then when we're into the public input hearings, to those
24 general areas that we'll be working with groups on the
25 ground there, to give the toolkit out.

1 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Now, I would think that -
2 and we'll discuss this - but I would think that we need
3 to have this posted as soon as possible because our
4 hearings are coming up. However, it is still not a
5 perfect document in that we need to get Q2's input on
6 this, and I know that Commissioner Ancheta has indicated
7 that he's particularly concerned about making sure that
8 the public provides the right type of information, legal-
9 based information that we will need, but we really can't
10 do that until Q2 is on board with a contract, so we're in
11 a dilemma here, a window of time where we can't really
12 get that information until they're on board. But, at the
13 same time, we need to post this, so many Commissioner
14 Ancheta, do you want to speak on that?

15 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: I can speak to some of
16 those of those issues. I mean, and I think this is some
17 action items that are further on in our agenda that will
18 be proposed regarding delegation, but there are a couple
19 ways you can go. Obviously, we are in a tough place here
20 now because our consultant is not formally on and we
21 can't just sort of say, "Hey, do this stuff" without a
22 contract, obviously. But we need to know, in particular,
23 what we can guess, and maybe they'll tell us a little bit
24 about what we actually need to put on paper so the public
25 will not give us either incomplete or the wrong type of

1 information, for them to use and put into *Maptitude*.

2 And, again, there may be a process question in
3 terms of how we're going to do this over the next week
4 and a half that goes maybe to delegated powers, but there
5 are ways to look at it, which is you can delegate a fair
6 amount to a team, which we can hope Q2 is on in at least
7 a week from now, I'm hoping that's the case because, if
8 it's two weeks, we're in some trouble because we'll have
9 to simply act without Q2's direct input. We can try to
10 work some stuff out now so that everybody on the
11 Commission feels comfortable, generally with what's in
12 there. There is a lack of specificity on some things,
13 and just, again, if the Commission feels comfortable,
14 delegating some of that to, again, it could be a team of
15 Commissioners, or Q2, once they're on board.

16 Another way to do it, which I've discussed with
17 Commissioner Ontai, is to maybe break it up so that the
18 toolkit doesn't have too many details, but we may refer
19 to some other document that would be available close to
20 at least the Redding meeting, that is a bit more
21 specific, maybe a little more technical, but it gives
22 enough guidance so that there's an alignment between what
23 the public gives and what Q2 needs. That's a
24 possibility, I'm not suggesting that's the way to go.

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Here's how -

1 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: There are a number of ways
2 to look at it, but I think we have to be mindful of the
3 fact that we don't have a full team, and we don't have
4 Commission meetings in between to actually approve a
5 final product, as well. So there are a couple process
6 issues that are there.

7 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Right. Just a suggestion
8 that the way we proceed with the discussion right now is
9 about what things Commissioners, in categories or
10 specifically, want to make sure are included in this kit,
11 that aren't in there now. Let's not get into like, "I
12 want it to read like this and say...", just categories of
13 things that you want to have in here. Let's have that
14 discussion for a certain amount of time, and then I would
15 propose that, even before we get into that, that we do
16 make a decision about whether we can delegate, then,
17 given once we've come up with the concepts that we want
18 included in that toolkit, that we do some delegated
19 authority, it could be the lead from outreach and the
20 lead from technical meeting. In other words, let's
21 figure out the delegation thing because I do think we're
22 going to need to do that in order to move quickly, it
23 won't be the first time we've done it, we had to do it
24 with some other issues when we didn't have time between
25 meetings. So, are people willing to proceed like that,

1 that we go into categories that might be missing that we
2 need to have in the toolkit? And then we have the
3 conversation about how we make that happen between now
4 and Redding? Commissioner Di Giulio.

5 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I just want to make - to
6 impact this conversation, I would like to make a
7 distinction here. There are two recommendations we're
8 asking for, one is what Commissioner Ontai is discussing
9 is, the operational structure of the input hearing vs.
10 the technical structure of receiving public input. And
11 the relationship to the toolkit, the toolkit stands as a
12 part of outreach. There will be a technical component
13 added to that in terms of kind of providing this general
14 framework to be of assistant, like a description of what
15 will be happening, but the actual material, the
16 worksheets for the public, how they will provide the data
17 to us, and some of the other workups that we are going to
18 discuss in terms of technical, there is a distinction
19 between these two. So, in looking at the toolkit, there
20 will be a technical aspect, but you're looking at
21 everything else that's been developed by the Outreach
22 Committee so far.

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I have Commissioner Dai and
24 then Commissioner Filkins Webber. Do I have Aguirre.

25 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: I think he may have been

1 first.

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: First?

3 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: We might, it depends on
4 the comments of the previous two speakers.

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Go ahead, Commissioner.

6 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yeah, I was just going to
7 advocate for the lead discussion. We have some
8 instructions or a document from Mr. Claypool that we
9 could refer to.

10 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay. I would like to wait
11 until we finish this discussion that we just started
12 before we switch over to the delegated authority, let's
13 finish the conversation about, knowing now that we're
14 talking about two different toolkits, what needs to go in
15 there and by when. So, we have Commissioner Dai,
16 Commissioner Ward - oh, Commissioner Dai, Filkins Webber,
17 and Ward.

18 COMMISSIONER DAI: Okay, I just wanted to make a
19 note that the Public Information Committee actually
20 reviewed this document quite thoroughly last week and
21 already gave Mr. Wilcox our feedback, which I understand
22 has not be incorporated yet, but will be -

23 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR WILCOX: I am working
24 with the partners to do that right now.

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Thank you. Commissioner.

1 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: As I recall, when
2 we were in Claremont and we were talking about
3 educational materials, if I'm not mistaken, didn't Ms.
4 MacDonald say that she had like a toolkit that was ready
5 to go if we were to consider those initial educational
6 meetings? Because how I view this a little bit is - and
7 we might be able to do it kind of two-phased, could this
8 possibly be the outreach, you know, document with
9 reference to another - you know, the technical aspect of
10 the toolkit that we would get from Ms. MacDonald? So, if
11 we approved this, and I'm fully confident that
12 Commissioner Dai and the Public Information Committee has
13 probably thoroughly vetted this, but is that one way that
14 we could go? Because then, if we anticipate we're on
15 schedule for the contract for Q2 to be, as I understand
16 it, barring any other changes like April 1st, that then
17 she could give us, you know, the two or three pages that
18 she already says she has worked out as far as the
19 worksheets, the technical aspect, that could just be
20 referenced in here, but then that will be like another
21 section two of the toolkit, and we can probably approve
22 that in Sacramento. It is, of course, going to be just a
23 smidge delay for Region 9 in Redding, but at least that
24 might be one way to look at it, I kind of see that if we
25 do it in two phases, two parts, I guess.

1 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yeah, reactions from the
2 committees?

3 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I think this leads to
4 your point that, yes, we just don't have the information
5 to review right now, so I think to separate that in terms
6 of the toolkit - we also, to clarify, because this goes
7 to the question of a lead, is that the Outreach and in
8 terms of the structure for the Input Hearings, needs to
9 be able to direct - we need to recommend as a Commission
10 that the staff continue to work on it so they can have
11 more details for us next meeting. We need to have the
12 Commission's recommendation that, for the technical side,
13 that we can work with Q2 to give us that information, and
14 that's partly where a lead would be very helpful, I
15 think, in the circumstance so that there is some
16 communication between outreach and staff as they're
17 finalizing the details of outreach, and that there's some
18 type of lead. I think this is a discussion in how we're
19 defining lead, but, for lack of a better word, a point of
20 contact with Q2 to be able to translate what we've been
21 saying here -- not translate, but to transmit -- what
22 we've been saying in terms of the development of the
23 technical material, so that we're a little bit further
24 along, so when we come back right before input hearings,
25 we'll have a more refined document to review at that

1 point.

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Dai and then -

3 COMMISSIONER DAI: Just a point of clarification.

4 I mean, the reason the Public Information Committee
5 reviewed this is that this is going on the website, which
6 is due to go live on March 31st, so it would be good to
7 have some content for the website, so unless there's
8 objectionable material in this, I would recommend that we
9 approve this as a first draft and any tweaks, I mean, the
10 website can be changed in a second, so that we treat it
11 as a work in progress, rather than waiting to approve
12 some final perfect version, you know, the day before we
13 get it ready.

14 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: And that is our action
15 recommendation.

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: That is the action
17 recommendation. Okay, can I get a motion on that?

18 COMMISSIONER DAI: I move that we approve the
19 document as a first draft so that we can go ahead and put
20 this toolkit up on the website, with the understanding
21 that it will continue to be refined as our contractors,
22 Q2, get finalized.

23 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: Second.

24 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Can you read that back for
25 us?

1 MS. SARGIS: The motion is to approve the toolkit
2 document as the first draft.

3 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Public comment?

4 MS. WOODS: Hi. My name is Rani Woods and I'm
5 from the Los Angeles County Federation of Labor, AFLCIO.
6 And I just had a comment on the toolkit. I was thinking
7 it would be very helpful to have examples of testimony,
8 not necessarily real testimony, but so that people have a
9 framework to work from. Thank you.

10 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right, I don't think we

11 -

12 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I have a question
13 if this is a discussion. So, at the time that this goes
14 live, then will we have the versions that are translated
15 into the handful of languages that we have previously
16 discussed?

17 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR WILCOX: We're working on
18 that right now to have it at least, at first, in Spanish,
19 and then to have it in all the languages.

20 COMMISSIONER DAI: And also, there is an
21 automatic translation tool in Google, so we're looking
22 into having that capability, so it could be translated
23 into any language.

24 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, let me just
25 clarify, then, are we - is that option going to take the

1 place of us ensuring the translation across the handful
2 of languages we previously discussed? Or is that in
3 addition to?

4 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR WILCOX: Well, that's one
5 of the things that we're looking at, we're also working
6 with New America Media and their translators to makes
7 sure that whatever process that we use, that we have it
8 where it is acceptable. And so, we will start with
9 having, you know, the buttons on the website in those
10 actual languages, and then having the first materials
11 such as the toolkits and the press releases on the
12 meetings.

13 COMMISSIONER DAI: And just to clarify, Google
14 features automatic translation, it's extremely good for
15 romance languages, it's passable for Asian languages, so,
16 but it's okay.

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Anything more on this point?
18 Yes, Commissioner Ancheta.

19 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Just a question because it
20 has been posted, right? In draft - that's where I got it
21 a couple days ago.

22 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR WILCOX: Yes, it was in
23 draft form when it was - yes, when it was before the
24 Public Information and Outreach Committee Meetings last
25 week, we posted it.

1 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: I am just wondering what
2 version is on the Web now and then what will go - what
3 we're voting on would be posted?

4 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR WILCOX: It will be
5 different, yes, there are some changes, some additions
6 that were made by the committees, that we're working with
7 on the partners, and then also where it says
8 "Commissioner Bios," those are actually the Commissioner
9 Bios and the thank you's will be filled in.

10 COMMISSIONER DAI: And the response to the public
11 comment. One of the suggestions the Public Information
12 Committee made was to provide examples of testimony, so -

13 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR WILCOX: Exactly.

14 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: And just - you might want
15 to differentiate between what is now on the Web and the -
16 you can call it maybe the second draft, if this is the
17 first draft or Committee draft because we are trying to
18 keep even past versions of documents, I think.

19 COMMISSIONER DAI: We're not going to post it as
20 a document. It will be the website. It will be part of
21 the website, which is why I wanted us to move forward on
22 it.

23 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: It was a clarification how
24 - what the difference between what is now and what's
25 later, okay.

1 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right. So, I'm sorry,
2 we'll wait until the end of the session for more public
3 comment - no, no, we're done. So, I know we have a lot
4 more on the logistics. Do people want to take a - I know
5 the Legal Advisory Committee has a recommendation on how
6 to deal with the delegation of authority.

7 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Don't we have a
8 motion on the floor?

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Oh, sorry, yeah. Motion on
10 the floor. Do we want to do a roll call on this? We did
11 do public comment. No? Oh, that was another motion,
12 sorry. Okay, go ahead.

13 MR. SALIVARI: David Salivari again. I want to
14 squeak in one more public comment on the motion on the
15 floor. I haven't had a chance, really, to read this
16 document, but obviously it's pretty important insofar as
17 what you're putting up on the website. I'm going to
18 review it and make a written public comment later. One
19 of the things that does concern me is that the groups
20 that you guys had partnered with in order to create this
21 document, Common Cause, I know them by reputation a
22 little bit, the other one, the Redistricting whoever they
23 were, you know, I don't know who these folks are and I
24 think that's very very important, so I'll review this and
25 I'm going to make a written public comment later. Thank

1 you.

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Thank you. Sorry about that.
3 I got my motions mixed up. All right, so now we do have
4 a motion on the floor, we've had public comment. All in
5 favor, raise your hands and say "Aye."

6 (Ayes.) Opposed? All right, now, my next
7 comment was going to be, if we need to do -

8 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Hold your thoughts.
9 Unanimous.

10 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Unanimously in favor of
11 adopting this second draft of the Toolkit that will be on
12 our new revamped website on April -

13 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR WILCOX: March 31st.

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: March 31st, not April, March
15 31st. Okay.

16 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR WILCOX: Yeah, not April
17 Fool's Day.

18 [Laughter]

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Good, okay. All right. Go
20 ahead.

21 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Okay, so that's how the
22 public is going to be given guidelines, using a toolkit
23 for presenting their information. We expect
24 Commissioners to be active in asking questions that you
25 think are critical for helping us to make the right

1 decisions. And we're not mapping, we're not doing any
2 decisions, we're asking questions. The Mapper is coding
3 and cataloguing all of this information, and that's being
4 done. Simultaneously, we do expect electronic messages
5 coming in from the public and so that's an issue that was
6 discussed at the Outreach Committee and Tech Committee,
7 and so, when we're looking at that type of electronic
8 information that is coming in, it could be someone from
9 San Jose calling at a hearing in San Diego, it may be
10 totally irrelevant, but that may happen. We may have
11 calls coming in from Washington, D.C., giving their two
12 cents, and that may happen. So, the question is, what
13 type of information that's coming in electronically
14 should the Commission accept for that hearing? And what
15 other information should we either discard or archive?
16 So, I open that up for discussion.

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Discussion?

18 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Do you want to summarize
19 the recommendations from the Outreach/Technical Committee
20 on that? We did provide a recommendation.

21 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: We did. Our recommendation
22 is that we only catalogue and record information that is
23 relevant to that region's discussion, and archive
24 everything else.

25 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Could I add to that just

1 slightly for a little more information? There was some
2 discussion about - we kind of broke it down into three
3 levels of type of electronic options to deal with
4 electronically submitted input and/or there's been - the
5 first one would be a very high intensity, there are some
6 suggestions from community groups that you almost have,
7 for lack of a better word, a *Skype* option, where in the
8 public input hearings you would have an option for people
9 to be on *Skype*, they could interact, you could ask them
10 questions, but we had decided as an Advisory Committee
11 that was not possible - feasible - partly for the
12 technical side of it, the staff intensity, plus it wasn't
13 giving due diligence to the people who were there, and
14 there's no way to confirm that someone who is calling in
15 wasn't sitting in their living room in North Dakota. So,
16 the other option was to accept electronically submitted
17 input and read it aloud in the meeting, which, again,
18 says that's - the amount of time, the amount of effort,
19 we just didn't think that was feasible. The third
20 option, which is the one we have recommended, was to do
21 due diligence and accept all that electronically
22 submitted public input and to be able to catalogue it,
23 the staff would catalogue it, and give it to our
24 consultants who would then roll that up with all the
25 other input from that hearing, so it would be able to be

1 considered, but it wouldn't be read aloud, or otherwise
2 interacted during the meeting.

3 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: And before we go any
4 further, can I ask Dan to recapitulate what we did
5 decide?

6 MR. CLAYPOOL: That is, and a point of
7 clarification, the term "archive" vs. - all the
8 information that we receive electronically is going to be
9 posted, so everything is going to be available. The only
10 thing we're going to do is to work through that
11 information and make sure that those emails that were
12 germane to that region when you were taking your
13 testimony are rolled up into that testimony. So,
14 everything would be available to the public, but we would
15 be selecting out the portion that needs to be with that
16 region.

17 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: And the Mapper would need
18 that information to summarize that regional report.

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Filkins Webber.

20 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Appreciate your
21 recommendations. Given that quite a number of people
22 will probably travel great distances to attend public
23 hearings because some people feel that there is a
24 difference, you know, actually presenting information, I
25 would like to give due consideration to those people who

1 have actually come to the hearing and recommend against
2 reading anything. If we do get it, and it's possible,
3 what we could do is just acknowledge a list, maybe, of
4 electronic submissions, maybe at the end of the input
5 hearing, to say, "Okay, this will confirm we've
6 received...", you know, unless we want to cut it off at a
7 number. I mean, if you've gotten 25 electronic
8 submissions in one input hearing, you know, we could
9 probably just run through the list quickly so that people
10 realize we did receive it, without having to read
11 anything. So, we receive a public comment from Joe Smith
12 from Monterey, or things like that, that might be an
13 alternative so that people confirm that we've received
14 it, that that's what is going to be archived, without
15 having to read the whole thing and taking away from the
16 people who have actually physically drove to the meeting.

17 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I think the only issue
18 with that, and we did consider that to some degree, but
19 this is why we wanted a recommendation to establish a
20 policy because, if we said, okay, we will allow some type
21 of reference to a public input, if that was kind of a
22 door we opened, we could get flooded. If people thought
23 that - we're not talking 25 emails, it could be a couple
24 hundred in some places if they know it's an option for
25 their name or their recognition at the meeting. And so

1 it was the acknowledgement that their input submitted
2 electronically was very important to the process and
3 would be included, but we were trying to recommend a
4 policy that would narrow the scope so that we don't have
5 the possibility of being overloaded at that meeting, to
6 be respectful for those who are there, and the
7 Commission's time and staff's time.

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Mr. Claypool.

9 MR. CLAYPOOL: Just as a possible measure that we
10 could go for acknowledging those individuals, we could
11 have staff take those e-mails that we're going to roll up
12 with the region, and then tell people, "You're separated
13 on our website where we post," and say, "These are the
14 ones that went with the region. Your name should be in
15 there." And so they can find it.

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay. All right.

17 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Okay. So -

18 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: And just for a reminder, the
19 format for the report backs that we - everything be about
20 a recommendation.

21 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: So is that clear to staff on
22 what we're going to do? All right. And then, lastly,
23 the Chair at the time thanks the crowd and concludes the
24 meeting, it's as simple as that. Once that's all done.
25 At the end of the meeting, after all the input from the

1 public is completed, then the Chair wraps up the hearing
2 and thanks everybody.

3 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, Commissioner Dai,
4 Commissioner Filkins Webber, Commissioner Aguirre.

5 COMMISSIONER DAI: I just had a question. Since
6 we can't prevent people from making comments about other
7 regions, are we going to be capturing that input? And
8 would it just be catalogued for a different region, but
9 it would be captured? I just wanted to clarify that.

10 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yeah, and so the Mapper, I
11 think, will take that information and let's say a caller
12 calls in from San Jose to San Diego, but the comments are
13 more relevant to San Jose, and the Mapper will take that
14 into consideration for San Jose.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay. Commissioner Filkins
16 Webber.

17 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: In looking at your
18 outline in the recommendation from your committee on you
19 went through a brief introduction, you discussed, I
20 guess, the availability of toolkit to the public that's
21 coming in the door, and then, I guess, commencement of
22 the input process, Commissioners to ask question, and
23 then we dealt with the simultaneous electronic submission
24 issue. My one question is this, did your committee
25 discuss some of the previous recommendations by this

1 Commission about setting aside maybe a half an hour, or
2 an hour, for education with the use of the toolkit?
3 Because what it sounds like here, and, again, this was
4 that balance. We've taken out these educational
5 workshops that would sponsored by the commission and, in
6 lieu of doing that, we did discuss the possibility of
7 setting aside a half an hour or an hour for education
8 before these input hearings, because you are going to
9 have potentially somebody who is, you know, deeply
10 involved in following us, bringing along, hopefully, five
11 of their friends, who don't know anything about this.
12 And they want to sit there and they would love to hear
13 from us. So, did the Commission consider that in your
14 format for the input hearings?

15 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: First of all, we have to do
16 that, and absolutely have to do that, but I was assuming
17 that is going to be part of the toolkit and we could pull
18 that out and have that as a stand-alone piece.

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Mr. Claypool.

20 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: If that were the
21 case, then who does the committee recommend that would be
22 doing the education? Would that be Q2? Would that be a
23 staff member? Would that be a Commissioner member? Have
24 you discussed that?

25 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Dan, what do you think?

1 MR. CLAYPOOL: I don't think we can do that.
2 When we lost CCP, we lost the ability to have a separate
3 person for that function. We'll have enough staff people
4 there for someone, probably myself, to work with people
5 as to where the toolkit is, and where they might find
6 things in there, and as we go along, the person who is
7 making sure that people stay stocked and so forth, and
8 that people know where things are, might even be helpful
9 enough to say, "These are some examples." But, beyond
10 that, we don't have enough staff to do anything other
11 than to direct people to our website, or to direct them
12 to the toolkit.

13 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Now, what Q2 did, they did
14 exactly that, by the way, in San Diego and in San
15 Francisco. They actually had a two-part phase, the first
16 phase, it went throughout the communities in San Diego
17 essentially doing the educational piece alone, telling
18 the communities and the neighborhoods what Redistricting
19 is all about, what the issues are, how to go about
20 providing the right information. Then, the second phase
21 itself was the input hearing, which was all centrally
22 done at City Hall, and so the public had some educational
23 outreach information in advance. We don't have that
24 luxury, so we're going to have to build that into our
25 input hearings. So, I think one solution may be to ask

1 Q2 to provide that at our input hearings as part of their
2 opening services.

3 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Commissioner Ontai said
4 in our discussions, in our just kind of consulting with
5 Q2, Commissioner Ontai had asked Karin and Ana Henderson
6 to give some background, but, yes, it is their intention
7 to have an educational overview at every meeting, both in
8 terms of a brief summary of what's going on because I
9 think people can get a little supplement with this
10 toolkit, but to also provide some technical guidance, as
11 well. But I do think there is an issue that - so, to
12 answer your question, yes, there will be an educational
13 component at the beginning of each meeting. The bigger
14 issue is that everyone who comes is not going to be at
15 the beginning of a meeting, so there was some suggestion
16 about having - like videotaping one of Q2's presentations
17 at the beginning, or somehow having a small separate
18 video that you could have in the back of the room, and
19 also run as a way to give additional - as people come in,
20 they could watch a short video to understand the material
21 that's in front of them because not everyone is going to
22 be at the beginning, so as a way to acknowledge the need
23 for some educational component, and to explain what's on
24 the table when they walk in.

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Filkins Webber.

1 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: The Commission has
2 to approve that any, you know, plan of their educational
3 overview before it's presented as our educational
4 material at the intro, and so, in looking at the calendar
5 and in consideration of when we will have a contract in
6 place, I guess we just have to queue it up to talk to
7 them about what that's going to be, so that we can
8 consider approval of that for the 7th and 8th, just as a
9 recommendation of the Commission for the Technical or
10 Outreach Committee to consider that.

11 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: That would be our
12 recommendation.

13 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right. Do we need to
14 vote on that? I don't think so, okay. Commissioner
15 Raya.

16 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I just had a question about
17 the video that we did yesterday, is that - I know at some
18 point we talked about that being an introductory part of
19 the hearings, so is that still - I guess - why don't we
20 see how we all came out? Who knows what the results are
21 yet?

22 COMMISSIONER WARD: They do a great job of
23 setting the table for, again, Commissioner Filkins
24 Webber's example of people that show up to the meeting
25 not really knowing what it's about, or how to

1 participate, they do a good job of setting the table, but
2 certainly there is no technical data on that, and nothing
3 that would tell them how best to provide testimony that
4 is useful for the Mappers. So, we would need
5 additional...

6 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: How long is the
7 video going to be?

8 COMMISSIONER WARD: Approximately three, three
9 and a half minutes.

10 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: That would be a
11 great way to open the meeting, just my suggestion, and
12 then move forward with the Q2 Tech, so...

13 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I have Commissioner Yao, who
14 has been waiting for a while.

15 COMMISSIONER YAO: It's been said. Thank you.

16 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: I just want to make sure,
17 Dan, that when you finalize the contract with Q2 that
18 this piece is in there, the educational piece, because it
19 wasn't clearly defined -

20 MR. CLAYPOOL: It will be whatever was in the
21 Statement of Work, and I don't believe we had that in the
22 Statement of Work. The contract that we will sign with
23 them will be what we agreed that they would provide us
24 when they bid, and there was nothing in the bid for
25 educational outreach, their bid was for line drawing.

1 So, that's why I wanted to make the point that we don't -
2 we're not staffed for it, it was always - and I'm going
3 to go back to it again - it was always assumed that CCP
4 would pick up this portion of it for the educational
5 component of it, and so it's not - I'll look again, but I
6 don't believe it's in there for Q2, they're strictly line
7 drawers.

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Dai.

9 COMMISSIONER DAI: I have a couple of things, one
10 is that video will be on our home page. All this
11 information is going to be on our website, and I think
12 we're kind of over-thinking this. This is not that
13 complicated. I mean, I think a lot of this will be
14 accomplished by having some great examples on how to give
15 testimony, which we plan to have on the website, so, you
16 know, it might be as simple as directing people to the
17 video and the information on the website.

18 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I have Commissioner Ward and
19 then Commissioner Raya, and then I really urge us to move
20 on, please.

21 COMMISSIONER WARD: I'll defer.

22 COMMISSIONER RAYA: The only suggestion I'm going
23 to make is that, when we do put these materials together
24 from the toolkit, that we pull out that page that says
25 "How do I talk about the community of interest," so that

1 that's highlighted, because it's a lot of information for
2 people to go through.

3 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, that's great. Okay,
4 before we move on, I know there's an -

5 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: There's one more issue
6 that's leftover, I apologize, from Technical and
7 Outreach.

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Oh, okay.

9 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I'm sorry, just to -
10 again, I want to clarify that it's okay if the Commission
11 will agree for the recommendation, Commissioner Ontai had
12 discussed the calendar, the operational structure of the
13 input, and I understand that the direction to give to
14 staff to continue to work on these elements. We're also
15 asking --the Technical Advisory Committee is asking the
16 Commission's approval for a recommendation that we
17 continue to work with Q2 in developing these materials.

18 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: That is what I was about to
19 get to.

20 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Oh, okay. I thought you
21 were moving on to the next one, I apologize.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, the one outstanding
23 issue on this is the issue of delegation of authority to
24 allow the technical and the outreach team to work with Q2
25 to finalize some of these details. Is that correct?

1 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Commissioner Ontai,
2 correct me if I'm wrong -

3 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: There's the toolkit -

4 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Yeah, basically there is
5 going to be overlap. We see kind of the structure - the
6 toolkit aspect, there's a technology aspect to it, but
7 maybe this is a semantics -

8 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Well, there certainly is the
9 Q2 and the issues that Commissioner Ancheta had brought
10 up. And so that has to be finessed. And then, the
11 technical piece that we're talking about, I think, ties
12 in to the same issues that Commissioner Ancheta is
13 talking about. So, I'm not quite sure, it could be
14 semantics. But the issue is, we need to get that
15 resolved and the best solution might be some delegated
16 authority.

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Does that address your
18 concern?

19 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Yes.

20 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yes? Okay, Commissioner
21 Dai.

22 COMMISSIONER DAI: We have not discussed timing,
23 the time of day of these meetings, which is kind of a big
24 thing.

25 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: We very briefly decided to

1 let staff - to work with Q2 in working out the daytime
2 events and the nighttime events. Q2 has recommended from
3 their experience that the best times for weekends are
4 2:00 to 5:00 p.m. So, that is kind of generally what
5 we're looking at. On the week days, it's 5:00 to 8:00
6 p.m. Now, one contingent that sometimes these meetings
7 may go on and on and on.

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Right. Commissioner Filkins
9 Webber.

10 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I had an
11 opportunity of participating with the Greenlining
12 Institute at their first educational workshop, which I
13 think was like their second or third that they have done,
14 and one thing that was clearly evident was that 5:00 was
15 too early. They had nearly three-quarters of the people
16 come in at 5:30, so you have to think about logistics of
17 people, for the most part, if we are considering the week
18 days, there will be a number of people that do the 9:00
19 to 5:00 bit, and they will not be able to get there by
20 5:00.

21 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I think the
22 recommendation for times from Karin was there is a
23 difference between Northern California and Southern
24 California, that Northern California would be a 5:00 to
25 8:00 and Southern California would be 5:30 to 8:30, and

1 weekends would be 2:00 to 5:00.

2 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: I think it needs to be 6:00
3 to 8:00, but it's going to be in that generic area.

4 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, can we just instruct the
5 Committee in working with Q2 to make sure that they take
6 into account, particularly in areas where there are long
7 commutes, that we have to accommodate the fact that
8 people will be getting off work and have to drive to the
9 meetings, and really make sure that they think about that
10 in designing the schedule for the week day meetings. Is
11 that -

12 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yeah, yeah. The hours can
13 be adjusted, you know, a little bit here, a little bit
14 there, that would be site specific - L.A. certainly, and
15 San Diego, certainly, has different dynamics than, say,
16 Northern California.

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay. Commissioner Yao.

18 COMMISSIONER YAO: The - how much time we allow
19 each speaker - is that topic going to be discussed later?
20 Or is this something that we need to decide? Is it a
21 five-minute, three-minutes? Or is it something that
22 Commissioner Ancheta recommended that the presenter give
23 us information in writing, and then just spent a minimal
24 amount of oral presentation on what they want to give to
25 us?

1 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: And that was specific to
2 the statewide presentation, but it's a good question. I
3 mean, certainly in terms of the individual speakers.

4 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: We didn't really discuss it.

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Do we really want to spend
6 time right now deciding how many minutes people should
7 speak at each meeting? I mean, if people want to, let's
8 do it.

9 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: We've got to set up
10 the procedure. And if we were discussing it now, if the
11 public wishes to comment before we get to our next
12 Sacramento meeting, I would suggest it. And just on that
13 issue, I don't have any opinion, and maybe it might be a
14 balance between the number of people that we have there.
15 Three minutes is a very short period of time. If we
16 expanded it to five, but then, again, if you're talking
17 about 25 people want to speak, or, I don't know, but I'd
18 be at five minutes, really.

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Five minutes. Another -

20 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: And then also individuals
21 vs. organized presentation, I think we should set some
22 limitations that are different.

23 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: And, again, what we're
24 thinking about for the statewide groups, maybe it's a
25 good suggestion, too, which is, you know, if you're

1 preparing to give us some testimony, just go ahead and
2 write it all out, and if you bump up against the time
3 limit, at least we'll have your written materials - not
4 that we wouldn't accept anybody without materials, but I
5 think that gives us something to work with because we
6 might be dealing with a lot of people and we might, just
7 to get everybody in, we might have to trim the times.

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I think that's a great
9 suggestion, so there's a suggestion that we have five-
10 minute limit on comments, but that everybody be urged to
11 accompany their comments with written comments so that we
12 can always take the written comments under advisement if
13 for some reason they don't finish. That's just one first
14 proposal I have. Commissioner Di Guilio, Commissioner
15 Yao, and Commissioner Filkins Webber - and Commissioner
16 Parvenu.

17 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: A consideration - if we
18 start these meetings and we get a group, an alliance is
19 coming together to speak for more than just themselves,
20 do we want to increase that time limit beyond five
21 minutes? Is there are threshold for how many people
22 you're speaking for?

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I have - Commissioner Yao,
24 do you want to speak to that?

25 COMMISSIONER YAO: Sure. I think it would be

1 good for us to set up the maximum time so we can
2 automatically default to it if we have a very large group
3 of people that would want to speak before us. The Chair
4 always has the option to extend the time limits beyond
5 the maximum that we set for ourselves, and for community
6 groups, they all have learned to basically share the same
7 note and one speak after the other to extend beyond the
8 five minutes, in all cases. But I think it's probably
9 good to have some kind of procedure going into the
10 meeting as compared to trying to figure out what to do
11 when we encounter the situation.

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Filkins Webber.

13 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Does the Commission
14 feel that they've satisfied some of the public comment
15 from organizations such as MALDEF and, I think, some of
16 the others? I think we received this maybe from the
17 civic engagement that we did up here before, in other
18 words, are we - I do recall them saying that they wanted
19 more time at these input hearings to make presentation.
20 Do we feel that we've satisfied their interest because
21 we're going to allow them to sign up on these regional
22 meetings, such that - because I can see a situation that
23 we are going to have some groups that are focused in
24 certain areas, for instance, in Los Angeles, and those
25 groups that are focused in that area, for educational

1 purposes. And they're doing a lot of their own input
2 hearings, they've told us that at the civic engagement,
3 so they may very well want to present to us when we're in
4 that locale, even though it's not the designated region.
5 So, when we're considering this five minutes, I know that
6 we're going to receive some public comment if we just
7 limit this discussion to what we expect to be the average
8 citizen that presents to us. Would there be an occasion,
9 or would there be a process by which some of these larger
10 groups that are doing input would come to these input
11 hearings and be able to sign up for maybe 15 minutes? Or
12 do we feel that we're satisfied that they're going to
13 present their larger scale information on a regional
14 basis?

15 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: I think Commissioner Yao had
16 indicated that the Chair would have some flexibility, so
17 if you had an organized presentation such as MALDEF, or
18 NALEO, they may require 10 or 15 minutes, but that should
19 be a request made upon the Chair and the Chair should
20 make that judgment.

21 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, if I'm hearing this
22 correctly, and I do have Mr. Parvenu and Ms. -
23 Commissioner Galambos Malloy - is that we would set a
24 time, and if people wanted to exceed it, if they wanted a
25 waiver for that, they would ask the Chair when they asked

1 to speak? Is that what we're saying?

2 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Or we'd have two
3 separate - we'd have an individual time limit and a group
4 time limit?

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I'm going to go back to the
6 order - Commissioner Parvenu.

7 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Yeah, I would like to
8 encourage the partners who have organized maps and
9 information to, at our input meetings, provide that input
10 within the allocated time that we establish, three, five
11 minutes, whatever it is, and encourage them to return to
12 give a more formalized presentation when we're at
13 Northridge or wherever we're to meet, and then allow them
14 the time necessary to give a full comprehensive
15 explanation of their maps or proposed maps. That's what
16 I'd prefer to do. Secondly, at some point, I would like
17 us to consider having a draft or a mock agenda for these
18 meetings, something in writing. So far, we've mentioned
19 the video, we've mentioned the toolkit, and I would like
20 to see a mock of a draft agenda before us.

21 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: That's a great idea.

22 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Great idea.

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Galambos
24 Malloy.

25 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yes, this is in

1 regards to how much time to allow individuals, and this
2 is kind of a philosophical question for me because I'm
3 trying to balance the idea around having some level of
4 flexibility to adapt to the conditions in any given
5 hearing, and at the same time have consistency across the
6 state in terms of what one person, one vote means, and
7 not wanting to end up in a situation where it appears
8 that an individual who lives in a heavily populated area,
9 where they're showing up to a meeting with hundreds of
10 other people, are somehow getting less of the
11 Commission's time or attention than someone who lives in
12 a meeting where not that many people show up. And so,
13 you know, I'm open to hearing what other folks have to
14 say, but I do feel that having a standard that's going to
15 be the same standard is important, given the
16 underpinnings of how this Commission's work was created.

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Raya.

18 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I would echo that because my
19 concern was, when we were talking about giving groups
20 with some title more time than the individuals, and I
21 would have a deep concern about a different standard in
22 that respect, but maybe we need to also, at the same
23 time, keep encouraging people to submit information
24 through the other means that are available because we
25 clearly are not going to be able to accommodate everyone

1 at every location - well, we'll accommodate them, but
2 we're not going to be able to give them 10-15 minutes.

3 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Ward and
4 Commissioner Yao, and then I'm going to ask for sort of
5 the Chair's privilege, you know, I know Commissioner
6 Barabba needs to leave and I want to make sure that, I
7 think there is something we want to vote on, the
8 delegation authority -

9 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yes.

10 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: -- and I want to make sure
11 we don't lose a Commissioner before we do that.

12 COMMISSIONER WARD: I'll defer, then, Chair.

13 COMMISSIONER YAO: I just want to answer
14 Commissioner Filkins Webber's concern. A group like, for
15 example, the League of Women Voters, they can have three
16 speakers and a Chair can recognize to allow these three
17 speakers to speak in succession, and they will, in
18 essence, control their agenda and get their 15 minutes in
19 without us having to set up any special condition for
20 them. And I think they all know how to do that, so the
21 individual limitation really is just an attempt to set
22 some kind of standard.

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, so where we're at is
24 we believe we should have standardized time, we should
25 not make differences between groups and individual -

1 correct - that we should have a mock agenda so that we
2 know what our script is, in a sense, when we get into the
3 meetings, and that the toolkit and the video online may
4 help to fulfill some of the educational aspects that we
5 had to draw up when we eliminated that portion of our
6 work with the educational hearings. We haven't decided
7 on a time, we just said uniform. Are we going to agree
8 on five minutes -- Commissioner Di Giulio?

9 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: No, I'm sorry.

10 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Are we ready to agree on a
11 time limit? Yes? Any suggestions? Five minutes?

12 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I would move that
13 the procedure for this Commission be, at each input
14 hearing, that a member of the public be afforded five
15 minutes -- I'm sorry, up to five minutes -- for
16 presentation of their information.

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Do I have a second?

18 COMMISSIONER YAO: I will second that motion.

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Let's read back the motion
20 and then we'll have public comment.

21 MS. SARGIS: The motion is that the Commission's
22 procedure that each input hearing - each presenter would
23 be allowed up to five minutes for their presentation.

24 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Public comment?

25 MR. MILLER: Madam Chair, I just wanted to note

1 that, in these proceedings here, which are different
2 because there is less time for public comment, you
3 expressly reserve to the Commission the option to limit
4 time to three minutes if there is a certain number of
5 speakers. There should be more time for public comment
6 at a public comment meeting, but in the event of a very
7 large turnout, you might want to retain that discretion
8 to shorten time.

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right, well, let's hear
10 public comment on this.

11 MR. MILLER: Oh, I'm sorry, I didn't see you were
12 here.

13 MS. WOODS: Oh, so I just had one question and
14 one comment, one question was, I'm an Angelino, and if I
15 came to a hearing in L.A. with two of my friends, would I
16 then - would we have 15 minutes collectively to present?
17 Okay, then my second question is your point -

18 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Well, we're not allowed to
19 really answer questions, this is just public comment.

20 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: You can, given that
21 it's a motion on the floor.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right, okay.

23 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Am I correct? And
24 if it's non-agendized items that are not up for
25 discussion, then we can't answer. But, for clarification

1 purposes, yes, you're correct.

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay.

3 MS. WOODS: That was my first question, and then
4 the second one, to the point made by Commissioner
5 Galambos Malloy, I think you would have an issue with
6 people from Los Angeles, particularly, because I think
7 there will be so many folks coming to the hearings where,
8 if I came to a hearing in Los Angeles, my time might be
9 cut down vs. if I came to a hearing in some smaller city,
10 and that wouldn't really be fair.

11 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: And so your suggestion would
12 be?

13 MS. WOODS: My suggestion would be that you
14 either have more hearings in areas that are highly
15 populated, or probably just take into account, looking at
16 what happens in Phase 1, the pre-map phase, to help get a
17 sense of how you go about phase 2 because today you've
18 been really focused on making sure that you've got a
19 schedule, which is incredibly important for anyone that
20 wants to present, but if you find that so many people
21 present in big cities, and you don't have enough space
22 for the big city folks, then you'd have an issue moving
23 forward. So, just to keep that in mind.

24 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Thank you.

25 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: I do want to say one thing,

1 being a Planning Commissioner in San Diego, and I've been
2 before many adversarial groups. If we limit each speaker
3 to five minutes, and that's the only real rule we have,
4 I've seen many occasions when organized groups will take
5 advantage of that, and 20 people will show up, given 5
6 minutes, each, all talking about the same issue. Does
7 that make sense? So, that is something we should
8 consider.

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Barabba and
10 Commissioner Raya.

11 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I was under the impression
12 that they were going to have a little screening at the
13 beginning of this where people get a number? And could
14 we somehow in that screening make sure that whatever the
15 subject is, there is one speaker for that point? Is that
16 possible?

17 MR. CLAYPOOL: I don't know the degree to which
18 we can - we can't require them to give us their names, so
19 I certainly don't believe we could require them to tell
20 us what they're going to speak to us about or how they
21 are with.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Ward and then
23 Commissioner Ancheta.

24 COMMISSIONER WARD: This idea might have been
25 taken off the table, but it seems like I recall in

1 conversations with CCP and technical experts from I think
2 about a little over a month ago, was that they were
3 talking about having paperwork available at the meeting
4 for people to provide their input on, and better qualify
5 their inputs. In other words, people come to the meeting
6 with general concepts about their communities, not only
7 was the point to come to deliver that, but also to help
8 refine it into usable information for us. So, if in fact
9 that capability is still going to be there, some form
10 with a map, whatever the case may be, something to record
11 that testimony, to me, giving the Chair the flexibility
12 to be able to change times given the venue, or even limit
13 speakers, whatever the case, does seem appropriate
14 because, again, this is not the only way a speaker can
15 give that testimony; if this was the only avenue, then
16 those concerns seem to make a lot of sense, but being
17 that this is one of many avenues with which to give that
18 testimony to this Commission for equal consideration with
19 all the rest, whether we do three minutes or five minutes
20 in a given city doesn't seem to be that impactful.

21 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Ancheta.

22 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Well, I'm not going to
23 speak to Commissioner Ward's point, but - I support the
24 motion for five minutes, but just to be clear, I'm not
25 sure if it's exactly in the wording, but I want to make

1 sure that this is not the time limit that we're applying
2 for the statewide meetings, that would be different, but
3 make sure that the - the wording is fine and I think we
4 understand that, and we would need a second - a different
5 motion on that, which could be now or later, but -

6 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Public Input
7 Hearing -

8 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: -- because I'm concerned
9 that term might be - could be interpreted as every
10 hearing, and I think the intent of the Commission is not
11 to apply it to every hearing, the statewides would be
12 different, but -

13 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Did you say regional
14 hearings as opposed to the statewide hearing?

15 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Minor amendments, or
16 again, we could have a second motion that would simply -
17 we may not have discussed it yet, but I think we would
18 allocate more time for submissions in the statewide
19 hearings. I just want to make sure that we're not, by
20 the wording of this motion, we're not precluding that
21 change.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: And do you have a comment on
23 the five minutes?

24 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Oh, I support the five
25 minutes.

1 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay. Commissioner Raya had
2 her hand up.

3 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I would just hope that we --
4 in particular, organized representatives and members of
5 the public who might be a little more prepared to get a
6 group together would give some consideration to the fact
7 that there are other people, just individuals out there,
8 who are going to make that effort to come and may not
9 have any other opportunity or means to tell us whatever
10 it is that's important to them, so I think there's a
11 responsibility not just on our part to try and structure
12 the proceeding fairly, but also for members of the public
13 to consider, you know, the opportunity that should be
14 provided to everyone.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: And I know we have more
16 public comment, but I think that is something the Chair
17 would have to really work on, you know, having a good
18 relationship in that hearing with the public, asking them
19 to use their courtesy and their common sense to make sure
20 that everybody who is present gets a chance to speak,
21 that we will have to, you know, manage it well in terms
22 of also appealing to the public that they, you know, some
23 degree of courtesy. Public comment?

24 MR. SALIVARY: I'd just like to say that I really
25 hear Commissioner Ontai's, you know, what he said about

1 the San Diego hearings that he's been at, and where
2 groups take them over. So, I would like to suggest, if
3 it's not possible to take people's names and have them
4 basically tell us who they are, and what they're going to
5 be speaking on, that the process be done randomly so that
6 people don't speak in a row, you know, speakers five
7 through 10, are all on one subject. Perhaps numbers can
8 be taken, and then they can be picked out of a hat so
9 that this gaming of the timeframe cannot happen. I'd
10 also like to say that I did think that the 15 minutes for
11 the larger groups would be a process where the larger
12 groups would then, you know, put up their best speaker
13 and speak in a more organized fashion, and that, I think,
14 would be much more helpful to the Commission than having
15 three people in a row tag teaming like from the League of
16 Women Voters, so if you just could consider some of these
17 points, ways so that folks cannot game the system. Thank
18 you.

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Do we feel this - okay? So
20 we have a motion. Maybe you can just restate it.

21 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And I just have one
22 question.

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So there is still
24 discussion?

25 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Well, just one

1 other -

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, go ahead.

3 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Given that it's my
4 motion and I've heard the comment, we did have this issue
5 before and it's based on what Mr. Miller had said, is
6 everyone inclined to accept the five-minutes as the
7 motion stands? Or should we give due consideration for
8 obviously greater public participation when we have a
9 larger number? I mean, we do want to balance the
10 fairness as has been raised by Rani today and, you know,
11 but we have to understand that there are more populous
12 areas and we want to hear from more people. So, I would
13 entertain an amendment if the Commission is inclined to
14 consider that over a certain number, we would have to go
15 down to three minutes. But, Commissioner Galambos
16 Malloy, I understand your point, but I don't want to lose
17 that opportunity since we do recognize it's a
18 possibility. So I could consider an amendment if the
19 Commission was inclined to consider.

20 COMMISSIONER BARABBA: I would so move that
21 amendment.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right, discussion on the
23 amended motion?

24 COMMISSIONER DAI: And is it a friendly amendment
25 so that -

1 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: It is a friendly
2 amendment that I would propose that the procedure of this
3 Commission will be an allowance of presentation from the
4 public at the regional input hearings in a timeframe up
5 to five minutes for presentation, at the Chair's
6 discretion, in the event of a large number of people, and
7 I'll let the Chair determine what that is, that the
8 timeframe for public input would be at three minutes.

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Do I have a second for that
10 motion?

11 COMMISSIONER WARD: I'll second that.

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Discussion. Commissioner Di
13 Guilio has had her hand up, Commissioner Yao.

14 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I understand the
15 intentions of the amendment and, while I think that's
16 been a good approach for us at our Business Meetings, I'm
17 concerned that if we do this in the public meeting that
18 we may - it goes back to what we've heard many times,
19 that if you're in a populous area, you may be reduced to
20 three minutes, rather than five, so you're proportional
21 representation, so to speak, is less than if you lived in
22 another location. And then, if you had the issue where,
23 if we are in the week day, we might be willing to extend
24 a couple hours for public input, but if you're on the
25 weekend, you could technically extend for four, five,

1 six, seven hours, if you needed. So, if you were in a
2 big city on the weekend, and you may have more
3 opportunities to have five minutes than if you're in a
4 big city on the week day, I just think that, because
5 technically you could extend longer probably on a weekend
6 if you start from two to four, and if you wanted to
7 extend three or four hours vs. maybe only one or two on
8 the weeknight, unless we want to go until -

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So you would be voting
10 against this?

11 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: So, I would be voting
12 against it because I just think proportionally you - if
13 you live in a place that has a higher - we could have a
14 run-in in Auburn, I don't know, but so you could be -

15 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: It is left to the
16 Chair's discretion, but -

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: There is a motion on the
18 floor that has been seconded, and so please speak to
19 that. So, Commissioner Yao, Commissioner Forbes, and
20 Commissioner Ward, Commissioner Di Giulio, Commissioner
21 Dai.

22 COMMISSIONER YAO: As far as procedure is
23 concerned, I would like to see us basically extend the
24 length of the meeting to accommodate the people that are
25 interested in speaking at the five-minute speaking

1 duration, and then, if we exhaust that, then we perhaps
2 need to limit it to three minutes, as compared to just
3 limiting it to three minutes automatically, so that's my
4 comment.

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Ward - oh,
6 Forbes.

7 COMMISSIONER FORBES: Right. A variation is that
8 you have - I've seen this done - you've had all the
9 three-minute speakers go first, and then you have another
10 group of five-minute speakers, so if you can say you
11 piece in three minutes, you get to go first, you don't
12 have to wait. And a variation on that is to say
13 everybody gets to speak for three minutes, and once we
14 get through everybody, we'll open it up again and you can
15 talk longer. But that means the people at the end don't
16 have to wait forever if they don't have five minutes to
17 speak.

18 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Ward and then
19 Commissioner Dai, and then Commissioner Galambos Malloy,
20 and then Di Giulio.

21 COMMISSIONER WARD: Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.
22 Again, just the reason why I seconded the amendment, and
23 appreciate it, is again, just trying to understand why
24 are we there? What's the point? It's to get the input.
25 And we want to give as many people the opportunity to be

1 heard in person as we can, but we have vehicles to
2 capture that testimony regardless of whether it's three
3 minutes or it's five minutes, we're going to get that
4 data, that's what we're there to do, and I think if we
5 take the flexibility away from the Chair to be able to
6 make a venue specific decision on how we can best serve
7 that community at that meeting, we're making a mistake
8 because we don't know, we haven't even done one. We
9 don't know. There might be facility issues that we can't
10 just plan on extending hours on end to accommodate what
11 shows up. There are facility issues, I'm sure, there is
12 a whole host of things that are yet to be decided, and so
13 it just seems logical to say, "Hey, let's plan on five
14 minutes," the Chair having the discretion to cut that
15 down to three if needed, with the discretion if the
16 facilities allow to extend hours, whatever the case may
17 be. But the point is, our goal as I see it is to get the
18 input and, again, whether we're able to cut it to three
19 because of the turnout, and then make sure that they have
20 the opportunity to capture that in writing, and provide
21 that before they leave and things like that, it's all
22 equal weight, whether they say it in person, you know, we
23 care and we want to hear it and that's what we're there
24 to do, but to take that flexibility away from the Chair,
25 I think, is really a mistake, having not even gone out

1 and seeing what's awaiting us.

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I have three more and then
3 I'm going to end this round. Commissioner Dai.

4 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, I agree with
5 Commissioner Ward, I also like Commissioner Forbes' idea
6 of letting people use the three minutes up and then
7 seeing who else has more to say. I think, to
8 Commissioner Ward's point, I think that, you know, public
9 hearings like this were designed in a different era, I
10 think this time we may see a couple orders of magnitude
11 difference in the amount of input we're going to get by
12 email and posted to the website, and so I think we need
13 to not forget that that is a perhaps more important
14 vehicle than the in-person public hearings that we are
15 going to do.

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Galambos
17 Malloy.

18 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, you know, I
19 still think that consistency is what we need to strive
20 for, and I understand, having been Chair before, and
21 knowing that I will be Chair at some point again, that I
22 also appreciated that flexibility. So, I'm just trying
23 to do actually some rough calculations on what it would
24 mean to operationalized this, so let's say we were at a
25 hearing and let's say we had 100 individuals turn out.

1 If we were to give them three minutes each, we're talking
2 300 minutes, so if we had 100 individuals at three
3 minutes apiece, we're talking 300 minutes, which gets us
4 at a five-hour meeting. If we had the same 100
5 individuals show up and we gave them five minutes, each,
6 we're talking 500 minutes, which is a - I'm sorry, I
7 can't speak and do math at the same time - but we're
8 talking about roughly an eight-hour meeting. So, if we
9 were going to make a decision on an absolute number, I
10 would say let's err on the side of three minutes because,
11 again, our goal is to hear from as many citizens in the
12 State of California as possible, and I also would err on
13 the side of consistency, so we are not privileging less
14 populated meetings with people being able to influence us
15 more than in more populated meetings.

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So you'll be voting against
17 the five-minute motion?

18 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I will.

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right, that's -

20 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Can I just -

21 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: -- and Commissioner Di
22 Guilio.

23 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: And I just wanted to
24 clarify, as well, too, because that was the point I was
25 trying to make earlier is that I would be voting against

1 it because I want the consistency, as well, and I agree
2 that three minutes... But, I did want to address
3 Commissioner Forbes, the first come, first serve, even
4 though in concept it's a nice one, if you have 10 people,
5 let's say 20 people, that are three minutes, then you're
6 going to - and they spend the whole time, but yet someone
7 has been there waiting for five minutes from the very
8 beginning and people continue to come in for three
9 minutes, that person who was there right at the
10 beginning, and they want five minutes, is going to have
11 to wait a very long time, so I think it should be a first
12 come, first serve, and we have to keep it consistent, so
13 I would vote for three minutes, so I would be against the
14 five minutes.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I'm going to call the
16 question. Can you please -

17 MS. SARGIS: I'm sorry, I have two things. I
18 didn't hear the second to the original motion. Did
19 anybody second it?

20 COMMISSIONER YAO: I seconded the original
21 motion.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: And then there was the
23 amendment, the amended motion.

24 MS. SARGIS: And then I just needed the last part
25 of your motion. I got that the procedure would be, at

1 each regional input hearing, each presenter will have up
2 to five minutes for their presentation, and at the
3 Chair's discretion, if the crowd warrants, time -

4 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Would be limited to
5 three minutes.

6 MS. SARGIS: Okay, would be limited to three
7 minutes. Do you want me to repeat that?

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I think we're fine.

9 MS. SARGIS: Okay.

10 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, call for the question.
11 All those in favor of the motion, say "Aye," and raise
12 your right hand.

13 (Ayes.)

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I'm voting no.

15 MS. SARGIS: Okay, 10 ayes, the motion passes.

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay. All right.

17 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Whew.

18 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Whew. Thank you, Technical
19 and Outreach Committee. I know everybody - how is the
20 break --

21 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I'm sorry, Chairman, we
22 do have one thing in terms of agenda for the next
23 meeting. Because of our limited time, we have to
24 determine in order to post for the input hearings,
25 because we won't be meeting again, we need to determine

1 the time for at least until - technically until April
2 28th, all those meetings, but probably we should just
3 finish out April because we will not have another meeting
4 time to determine the input hearing times, so we would
5 need to have those agendized for public posting.

6 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Can we leave that to the
7 staff to do?

8 MR. CLAYPOOL: We would need you to approve them.
9 How about, while you take the break, we figure the times
10 and then you can approve them after our break?

11 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Please. And then, can we
12 come back also with the motion for the delegated
13 authority so that we can do some of these things in
14 between of this nature, going forward?

15 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And then just one
16 other - do we need to vote on this, at least through
17 June? And we could do that with the time, I'm assuming
18 it would be a combined motion, at least April through
19 June? Was the committee looking for that? That was an
20 action item, okay.

21 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: We are looking for an action
22 item on this, yes.

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, so we'll do that with
24 the times, because it didn't include that, we'll do it
25 altogether. All right. Five minutes.

1 (Recess at 2:45 p.m.)

2 (Reconvene at 3:00 a.m.)

3 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: We're back live, it's 3:00.
4 We have two more items before we move on to the next of
5 our Advisory Committee reports. The two items that we
6 have in front of us are the actual adoption of the
7 calendar, with times, and the second item, which has been
8 brought to my attention, that I didn't realize was still
9 outstanding from the Outreach and Technical Committee, is
10 the logistics of how we're all going to get to all of
11 these places, and a discussion on how to do that in the
12 most convenient and least expensive way. Let me just
13 say, on that discussion let's - I don't want to sit here
14 for two hours and discuss busses and routes and what
15 airline has the best flights. What I would suggest is
16 that we have some parameters and we really ask staff to
17 explore some ways to make this work, instead of us trying
18 to be 14 travel agents.

19 So, with that said, we have an item - there is no
20 motion, but because we need to discuss the times -

21 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yeah. So, did staff manage
22 to contact?

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: No, they're trying right
24 now.

25 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Okay, so again, the

1 recommended time for the week days are in the evenings
2 and the suggested hours - we could suggest 6:00 to 9:00
3 and more, if necessary. I'll put that on the table. On
4 week days. Maybe we'll take it in that order.

5 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Could I suggest there's
6 also maybe some regional differences, that Redding and
7 Yuba City, and maybe even into the 13th, I don't think
8 traffic will be as much of an issue here, so the times
9 may be different, could be earlier than the ones in L.A.,
10 and I'd really like to hear the L.A. specific ones
11 because I think if we set a general time for the Central
12 Valley and Northern California, we could probably be okay
13 with that.

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: My only comment about that
15 is, again, the consistency issue. Why don't we just - if
16 people have more time to get there, they have more time
17 to get there. Why don't we just say 6:00 everywhere, and
18 if that gives some people time to eat more than others,
19 so be it. I mean, just have a set time so there is no
20 confusion. That would be my comment on that. Others?
21 Yes?

22 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: When you say "set
23 time," is that time across all the regions?

24 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yes.

25 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: My only thought

1 around that is regarding some of the meetings that if we
2 start at 6:00 and we have particularly large meeting,
3 that it does not give us much flexibility, it means we'll
4 be going very late into the night, potentially, midnight
5 according to some of the rough calculations I was doing,
6 and so maybe there would be opportunity of starting a bit
7 earlier?

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: My own thought about that is
9 that 5:30 is not a big difference from 6:00 and if we're
10 going to be late, we're going to be late, so I don't
11 think it's worth changing 6:00 to 5:30 just to get in a
12 half hour, but that's just my own. Commissioner Filkins
13 Webber.

14 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And we won't know
15 how many people are attending to accommodate that prior
16 to a hearing.

17 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: So, I would say that I would
18 recommend starting at 6:00, ideally ending at 9:00.

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: If possible, yeah.
20 Commissioner Yao.

21 COMMISSIONER YAO: Question. Are we committed to
22 stay until 9:00 just in the event some people show up in
23 a meeting late?

24 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yes, you know, if we have to
25 go beyond 9:00, we have to.

1 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I think it's like any other
2 meeting. We notice it, it's publicly noticed, and we
3 have to be there until the end of the meeting, you know,
4 that's been noticed. Commissioner Filkins Webber.

5 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I agree. That was
6 my same point at the civic engagement and Mr. Wright has
7 mentioned that, actually, in writing and today, and I do
8 feel that if we're going to agendize it for 6:00 to 9:00,
9 we will be committed to be there until 9:00.

10 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Galambos
11 Malloy.

12 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Just in the L.A.
13 area, I do have some concern around starting at 6:00. I
14 think that, in addition to the public, it also puts us as
15 Commissioners in the position of traveling to get there
16 during the peak of rush hour, when there may be people
17 who would be able to come and give their testimony
18 earlier in the evening.

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Can I have a motion on the
20 6:00 to 9:00 for the weeknights?

21 COMMISSIONER RAYA: So moved.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: We've got a motion on the
23 floor. Is there a second?

24 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Second.

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Discussion? Yes,

1 Commissioner Ward.

2 COMMISSIONER WARD: I was just curious, is this
3 something that we can't just give direction to staff to
4 do, like guidelines as to what we'd prefer? And the only
5 reason I ask the question as to why it has to be a -
6 again, not knowing, we don't have facilities for almost
7 any of these yet, and kind of similar to what
8 Commissioner Galambos Malloy is saying, there might be
9 intricacies that we all agree for site-specific
10 locations, can't we just say to staff that this is what
11 we would like to see, but not formalize it in the form of
12 a motion that is inflexible?

13 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Whose motion was that?

14 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Mine.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Is there any way you want to
16 change it?

17 COMMISSIONER RAYA: No. I understand that we
18 have notice requirements regardless of the fact that this
19 is here, there, and everywhere, so that's why I'm saying
20 6:00 to 9:00. I mean, obviously we have options if we
21 really have to exercise them at some point, but we need
22 to start somewhere, I think, for the sake of the public.

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Di Giulio.

24 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I want to make a
25 suggestion for a friendly amendment, simply that we would

1 keep the motion but that if there's issues related to the
2 venue, that we allow staff to make those minor changes.
3 Is that possible to address that concern?

4 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Well -

5 COMMISSIONER RAYA: If I may politely decline?
6 Only because I think we have that discretion, or the
7 power, whatever, already. Don't we? Would I be correct
8 in saying that -

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: You would be correct that -
10 this is where we're going to get into the delegation
11 issue, but if we said 6:00 or 9:00, but we - if the place
12 we're going to be at is flooded, or, you know, I'm
13 serious, stuff is going to happen, we have to have some
14 way of dealing with that that staff consults with X
15 people that we have delegated authority to, to deviate
16 from the agreed upon 6:00 to 9:00 schedule, and we've got
17 staff for a reason, and if they find out that this one
18 location - the security guards go home at 8:00, and so in
19 order to have three hours, we have to meet at 5:00, then
20 they can come back to the lead people and say, "We know
21 we have a policy in place, but we suggest that we do this
22 for this place, and we'll do it with proper notice,"
23 which is why we need to move on because they have to
24 start making these calls about these places so that, if
25 there are difficulties with some of these locations, they

1 can start identifying them and then we may have to alter
2 things. So, there is a second. More discussion on the
3 motion? Okay, call for the question - oh, public
4 comment, sorry.

5 MR. WRIGHT: Jim Wright again. Commissioners,
6 might I suggest that you tell staff that you want a
7 three-hour meeting in the evening at the appropriate
8 time? Or if, at the day meeting, you want a five-hour
9 meeting during the day, that's what might be a site-
10 appropriate time. And the other consideration is, some
11 of the times you have business meetings on the same day,
12 and suggest that you might agendize those before the
13 public input meeting, rather than after. Thank you.

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Any other public comment?
15 More discussion. Commissioner Di Giulio.

16 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Mr. Wright made a good
17 point. Did we not add a business meeting at the end of
18 April? So, would that change the time for that day
19 because that is part of what needs to be agendized?

20 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: My notes show, yes,
21 April 28th at the Los Angeles Downtown venue, I have a
22 note as a business meeting, but I don't think this motion
23 goes to that, necessarily, I think it's just for the
24 public input, but certainly I would leave it to staff's
25 discretion for appropriate time of our business session,

1 in conjunction with the Chair. The Chair is going to
2 know what the agenda is going to be and how much time we
3 need to spend for a business meeting on those days that
4 we've designated separately from input, so I think public
5 input is what the focus of the motion is for 6:00 to
6 9:00.

7 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Thank you. More discussion?
8 Okay, call for the question. All in favor, signify with
9 "Aye."

10 (Ayes.) Any opposed? The motion passes. Oh,
11 sorry. One "no" from Commissioner Ancheta. All right.

12 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: The second recommendation.
13 The weekend hours be from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Do you want to give us your
15 thinking so that we don't repeat that with just -
16 anything we need to know?

17 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: The idea on weekends, you
18 have great opportunities for family to attend. Mornings
19 usually are, well, they're visiting family things, but I
20 would imagine the afternoon hours allows the families or
21 people to come to these events. That's it.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yes, Commissioner Parvenu?

23 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: You're suggesting 1:00 as
24 opposed to 2:00, giving Saturdays a longer window of time
25 than week nights, which are three hours? So you are

1 recommending that we have four hours on Saturdays and
2 Sundays?

3 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yes. I'm open for
4 discussion.

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Di Guilio, and
6 then Commissioner Galambos Malloy.

7 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Just to speak on that,
8 is there - because we just raised this issue before, is
9 that, if we notice it, we have to be there for that
10 entire time. Is there a benefit to having a three-hour
11 window, knowing we could go longer, vs. locking ourselves
12 into having to be there for four hours? Do we
13 anticipate having significantly more public comments on
14 the weekend that would warrant the need to be there for
15 four hours - at the minimum?

16 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yeah, I think we're going to
17 have more people showing up on the weekends. That's my
18 thought.

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I have Commissioner Galambos
20 Malloy, Commissioner Ancheta.

21 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: My only
22 consideration was for the Sunday specifically, that 1:00
23 is a pretty tight window for those where going to church
24 is, you know, normally it can go - you might get done
25 with church at 12:00, some churches you might get done at

1 1:00, or, you know, just building in a little cushion in
2 there so on a Sunday, starting at 2:00 might make more
3 sense.

4 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Two is fine.

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Two to five?

6 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: And, again, it might go over
7 5:00, but that would be the ideal termination.

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Ancheta.

9 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yeah, and actually the
10 reason - I should have spoken at the previous - the
11 reason I voted no in the previous motion is my feeling is
12 we should give staff the discretion to set the times, but
13 there should be equal hours. I prefer four hours for
14 both night and weekend, but not - there's not a
15 differentiation because, again, we're hitting different
16 regions and if we give four hours to one region vs. three
17 hours to another, but that was my feeling, and that's
18 also why I voted no on the last motion.

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, the recommendation now
20 is weekends 2:00 to 5:00. Do I have a motion on that?

21 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: So moved. Was -
22 would you like to amend your motion, or did you make a
23 motion?

24 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: No, it was just a
25 recommendation, I didn't make a motion.

1 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yeah, and he changed his
2 recommendation from 1:00 to 2:00 and it's now 2:00 to
3 5:00. There was discussion. Is there a motion that we
4 meet on weekends from 2:00 to 5:00?

5 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: I would like to make that
6 motion that we have the weekend hours from 2:00 to 5:00
7 p.m.

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Is there a second?

9 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Second.

10 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Discussion? Public comment?

11 MR. WRIGHT: Jim Wright again. Ditto my previous
12 comments. I think a period of time, rather than an
13 absolute hour is a better idea.

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Thank you.

15 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: I see Daniel stepped in.
16 Were you able to communicate with Karin?

17 MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes, I was. And I have a few
18 pieces of information. The first thing is that Ana is
19 gone to one meeting and she has the information, Karin is
20 leaving on another meeting, so the earliest that I'm
21 going to be able to coordinate this calendar with her is
22 going to be Monday, so we're going to have to work
23 through the lead and then send you out that information.
24 She - on the issue of the two regional meetings, she said
25 the closer those meetings are together, the better off it

1 will be because then she can get the information and then
2 present it to you more quickly and incorporate it the
3 map. On the conversation of how many days she needed to
4 meet with you, she indicated that she only needs a couple
5 of days, that she's going to take the information you've
6 given, create the maps, and then would meet with you and
7 you would make the corrections in that two-day period.
8 So, we have blocked six days here, so perhaps we can have
9 a business meeting there, or whatever we need to do. Or
10 we could, if we were at the Memorial weekend, I guess we
11 could maybe take some of these other meetings and move
12 them out, I mean, I don't know. But at any rate, we
13 don't need that much time, it might just be - heaven
14 forbid, it might be a break for you guys and you could
15 just a little time off, but that's the information she
16 communicated to me. Also, she said that it doesn't
17 matter where she meets you, whether she meets you in
18 Sacramento to go over the information, or the Bay Area,
19 but because she lives in the Bay Area, she always thinks
20 the Bay Area is a better place for her to give you that
21 information. So, that's - and on the issue of the - now
22 that I think about it, there are two other issues - the
23 piece for the toolkit, that was actually given to us on
24 the communities of interest and so forth, when Bonnie
25 Glaser was here in our last session, but they are

1 refining it and she will give it to the Commission and
2 she would like very much to have it included into our
3 toolkit. And last, but not least, she wanted me to ask
4 the Commission to give her some guidance on what they
5 would like her to do as she goes around and still gives
6 some talks as the Director of the Statewide Database on
7 the database. She understands that she cannot be talking
8 about any of the redistricting for the Commission, but
9 she had prior engagements lined up to give those talks,
10 one of which she is giving this weekend, and she just
11 wants to clear that calendar with you and make sure she
12 is doing what you wish her to do.

13 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, well, let's finish -
14 we have a motion on the floor, I don't believe that
15 anything that we've just heard affects this particular
16 motion about the weekend times, so we've had public
17 comment. Any further discussion? Call the question?
18 All in favor? Say "Aye" and raise your right hands.

19 (Ayes.) All opposed? Motion passes.

20 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right, Mr. Chair, is
21 that -

22 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: That is it.

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: "Lead advisory committee
24 person!"

25 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: That is Part A, Part B is

1 now the calendar, itself.

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay. Now, some of the
3 information that - if you bear with me, I would like to
4 do something before we approve the calendar because I
5 think it might make the approval of the calendar a little
6 bit easier. Can we hear from our Chief Counsel the
7 recommendation on designating leads to work with the
8 Chair and staff in between meetings on certain items,
9 given that we're going to be having to make some
10 compressed decisions and changes potentially in venues?
11 This is the kind of thing we've been talking about. And
12 maybe you could just report this item out of the Legal
13 Advisory Committee, it was kicked over to us and we
14 considered it.

15 MR. MILLER: Well, we had a thorough discussion
16 in the legal committee about how this might work and the
17 benefits that would flow from it, and the concept that
18 emerged from our committee was, I think what we referred
19 to was more of a lead person for the Committee than a
20 Chair of the Committee, and the essence of it is that
21 that would be a regular person designated not to make
22 significant substantive decisions, either on behalf of
23 the Committee, but rather to focus on what I call the
24 mundane or the ordinary business that facilitates the
25 Commission's overall mission, and can hold things up in

1 the absence of a place to go. Maybe a good example is
2 what we were just talking about, where we would like to
3 have meetings from 2:00 to 5:00, and for whatever reason
4 there is a good venue, but we can only have it from 3:00
5 to 7:00, as a staff, I think we would feel constrained to
6 make that change where the Commission has spoken on a
7 preferred time without having some approved way to get a
8 blessing for that change. So, we thought that having a
9 couple of people designated from the different committees
10 was a good way to facilitate the ordinary, as opposed to
11 the extraordinary, between meetings.

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, yes, questions.
13 Commissioner Yao.

14 COMMISSIONER YAO: Mr. Miller, could you try to
15 distinguish the type of decisions that currently we ask
16 staff to coordinate with a Chair and a Vice chair to make
17 vs. the type of decision where a designated authority
18 from each of the Advisory Committees would be preferred?

19 MR. MILLER: Well, the one that comes up for us
20 all the time is simply setting the agenda. Now, we've
21 made some progress on that and, if we could stick to it
22 by each committee establishing the agenda for the
23 following meeting at the end of the current meeting, or
24 at least that is the procedure we followed in the Legal
25 Advisory Committee. But, in the absence of that, and

1 there hasn't been a cohesive way to do agenda planning,
2 at the staff level we've been kind of stuck with
3 generalities rather than specifics on behalf of the
4 Commission, in announcing to the public what to
5 anticipate at each meeting. So, that's a recurring one
6 where, if we could have simplified input to the
7 Commission, we think we could get a disproportionate
8 benefit from doing that.

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: And let me just explain a
10 little bit of the concern that was raised at the Legal
11 Advisory Committee and why it's not just the Chair, which
12 might be what people may be wondering, "Why not have the
13 Chair and the Vice Chair work with the staff on these
14 things?" There was a sense that both Commissioner
15 Filkins Webber and I expressed that sometimes when you're
16 the Chair and you're working with staff, you really feel
17 like you should be checking in with other members of the
18 Commission so that it's not really the Chair making
19 decisions with the staff, and that one way to feel like
20 you're getting -- as Chair -- that you're getting good
21 information from your Commissioners, is to be talking to
22 the lead of the committee that might be involved in
23 whatever this is, it might be a technical issue, it might
24 be a public information issue, and so it's to take it a
25 little bit out of just the Chair and the staff, which I

1 think, we both expressed, can be a little uncomfortable
2 and not feeling like you're checking in with the
3 Commissioners on some of these decisions. Does that
4 capture the conversation? And so, that's why not just
5 the Chair.

6 MR. MILLER: I would just add from our meeting,
7 and then having a particular person on each committee to
8 look to, I think, in turn facilitates the ease of being
9 Chair from meeting to meeting.

10 COMMISSIONER YAO: Sort of a question to both the
11 Chair and also to our counsel, the Chair today can talk
12 to the lead person on each of the advisory committees at
13 will, is that not the understanding we have?

14 MR. MILLER: Yes.

15 COMMISSIONER YAO: So, if the Chair is at liberty
16 to talk to each of whatever that individual is called -
17 the Chairperson from the Advisory Committee -

18 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: No, we don't have them, is
19 the problem.

20 COMMISSIONER YAO: Now, did I hear an
21 understanding that the Chair can talk to each of the
22 leads from the advisory committee at will?

23 MR. MILLER: In concept. I think that there may
24 be different practices from committee to committee as to
25 whether there is, in fact, someone who fills that role.

1 COMMISSIONER YAO: Okay, that may be a separate
2 issue. Assuming, and I emphasize "assuming," there is a
3 lead person for each of the Advisory Committees, and
4 again, I'm making a statement, I need you verification on
5 this, and a Chair can talk to each of these lead
6 individuals from each of the advisory committees, then
7 the Chair, by definition, has reasonable input from each
8 of the advisory committees and the Chair can work with
9 staff in making these type of decisions, and I guess I
10 need to be corrected where my assumption is inaccurate or
11 incorrect.

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I think sometimes the
13 problem becomes if, out of the three Commissioners, the
14 Chair and whoever the Chair wants to speak with, are
15 engaged in a three-person conversation, then we have a
16 problem.

17 MR. MILLER: Well, in our model that we've
18 constructed here, you don't have three people from any
19 one committee meeting, which constitutes a State body, so
20 we've divided people up in such a manner that you don't
21 run into the Bagley-Keene issue because "three" is
22 defined in a very particular way, and we would choose the
23 people to avoid that definition. So, you wouldn't have -
24 well, I'll just stop with that. I think everything
25 you've said is correct, that there is no correction to

1 what you're saying at all, I think there may be differing
2 practices as to whether the people have been designated
3 in each committee that match Commissioner Yao's
4 hypothetical. And, indeed, I think what the proposal is,
5 is to make the practice what you're describing.

6 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Correct, it's to designate a
7 lead that meets all the things we've talked about in
8 terms of, you know, not just bipartisanship, but
9 different parties, so that when people are consulting
10 it's okay. But we really need to formalize that so that,
11 when these things come up, the Chair can say, you know,
12 "I need to talk to you about this and I need to talk to
13 this other person about this," and then we can get back
14 to the staff.

15 COMMISSIONER YAO: If the Chair feels that she
16 has that authority already, what is - why is there a
17 necessity to clarify that?

18 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: There's not always a lead in
19 each committee to talk to. Yes, Commissioner Di Giulio?

20 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Could I ask for - to me,
21 it seems like what's happening, and I haven't been a
22 Chair in the past, so maybe those who have been, there's
23 quite a significant amount of information as you're
24 serving as the Chair that's on the large scale issue that
25 the Chair and Vice Chair are trying to coordinate, and

1 sometimes the specific details that are related to an
2 advisory committee, it seems like this is simplifying the
3 process for staff to be able to have someone to go - a
4 point person to have these discussions because,
5 otherwise, it becomes telephone - staff will tell the
6 Chair, and then Chair tries to tell the Advisory, and
7 then Advisory gives the Chair some history, the
8 background, so it becomes adding a middleman or a middle
9 person, and I would imagine, as the Chair, your duties
10 are pretty full already, that you don't need to be
11 playing the middle man in the process. I think it is
12 still necessary to have the Chair and the Vice Chair to
13 be included in this discussion in the sense that they
14 need to be aware of what's happening, but that the actual
15 - there's a mechanism - we formalize a mechanism to have
16 the staff have ability to contact the Advisory Committees
17 who probably have the bigger background and knowledge of
18 the issue at hand.

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, before we all speculate
20 on what is the authority that Mr. Claypool needs, why
21 don't you tell us what it is that you envision would make
22 this work better for the Commission, and then we can go
23 from there?

24 MR. CLAYPOOL: A single point of contact
25 permanently established in each advisory committee would

1 just give us the continuity we need to know that, as
2 we're developing things that are going to go on, or that
3 we express certain problems that may go forward, and I'll
4 give you a very good example, we have been promising the
5 Finance Advisory Committee certain spreadsheets since the
6 beginning of our venture. If that passes on and on, it
7 gets lost, and so that's what we're looking for, the
8 single point of continuity, and then that person can make
9 things, I would think, a lot easier for the rotating
10 Chair and Vice Chair.

11 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: And is your suggestion or
12 what you need is to be able to go directly to the lead?

13 MR. CLAYPOOL: I would always go to the lead, the
14 Chair, and the Vice Chair, they will always be cc'd.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: That's what I thought, okay.
16 Does that help at all, Commissioner Yao? No. Okay.
17 Yeah. Commissioner Dai.

18 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, I mean, I don't have a
19 problem with designating someone from each advisory
20 committee, I just don't understand why it has to be
21 permanent. You know, I think we have so many constraints
22 on us already, and we're all volunteers, and the whole
23 reason we went to a rotating leadership structure in the
24 first place was to spread the burden of leadership, and I
25 think that's equally true in the advisory committees and

1 I don't really understand why you need a permanent person
2 if we can tell you who your contact person should be
3 until the next meeting, I think that should be
4 sufficient.

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, now you understand it a
6 little bit perhaps the issue, Commissioner Yao, that it
7 rotates in some places, so it's never clear exactly who
8 the person is in the advisory committee, and we're just
9 trying to move faster and more efficiently as we get into
10 this next stage where we need to be able to do that. So,
11 the recommendation is for a permanent lead person, and
12 that is what the discussion is on.

13 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I'm curious as to - I
14 know in our meeting, we didn't have a discussion in terms
15 of our preference for this or not, for Technical and
16 Outreach. Have the other Advisory Committees made their
17 determination about this in a formal sense?

18 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Legal did.

19 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Legal did, they're the
20 only ones that have.

21 COMMISSIONER DAI: So, Finance and Administration did
22 meet, and in the Public Information Committee, we've
23 always rotated.

24 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And has Legal made that
25 one point of contact or a rotating?

1 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Well, let me just speak to
2 the rotation. It's been informal, and then, you know,
3 I'm the one that was - it never really mattered to me
4 that we had a rotating Chair or not, so - I mean, of the
5 whole Commission, but that was back when we were just
6 getting started and everybody wanted a hand in, and to be
7 really a part of it. You know, I'm on the side of, if
8 this is just going to make things easier, it's going to
9 eliminate multiple contacts, and it's going to get things
10 done, we're in a tight frame, let's - you know, I would
11 favor it.

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Ancheta.

13 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: So, one question - I think
14 this is fine, but the one question I would have is, if
15 you're a committee member and you want to get something
16 to somebody else, who do you go through? Do you go
17 through the lead? Or do you go to the Chair? We're
18 trying not to go to the staff, so I think we're clear
19 about that.

20 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: What are you trying to do?
21 Who are you trying to reach?

22 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Well, let's say I have a
23 concern about something that's being discussed and
24 delegated, who should I convey my concern to? The Chair?
25 The Lead? To both?

1 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: The Chair, I would say.
2 That's why I said what is it, is it something that is
3 related to one of the advisory -

4 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Well, let's say it's a
5 Technical Committee issue, and I'm not the lead, and some
6 Commissioner is the lead, and there's a Chair, a
7 different person, and we're trying to streamline things.
8 Who should I go to?

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: In this world, if this were
10 approved, I think the answer would be that there would be
11 a Lead Technical Advisory Committee person and that you
12 would always cc the Chair and the Vice Chair, as well.

13 MR. CLAYPOOL: Right, and I might clarify, we're
14 trying to establish this for staff. Now, what type of
15 relationship this Commission has amongst themselves is
16 different, this is strictly for us to know who we're
17 going to for continuity.

18 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Right. And the other
19 thing, there are occasions, I think it's already
20 happened, where the staff just contacts a Commissioner
21 directly for whatever, expertise, or something, and
22 that's fine, too. And we respond directly to the staff
23 person.

24 MR. CLAYPOOL: Right, but now we would go through
25 the lead.

1 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: You would go through the
2 lead, okay. So, let's say, for example, Mr. Miller asked
3 me - you had a few leads on racially polarized voting
4 because you were contacting a few people a few weeks ago,
5 you can't call me directly and say, "Can you give me
6 those leads?" I shouldn't use "leads," sorry.

7 MR. CLAYPOOL: There's always going to be
8 exceptions, but certainly Kirk should establish that with
9 the lead and then cc. It's just, more than anything,
10 it's knowing where things are going and knowing how
11 things are flowing to us, that's all. And also, and most
12 importantly, establishing a clear pattern for who is
13 making the decisions for this Commission, and that it's
14 not the staff.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Filkins Webber.

16 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And that's where it
17 gets a little problematic, and where there's a difference
18 between what Mr. Miller had said earlier, the difference
19 between what you described as being mundane, or not
20 substantive decisions, and so although, Mr. Claypool, I
21 understand what you're saying and you would like to see a
22 point person for [quote unquote] "decisions," that's the
23 problem, and so, for instance, the point that I made
24 earlier about your scope of work on an in-process review,
25 you know, if we move forward on this idea, you want to

1 move quickly, you want to move efficiently as staff, and
2 you want to designate a lead person, maybe the technical
3 lead, to call the shots and make the decisions on that,
4 the problem is that this Commission has already made it
5 policy and procedure that those types of [quote unquote]
6 "decisions" would not be made by a single individual, and
7 that's why it's problematic. So, I'm troubled here. We
8 do need the communication designation for staff's
9 purpose, to ease staff, but there's - we need to
10 determine, and this is where it gets a little more
11 complex, as to what the level of authority this
12 Commission would be granting to that lead person, and
13 that's why we've always come back to this Commission and
14 said the full Commission will give delegated authority on
15 certain issues. But it does cause a problem because this
16 Commission has not released their ability to make
17 decisions to these designated leads to help you in the
18 manner in which you just described, which is that you
19 would have a designated person for [quote unquote]
20 "decision making." But this Commission hasn't done that
21 yet.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Dai.

23 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, I mean, my
24 recommendation is we continue with what we've been doing,
25 which has worked very well, which is, when we know a

1 decision is coming up that will have to be made in
2 between meetings, and if it involves, you know, a
3 particular Advisory Committee, that we designate that
4 person until the next meeting because we are going to be
5 meeting a lot, so I don't really see why there would be
6 any problem with, you know, not having someone, you know,
7 not knowing who it's going to be for the next meeting,
8 because we can always make that decision at the following
9 meeting, three days later. I really don't think we're
10 going to lose a lot of time. I also, as part of this, I
11 am assuming that we are giving flexibility to staff to -
12 my recommendation would be that we agendize all these
13 public input hearings as we allow the opportunity to
14 potentially have business meetings, even if it's just for
15 an hour, if we need to make decisions because we're all
16 going to be there anyway, so that we all have our
17 standing agenda of items, as I said, that we spent a lot
18 of time thinking about, of a general agenda that would
19 cover most items, that we keep that going so that, if we
20 have a sub-item that we have to meet on for 15 minutes as
21 a full Commission, and we're all going to be stuck there
22 that day, anyway, that we are all able to make that
23 decision as a full body. And if we need someone in the
24 three days in between, then we designate whoever the
25 committee gets to volunteer because it may be different

1 each time. I mean, with the jam packed schedule that we
2 have, again, I know it might be more convenient for you
3 to have a permanent person, but it's not more convenient
4 for us. I mean, all of us are juggling other full time
5 jobs and I think we're not going to be available certain
6 times, we want to make sure it's covered. So, to me, I
7 think what we've been doing is working just fine.

8 MR. CLAYPOOL: If I might, it's working possibly
9 fine for the 14 of you, but it's not necessarily working
10 fine for your staff, and so we periodically get requests
11 from six, seven, eight Commissioners about things, and my
12 staff gets instructions from the Commissioners, and then
13 they stop working because they honor a call from you
14 because you're the Commission, and so I roll in and I
15 say, "What's been done?" "I'm working on something new."
16 And so, it undermines the what I'm trying to do. We had
17 a policy where it rolled through the Chair and the Vice
18 Chair, it does not always work that way. All I'm looking
19 for is one person that I can work with, that you flow
20 through and it flows back up. Now, if you want to
21 continue working this way, we can, but it isn't the most
22 efficient way for us to work, and that's what I was
23 looking for was just an efficient way to know that, if
24 there was something from Legal - and I wasn't looking to
25 have this Commission abrogate its authority to one

1 person. The whole thought was that, if there was - and I
2 probably - "decision" is the wrong term - but the whole
3 thought was that I would come to you and say, "We have
4 these emails that have come in, very mundane, you know,
5 can you and the Vice Chair make a decision on it for the
6 Commission?" Now, you can send them through the
7 Commission, or you can wait and say, "We'll bring it up
8 later," and then we can have that discussion, you know,
9 amongst the full Commission, but in the mean time, we
10 have things that we're not going to post unless this
11 Commission makes a decision, so it can wait until we have
12 our next business meeting, or it can be a decision that
13 three people can make on behalf of the Commission.

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Filkins Webber.

15 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Then what we need
16 to recognize and understand is that staff has asked for
17 our cooperation in that we follow the procedure that they
18 have recommended, which is if you have any questions,
19 concerns, recommendations, that it goes to the Chair and
20 Vice Chair of every meeting. This was an email that I
21 had sent out when I was Chair and there was a process and
22 procedure, for instance, Commissioner Ancheta said - or,
23 actually, I think it was that he had made recommendations
24 to Commissioner Galambos Malloy regarding some issues he
25 wanted to see on the agenda, and Commissioner Galambos

1 Malloy could not get to them, so then she transferred it
2 to me and, again, staff didn't have to worry about that
3 because, as a Chair, we had to make the decision as to
4 what we could fit on the agenda and pass it along. So,
5 what I would consider, that we understand the process and
6 the flow of information would be to the Chair and to the
7 Vice Chair, the Chair and Vice Chair will make the
8 decision as to what flows to staff, and you know, what
9 manner, I guess, you know, prioritize things of that
10 nature. I think the Chair - and if you need a decision,
11 Mr. Claypool, I think that the Chair and Vice Chair, I
12 trust, that they would recognize, whomever they are, that
13 this Commission has a set policy that no decisions will
14 be made that are obviously significant.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Right.

16 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: So, you know, if
17 it's a venue issue, please, change the venue three blocks
18 down, I don't think the Commission is going to worry
19 about it. But something that is more substantive, I
20 think the Chair and Vice Chair, whomever it is, will
21 understand that they won't be making decisions at your
22 request and, again, based on what Commissioner Dai said,
23 we're going to have so many meetings close at hand, we
24 will have a generalized agenda item on there to address
25 some of these concerns, and maybe there will be a balance

1 on what is emergency or not. But if we all understand
2 that that is the proper flow of communication, will that
3 help you? Or do you think that there are certain
4 circumstances without delegated authority where you need
5 a decision by the Commission on this schedule, that would
6 have to be done, that's not mundane and more substantive?

7 MR. CLAYPOOL: No, I don't, but I will say that
8 it will put some pressure - for instance, the agenda is a
9 good point - right now, at the behest of the Chair and
10 the Vice Chair, we typically go out to the different - to
11 someone; we're not always sure who that someone is, or
12 who speaks for them, but we'll go out to each one of the
13 Advisory Committees to find out what needs to go on the
14 agenda. We find ourselves scrambling a lot on that. You
15 handled it very well, but it is - as the time periods
16 compress, it's going to become more difficult for us to
17 establish these agendas sufficiently so that it tells the
18 public what we're going to do, without moving out to more
19 people than the Chair or the Vice Chair. Or, they're
20 going to have to do more work, one or the other.

21 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Well, as I
22 understood, the Chair is the one that is working on the
23 agenda, so if staff does not have a recommendation from
24 the Chair based on input from the Advisory, then I'm
25 afraid that the Chair would be the one that would be

1 failing in, you know, getting things appropriately
2 agendized.

3 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, it sounds to me like
4 what we have is a breakdown in the system that we set up.
5 It should work. So, I'm going to reiterate what we're
6 supposed to be doing. Members of Advisory Committee,
7 because we decided we need -- the advisory committee
8 agendas need to be specific so that the public knows what
9 we're discussing. So, those items are supposed to go to
10 the Chair of the Commission so that the Commission can
11 then talk to the staff and say, can you agendize this for
12 - whatever - legal, financial, etc.? So, that's the way
13 that's supposed to go. Staff is not supposed to be going
14 directly to the Advisory Committee, and the Advisory
15 Committee is not supposed to be going directly to staff,
16 it's supposed to flow through the Chair. And then, as
17 Commissioner Filkins Webber noted, if there are things
18 that have to be decided that are not of a substantive
19 nature, again, it goes through the Chair and the Vice
20 Chair, and the Chair and the Vice Chair should know now,
21 by this time, it's kind of like obscenity, you know it
22 when you see it, that this is the issue that really is
23 not a formalistic mundane issue, that this is something
24 that needs to go to the full Commission.

25 Now, if people want to designate leads for their

1 committee because they think it makes life easier, they
2 can do so because that would actually make life easier
3 for the Chair. I can say that, that when the Chair knows
4 who to call, instead of like this last week, there were
5 so many people in Technical that were going directly to
6 the Chair about items on the technical and outreach, it
7 would have been great to have a key lead person from
8 technical or a key lead person from outreach for the
9 Chair to go to, instead of dealing with a lot of members
10 of those committees. But if the Advisory Committees
11 don't feel compelled to do that, and to keep rotating or
12 to keep it vague, we can't really do anything about that.

13 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I'm speaking as just a
14 member of the Commission now, I'm not speaking for the
15 Technical Advisory Committee, but I think that there's
16 really a need - there's obviously - there's kind of two
17 issues, there's one that is the Commissioners', at least
18 the Commissioners' understanding of their roles and
19 responsibilities, but, again, I think it goes back to -
20 that's one aspect, which you just addressed - but the
21 other side is what makes things easier for staff and in
22 communicating with us, too, and I think that there really
23 does need to be - I feel like there does need to be a
24 point person. If it doesn't want to be - Legal decided
25 not for it to be rotating, there's the other option of a

217

1 half-way in between where you could maybe do someone for
2 a month, or three weeks, because I think if we're
3 changing someone every week, that's - it's going to be
4 hard for us to remember, it's going to be hard for staff
5 to remember, but I personally feel that having a lead
6 designation, at least for the technical committee, for
7 having done a little bit of the work, I could see the
8 level of coordination that has to be done between just,
9 let's say as an example, between now and the next
10 meeting, Commissioner Ontai is incoming Chair and
11 Commissioner Aguirre is the incoming Vice Chair, I don't
12 know if they want to be the point person from staff to
13 say, "Please contact someone from Technical so we can
14 have your direction," and then someone from Technical has
15 to contact the Chair, and then give it to staff. Isn't
16 it easier to have a straight line with that? Is that
17 what we're saying we could do, with a cc to the Chair and
18 the Vice Chair?

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: If you don't mind, we have a
20 really - we still have - I hate to really cut this short,
21 I think we've got one thing resolved, which is if we
22 stuck to the procedures we had agreed upon, that would
23 already go like 90 percent of the problems. I think the
24 issue of the leads maybe can wait. I think what would be
25 good is, at the end of this meeting, if everybody can

1 tell the incoming Chair and Vice Chair, and the staff who
2 is going to be the lead for the next meeting, that would
3 help tremendously. And then we could later talk about
4 what permanent process - permanent temporary process - we
5 want for leads on our Commission.

6 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: We agree that leads are
7 okay is the option of the Advisory Committee?

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I'm suggesting that we just
9 do the leads for this next week so that we know who our
10 Chair is, who our Vice Chair is, our lead of Technical,
11 our lead of Finance, our lead of Outreach, you know, and
12 everybody knows this from now until the next meeting.

13 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Please, amen.

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay.

15 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Madam Chair?

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yes.

17 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Why don't we do it right
18 now so that we don't have to come back to it?

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right, because we have -
20 okay, if people can just volunteer, I'm going to ask for
21 volunteers for each committee. Who wants to volunteer -
22 we've got a Legal Committee Lead. Who wants to volunteer
23 for Finance and Administration for the next week?

24 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Well, just so we
25 put the name down, I'm the lead on Legal.

1 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Finance and Administration?
2 Galambos Malloy. Public Information Advisory Committee?
3 Who? Michael. Outreach?

4 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I'll volunteer because
5 they're going to be doing Chair and Vice -

6 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: That's right, they're going
7 to need some help.

8 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: One caution in that
9 regard because all three of you are on the Outreach
10 Committee, so that's the only - I already looked at this
11 because you probably wouldn't have a problem any other
12 time, but that's why I asked you if the two of them are
13 on Outreach together.

14 MR. MILLER: They're actually developing a
15 computer program that will provide --

16 [Laughing]

17 MR. MILLER: -- that's another reason why a
18 designated person can be helpful, is then you don't have
19 to work a puzzle each time.

20 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: We're going to keep going.

21 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: For now, fine.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Technical? Technical Lead?

23 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I had done a lot, but I
24 am happy to give it to someone else if you would like a
25 chance, I don't mean to monopolize.

1 COMMISSIONER YAO: Since Vince is not here, it's
2 a good time to assign it to him.

3 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: No!

4 [Laughing]

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: No, that doesn't work, no.
6 I say stay with it.

7 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Okay, I'd be happy to do
8 it, I just didn't want to monopolize if someone else
9 would like to step in.

10 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right, is that -

11 COMMISSIONER YAO: Just one suggestion.

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yes.

13 COMMISSIONER YAO: We have a table under the
14 Wedrawthelines website, identifying who the next Chair
15 and Vice Chair is, let's come up with the table for each
16 of the Subcommittees or the Advisory Committees, and from
17 this point on, it will just be very clear. And task each
18 of the Advisory Committees to come up with that table and
19 be ready to be put under the website; otherwise, by the
20 next time we meet, this way, we'll put this issue to bed
21 once and for all.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I don't think it's going to
23 work because what people are saying is they don't want to
24 commit into the future, that they want to do it on an ad
25 hoc basis.

1 That's what I'm hearing. So, I think we can do - keep
2 what we've got and we'll continue to function on an ad
3 hoc basis.

4 COMMISSIONER YAO: All right.

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay.

6 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And just - can we define
7 - can you summarize for me the roles and responsibilities
8 of that lead?

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: To gather all requests and
10 information from that committee for items to be placed on
11 the Advisory Committee meeting and relay those to the
12 Chair and Vice Chair. And that's it.

13 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: What is their ability to
14 work with staff? I'm thinking with the Technical in -

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Well, that's what we just
16 said.

17 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I just want to make sure
18 it was clarified.

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yep, if you want to contact
20 the staff, you go through the Chair.

21 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So if there are issues
22 to summarize - there were some things we heard in our
23 outreach meeting that we decided that we wanted to make
24 sure Q2 provides for us for the next meeting, I would
25 give this to Commissioner Ontai and he would pass that on

1 to staff?

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Correct.

3 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Okay.

4 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Ancheta.

5 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Could I just ask the staff
6 in an email or something, just to be sure that - because
7 I'm not sure exactly when we are not supposed to contact
8 who, that we just memorialize that somewhere?

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Just remember, you have to
10 contact your Advisory Committee Lead.

11 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: And that's it?

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: That's it.

13 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Never contact the Chair
14 directly?

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: No -

16 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Well, that's what I'm
17 asking, under what circumstances?

18 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: If it doesn't
19 pertain to - if you're not on the committee and let's say
20 you have some question about a technical and you don't
21 know anything about it, I can see that I would want to go
22 directly to the Chair because I don't know anything.

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: And then I'll send that over
24 to Technical.

25 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And one point of

1 clarification because I think that's what had happened
2 before with this last one, but then - so, we were in
3 communication with the Chair, the Chair set the Agenda,
4 but there were some expanded items that the Technical and
5 Outreach didn't realize was going to be on the agenda, so
6 to make sure that the incoming Chair relays the final
7 agenda to those advisory committees, so they know what is
8 finalized on the agenda, so it's not a surprise.

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: And I think the reason that
10 happened is because there were people that went directly
11 to staff and put items on the Advisory Committee Agendas.
12 So if we follow this procedure, that shouldn't happen.
13 Okay?

14 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Yes. Should we have a
15 motion on that?

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I don't think we need a
17 motion, we're just clarifying and reaffirming our
18 existent system - policy. Okay, all right. Do you folks
19 want to power through? I know some of us need to catch a
20 plane. We have two more items, we have Legal Advisory
21 Committee report - I'm sorry - do we need to do the
22 logistics before we adjourn? Yes?

23 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: I think so, unless everybody
24 knows what to do next week -- two weeks from now.

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay. I'm going to ask you

1 to hold that for a minute if that's okay, and I want to
2 make sure -- because then I'll have to decide whether to
3 fly out or not, or cancel my flight. Can we have a
4 report, not so much from the Legal Advisory Committee,
5 but a report from our Chief Counsel, who wants to update
6 us on the work with our firm, with Gibson, Dunn, who has
7 been doing a great job negotiating fees, conditions,
8 that's what -- he's been great at doing exactly what
9 Chief Counsels should do, which is managing outside
10 counsel, and I just want to make sure we get that
11 discussion because it does involve also costs and issues
12 that we may need to know, and also may inform the
13 logistics, I'm not sure. Mr. Miller.

14 MR. MILLER: Sure. Well, after a long selection
15 process that you're all familiar with, we're down now to
16 actually having to do the work, which is actually a
17 pretty exciting prospect. I think I can simplify the
18 approach down to four buckets or bushels that we were
19 talking about in our committee.

20 When thinking about the work that the Voting
21 Rights attorneys will perform, Item 1 will be additional
22 training following on what you've had, and key to topics
23 of particular interest. We're trying to do that at our
24 next meeting and anticipate blocking out about three
25 hours if we can afford to do that, specifically for that

1 work. Next, is working with Q2 and this is really where
2 by far the largest number of hours and the greatest
3 effort will be expended, and that's two parts; the short
4 part is getting the two together to exchange information,
5 to understand how Q2 operates, to get a download on
6 existing data that they have already about map drawing,
7 but the bigger part of that is establishing the platform
8 for an ongoing relationship through the redistricting
9 process, and the opportunity to save money here for us is
10 to take full advantage of the services that Q2 has
11 contracted for, and to leverage that into reducing legal
12 fees. Now, that doesn't mean less legal advice, what I'm
13 talking about here is using the factual development
14 portion of the Q2 services so that the lawyers don't have
15 to do that. In a typical case, you don't have - you only
16 have half the equation, you have the lawyers doing
17 everything, you don't have the Q2 piece. So, if this was
18 a piece of commercial litigation, it would be up to the
19 lawyers to go out and gather the facts in the form of
20 taking depositions, reviewing documents, etc., you go
21 out, you bring all of that home, and then you start the
22 legal analysis. Here, Q2 is really the front person for
23 that responsibility. They're out there in the field
24 bringing in the facts that support the maps that require
25 the legal advice. So, to the extent that we can save

1 lawyer time from being on the outside, if you will,
2 that's a significant opportunity. So, our immediate task
3 is to understand how Q2 will organize the information
4 it's receiving in the field, hopefully summarizing that
5 in a very neat package that will permit the lawyers to go
6 right to legal advice. And if that works well - I think
7 it will - that will be very helpful to all of us.

8 Now, that results in two things. The other - the
9 big product, if you will - at the end of the day from the
10 lawyers is the final report. And that is the report that
11 is required by our statute, and it's the report that will
12 be the support for your decisions in any litigation that
13 should follow adoption of the maps. So, obviously,
14 that's a very key thing. Yes, it's fair to say the
15 lawyers are doing two things, they are advising you along
16 the way, and they're creating this final report that's
17 going to support the decisions you make about the maps.

18 So, our concept is, rather than waiting until the
19 night before the term paper is due to start writing the
20 final report, that we bake that in along the way, using
21 the facts that Q2 is developing, so that we've got a
22 product that we can explain to you and it's ready when
23 the maps are ready. And we think that package and that
24 approach will yield a very good result in the most cost-
25 effective result we can.

1 To this end, there's a joint meeting with Q2 next
2 week, I was actually hoping we could do it earlier, but
3 it's scheduled for next Thursday and that's fine, that's
4 still very timely. That will be the first of what I
5 think will be a number of ongoing meetings between the
6 two. There is another issue I want to alert you to in
7 this regard. As part of - well, actually, there's a
8 contacting process now, which I hope is not a real big
9 deal, it's actually simpler on the legal side than in
10 others, but in a State way of doing things, we ended up
11 with a formal contract between the law firm and State.
12 And as part of that, I am asking Gibson, Dunn to make
13 some additional disclosures that we have found necessary.
14 Information showed up on the Internet that the firm has
15 done some lobbying and made some contributions, so when I
16 saw this just last night, and when I did, I contacted
17 George Brown and also followed up with Dan Kolkey today
18 about this. And what I learned is, well, a couple of
19 things, several things. They were actually surprised by
20 it and the reason is the firm's lobbying work is what I
21 would call very tangential to what they're typically
22 doing and they, themselves, were not familiar with it.
23 Please accept this as an interim report. I don't - I'm
24 not done with this, that's why I'm asking for additional
25 disclosures from the firm, but here's what we've got. It

1 appears that all, or virtually all, of the lobbying is in
2 Washington and not in California. They immediately
3 started an email chain - they don't have the Bagley-Keene
4 rules - throughout the firm to try to identify, well, who
5 are these lobbyists? And, as to California, thus far,
6 only one popped up and it was in the early 2000's and it
7 dealt with some work for the soft drink industry, so that
8 would not implicate us. There is current lobbying work
9 going on in Washington. It appears that those are all
10 commercial clients, as opposed to political entities. I
11 think it's fair to say that that is the extent, but, as I
12 noted, we're asking for a formal report on that and what
13 I'm offering you today is my telephone summary.

14 When they met with us, they were reading the
15 disclosure statute, the one that you're familiar with,
16 that you were governed by when you joined the Commission,
17 rather more narrowly than we do. They understood its
18 application to be the individuals who are doing the work
19 and those four that you met, and with respect to those,
20 none of them have had any lobbying activity, nor have
21 they made political contributions that reach our
22 threshold, which is \$2,000, to any individual candidate.
23 However, the firm, independent of those, through a PAC,
24 has made contributions. It appears that they've been
25 very egalitarian in their distribution of monies, it's

1 within a couple of thousand dollars as between
2 Republicans and Democrats. It would have been better if
3 we had had that information disclosed when we were doing
4 the contracting process, but I'm bringing it to you now
5 and that's how it falls out. And I believe those were
6 all Federal races, as opposed to State Legislative races.
7 And that's pretty much the report on that issue.

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Discussion?

9 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Were any of those - to the
10 extent you have this level of detail, were any of those
11 California Congressional races?

12 MR. MILLER: Yes.

13 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Okay.

14 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Could you give me some
15 context, because I'm not familiar with a legal firm like
16 this, how was it that they didn't know? Is it because
17 the institution is so large? Or is it just they didn't
18 do due diligence in researching it? Or was it an
19 understanding of their interpretation, as you said, of
20 the conflicts of interest?

21 MR. MILLER: Yes.

22 [Laughter]

23 MR. MILLER: And that's actually not a flippant
24 answer, you've hit all three buckets correctly on this.
25 They had, I think, about 900 lawyers and the problem of

1 conflicts - this is not a conflict, per se, that I'm
2 thinking of - but conflicts among clients are commonplace
3 in firms of that size, and it is an ongoing problem for
4 them. So, managing that is an issue when you have 900
5 lawyers. The other one is as to the lawyers we're
6 working with, this work is really tangential and foreign
7 to what they're doing in their every day practices.
8 They're principally commercial and, as we know, have done
9 a fair amount of Voting Rights work, but are not involved
10 on government issues where you might be representing a
11 client as a lobbyist, so I guess it's fair to say it
12 really doesn't touch their practice or their lives and
13 they didn't focus on it for that reason.

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Raya.

15 COMMISSIONER RAYA: The information with respect
16 to contributions to Federal races, including California
17 Congressional, that's the only thing we're talking about
18 is contributions, not any kind of representational issues
19 with respect to California elected's or campaigns, or
20 anything like that? They have not actually represented
21 anyone? They've just contributed?

22 MR. MILLER: That is fair to say, yes.

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Any more comments?
24 Commissioner Filkins Webber.

25 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: This firm has not

1 provided this Commission full disclosure because the
2 information that you're providing right now is based on
3 what you've seen on the Internet and based on the limited
4 information that you've received in a telephone
5 conference with Mr. Kolkey today, is that correct?

6 MR. MILLER: And Mr. Brown.

7 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: And Mr. Brown. So,
8 what I find odd is that there isn't any further
9 discussion from any of these Commission members that sit
10 before me, that you had such concerns regarding the Leoni
11 firm, regarding their Lobbying efforts, and yet I don't
12 hear any discussion regarding this firm's lobbying
13 efforts, especially under a circumstance we don't have
14 full disclosure. There is also discussion by this
15 Commission regarding the lack of disclosure from the Rose
16 Institute, so I'd certainly like to hear from anybody
17 else that might have concerns about this firm's failure
18 to read a Government Code Section 8252, as a firm,
19 because the other problem that I have, Mr. Miller, firms
20 of this size - actually, firms of any size - given that I
21 was a partner in a firm, and this firm most certainly
22 should probably have a conflicts, you know, computer
23 program. I find it a little odd that they hadn't run
24 anything through their conflicts program because it might
25 have - now, conflicts in the sense of what we're talking

1 about are two different things, but be that as it may,
2 there are conflicts that come up in the representational
3 capacity, which I would think all of their lobbying
4 people would be in there, which sounds like, to me, that
5 most of their Congressional PAC money individual would be
6 in there, unless they see that to be something different.
7 But, I'm concerned on the lack of disclosure, I'm
8 concerned about their failure to read 8252, I mean, I can
9 see that they did interpret it a little differently, that
10 they did likely respond as to those four, but I'd like to
11 hear a little bit more discussion as to the silence that
12 I observed by my fellow Commission members in comparison
13 to your discussion as to the Rose Institute or Marguerite
14 Leoni, for that matter.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Well, I'm not going to ask
16 them to comment on that, but I think there are a lot of
17 hands up and I know I have a comment, as well. So, I
18 have Galambos Malloy, who wants to comment on the report,
19 Commissioner Dai, Raya, Commissioner Ancheta -

20 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, first, to
21 clarify -

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I'll put myself in the
23 queue.

24 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay. So, was
25 this discussed at the Legal Advisory Committee? Or is

1 this the first time that all of us as Commissioners are
2 hearing this information?

3 MR. MILLER: The latter.

4 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: The latter.

5 MR. MILLER: I learned of this last night and
6 followed up in the evening and early morning.

7 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Okay, I - you
8 know, Commissioner Filkins Webber, I can only speak for
9 myself, but please don't take my silence as anything
10 other than shock, absorbing the information, and
11 processing what options lay before us. As a
12 Commissioner, I am as concerned as I was at the time we
13 were hiring our legal and our Technical Consultants
14 regarding transparency and disclosure and process, and
15 clearly this is a situation that I'm very frustrated at
16 this point in the process that we're dealing with this.
17 Thank you for bringing it to our attention. Can you
18 confirm for me when we will actually have the list of
19 information, the full disclosures, including the
20 contributions, including the representation, all of it,
21 when will we have it?

22 MR. MILLER: They, I believe we have their full
23 attention on this issue and our - you know, they were
24 putting real effort into it today. With that in mind, I
25 would expect that process to be completed early next

1 week.

2 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: And the reason
3 that I ask, given that we just granted - or approved -
4 such a large contract with this firm, and that we have
5 had a very public process around our hires to date, it
6 concerns me that you had to find out about this on the
7 Internet and you had to go to the firm and bring it to
8 their attention, because I think we've been clear with
9 all of the consultants under whom we have been given -
10 considering that it was not just about the people we saw
11 in front of us to do the work, it was about their boards,
12 it was about their donors, it was about the whole
13 package. And my gut is that we need to have an emergency
14 meeting to review the information as soon as we have it.
15 I would be interested to entertain other suggestions,
16 but, to me, pending review of that information, I think
17 their contract is actually in jeopardy, potentially. I
18 mean, maybe it's not, but, again, it's a similar
19 situation to before when we were considering the
20 contracts. If we don't have the information, we're not
21 going to go on blind faith here.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I have Commissioner Dai,
23 Raya, Ancheta, then myself in the queue, and Commissioner
24 Parvenu.

25 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes, I'm actually troubled at

1 the - I had heard a wind of this and I actually thought
2 the Legal Advisory Committee had had an opportunity to
3 discuss it, but it sounds like they have not. It sounds
4 like the preliminary information alleviates a major
5 concern, which is it sounds like the lobbying work is not
6 with the California Legislature, which I would have a
7 major issue with. But it does sound - the California
8 Congressional races, I think, is a concern, I'm not
9 particularly worried about the soft drink industry. So,
10 I mean, I think we need more information is what it comes
11 down to, to evaluate this and it's an attention to detail
12 thing, again. This is also the firm that didn't get the
13 number of Congressional Districts right, so...

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Raya.
15 Commissioner Ancheta.

16 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yeah, I'm troubled by
17 this, but I think for the same - I agree with
18 Commissioner Dai's approach in terms of some of these
19 things. If they bear out as has been preliminarily
20 described, I don't think they're so serious, for the
21 Washington, I think that's sufficiently distant. But I'm
22 troubled by the fact that - and I'm assuming it was not
23 willfully - it wasn't a willful non-disclosure, but I
24 don't know at this point if it was willful or not, but
25 I'd like to confirm that it was not willful. It sounds

1 like it's not, but I want to confirm that. But I do want
2 to wait until we get more information because I want to
3 confirm - I am troubled by the donations element, and I
4 want to see if there's anything that is tied in - if it's
5 just those ones that you mentioned, I'm not feeling that
6 troubled about the lobbying, but the fact that it hasn't
7 been disclosed and there may be other things that were,
8 you know, and again, this is simply an Internet search
9 that you're doing as part of your - and I appreciate your
10 having done this, of course, certainly. That's
11 troubling. But I want to get a fuller picture before
12 making any kind of decision. But at this level, it's
13 quite disturbing that this is coming out.

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I've got myself in the queue
15 and then I have Commissioner Parvenu, and Commissioner Di
16 Guilio? Is that correct?

17 I spoke - we didn't talk about this on the Legal
18 Advisory, our Chief Counsel mentioned it to me before the
19 meeting, which is why I was trying to get to this. I
20 don't - if we were to get to the part of the discussion
21 about whether the disclosures are such that we wouldn't
22 feel comfortable retaining the firm, that's - I want to
23 put that to the side right now. I am very troubled by
24 the - and it doesn't matter to me that it's not
25 intentional, I'm very troubled by the fact that we had to

1 discover this ourselves and that a firm like that would
2 not look at that - if you are following this Commission
3 at all, which you would hope that the firm that is about
4 to represent us doing Voting Rights work would be
5 following the Commission, you would be reading the papers
6 and hearing all the controversy about all the partisan
7 sniping, and that we've done this and that we've favored
8 so and so and that somebody didn't disclose, and
9 therefore, you know, I mean, this has been - I know we're
10 in it more than other people, but I do think it's been
11 fairly public. And so, the fact that they didn't see
12 this - that they didn't in light of that interpret that
13 section of the Regs., you know, in the broader way, and
14 not just to the four people that appeared before us, I
15 don't know what that speaks to, but it bothers me. I
16 don't think it's intentional, I don't. I do think that
17 these firms are huge, you know, having worked with them
18 for many years, and I know they have a governance section
19 of the firm, they always do, and they do the D.C. office
20 and they do all the Regulatory work - FCC, SEC, you know,
21 USDA, all the commercial clients, they basically have a
22 lot of corporate clients who, part of what they do for
23 them is not just transactional business law, but they
24 work for them in D.C. So, I know all that, and I know
25 that they may not have thought of that as being the

1 equivalent of a lobbying firm that lobbies a Legislature
2 on California issues, but still, the statute was there.
3 And I don't know that I have at this point a concrete
4 suggestion, but I don't think it's enough to go to the
5 second part yet of the discussion, which is, well, let's
6 look at whether there is a conflict and whether these are
7 - I guess I'm still a little stuck on the fact that they
8 didn't look at that statute more carefully and that we
9 had to go to them, instead of them saying, "Oh, you know,
10 we've been reading all this stuff in the paper," they
11 could have just said that - "We've been reading all this
12 stuff in the paper and we realized, you know, we didn't
13 disclose this, but there are - we do do political work,
14 you know, and we do have people in our firm who
15 contribute to races, or to PACs, or something." I just -
16 it bothers me that they didn't see themselves as having
17 to do that with us. I don't know that it's a concern to
18 detail that translates into legal work, or whether it
19 does say something about their judgment, legally. I'm
20 not sure. That's all at this point I had, I don't have a
21 recommendation, I'm just venting.

22 [Laughter]

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Parvenu.

24 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I'll be brief because my
25 sentiments have been expressed by everyone here before

1 me, so there's not much more I can add other than to say
2 that I, too, am troubled by this revelation. I'm not
3 certain how it can be corrected at this point, I'm
4 looking at, if we were to go as drastic an extreme as
5 retracting the contract, where that would put us as a
6 Commission at this late date, and we need someone on
7 board as soon as possible. I don't know, either, what
8 the fix is here, but I want for the record for it to be
9 know that, if you recall, I was inclined to abstain from
10 my vote, now I wish I had, but for other reasons. But
11 now that we are here, hopefully we can fix this in an
12 agreeable way.

13 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Di Guilio.

14 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: And, again, not to
15 reiterate, to just kind of go back to Commissioner
16 Filkins Webber, I hope you, from hearing the comments, it
17 wasn't - the pause and lack of discussion was simply a -
18 where do we go from here?! I mean, I think everyone was
19 in the processing phase. And along those lines, I think
20 there is some agreement, this is very disturbing for us.
21 This is an issue that we need to talk in depth about and
22 have some serious discussions, so now that we all kind of
23 agree on that, I would be curious to - when this first
24 happened, my first thought was, "Boy, Legal has got to
25 figure something out for us here." I was willing to

1 impugn that because I didn't even know where to begin,
2 that was, I think, what my silence was - I need some
3 direction from Legal or somebody, Legal Advisory
4 Committee, or others. But I would like - seeming as how
5 we're on the same page, where do we go from here? I know
6 Commissioner Galambos Malloy mentioned an emergency
7 meeting, I'm not sure where we need to go with that, but
8 I'm assuming there's some more information we need to
9 have collected, we need to make some decisions what
10 impact - what impact does this revelation have on what we
11 need to do, very quickly.

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Uh huh. Commissioner Ward.

13 COMMISSIONER WARD: Sounds - I mean, in my
14 opinion, it sounds like what Kirk has recommended is the
15 right path, we just need more information, you know,
16 that's all there is to it. We need to hear back from the
17 firm and find out the information. But ultimately, it's
18 important to realize that the subcommittee had a process,
19 and they vetted firms, and this firm, you know, was
20 endorsed that they had the skills and the expertise to
21 represent the Commission, as did the other
22 recommendation, and I know that, again, my argument was
23 throughout it all was that when you have experience in
24 these areas, there's some baggage to it. I think some of
25 the issues on the table are different from that, and

1 that's what we need to find out the details on and, when
2 we do, we can talk about that, then. But I don't think
3 there's anything for this Commission to do at this point,
4 but simply acknowledge it, move on, and wait to hear more
5 information.

6 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, summarizing, if I may,
7 the conflicts policy that we adopted was not a strict
8 exclusionary policy, it gave us room to explore the
9 nature of the conflicts and see, you know, how
10 significant they were for our work. Of course, you can't
11 do that if you don't have the information, which is the
12 problem with the lack of disclosure that you don't know
13 what you're looking at. So, I guess the first step
14 really is to gather as much information as possible, so
15 that we can get to the second stage, which is whether
16 this disclosure, once we have this disclosure - full
17 disclosure - what issues does it present? The one thing
18 that is not, in my mind, wrapped up when we do that is,
19 and maybe there's nothing we can do about it, is the
20 discomfort that I think we all feel about not having had
21 the disclosure to begin with and what we do about that
22 part of things. And I don't know, you've been living
23 with this almost 24 hours, we haven't, Mr. Miller.

24 MR. MILLER: It seems longer.

25 [Laughter]

1 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Do you have any thoughts on
2 just the - I mean, this is all new for all of us in many
3 ways, maybe not for former City Council Members who have
4 dealt with things like this, so in a different setting.
5 Just the failure to disclose, what is your sense of what
6 we could or should do about that, different from what the
7 disclosures may lead to in terms of our decision-making?

8 MR. MILLER: Well, the substantive thing that we
9 can do is the thing that we are doing, which is requiring
10 a thorough disclosure with a common understanding of what
11 the disclosure expectation is, and that's what I
12 indicated I would expect to have early next week.

13 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Yao.

14 COMMISSIONER YAO: I would second Commissioner
15 Galambos Malloy's suggestion to have the Legal Advisory
16 Committee to get together at their earliest convenience
17 and make a recommendation to the entire Commission. At
18 this point, I think that you - since we heard from all of
19 you, and you share the same sentiment that we have, I
20 think you have the basis of calling any kind of emergency
21 meeting, either by phone, or otherwise, and make the
22 recommendation to this Commission at the earliest
23 convenience.

24 MR. MILLER: Right. In all respect, I wish that
25 were the case. The provisions for emergency meetings,

1 there are such provisions, however, they deal with
2 natural disasters, primarily.

3 [Laughter]

4 MR. MILLER: And this is man-made. It would be
5 tremendously helpful to our Commission if we could
6 proceed with such a meeting, but there isn't a provision
7 that permits it on facts like these. As I was sitting
8 here trying to think, you know, in building block terms,
9 if you will, your question of what do we do, well, we are
10 doing something immediately, and that is with a common
11 reading of the statute, that is common between ourselves
12 and the firm, receiving full disclosure. Now, I can
13 provide that to you, we just can't meet about it. I'm
14 making up a proposed course here as we work this out
15 together, and that would be this, let's assume that the
16 final disclosure that we get is very much like what I've
17 described here today, and the principle elements of that
18 are that they don't have registered California lobbyists
19 -- and that's registered with the Secretary of State --
20 there's - I'll call it a license for that, for lack of a
21 better term - that the vast majority, if not all of their
22 lobbying, is either in other states or in Washington, and
23 if we'd known that, as I think about the colloquy that we
24 had in the Committee, arguably, it might have come out
25 the same way, I can't speak for anybody about it, but

1 it's not quite a like-kind comparison in that the
2 discussion was around impacts in California. So, that's
3 one way to view the situation. As to contributions, you
4 know, obviously I wish we'd known those. I think one
5 test - let me back up one step - I'm reflecting back on
6 what I think I heard the Commission say about this, is
7 that you liked what I'll call the bipartisan nature of
8 the firm, you had a very strong Republican oriented
9 partner in Mr. Kolkey, who had worked for Governor
10 Wilson; George Brown is a Democrat and has done different
11 kinds of work, that's still there. And, well, I'm going
12 to hypothesize that, when we get a list of any actual
13 contributions, that they match those book-ends, and that
14 they, too, are substantially the same as to both parties.
15 Now, it's not exactly what we were hoping for, but you
16 could assume, you know, if you roll that up and it's
17 pretty much the same picture, and if that is demonstrated
18 to be the case in a hard way, that assuming the firm is
19 invited to come to our next meeting as we planned
20 previously, that's an opportunity for the Commission to
21 have a discussion with the partners about this, and if
22 you were to conclude today that if the information comes
23 back as hypothesized, that would be enough for us to
24 continue going forward with them.

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Let me see if I understand

1 the proposal. We won't finish the contract now, we'll
2 keep it open -

3 MR. MILLER: That would be up to the Commission.

4 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: That's what I mean. So, you
5 might continue to hammer out terms with them like you
6 have been knocking heads over there, but we don't sign
7 anything. And you continue to get full disclosure,
8 gather facts, and not only bring that, but have the firm
9 come and meet with us at the next meeting, and ask - and
10 we would have the materials, the materials - the facts
11 that you gathered, we would have them ahead of time, and
12 they would be public on the Web, as well, and we would
13 have those for our consideration at the next meeting. Is
14 that what you're proposing?

15 MR. MILLER: Yes. And then the question is, in
16 the mean time, do you want to continue - we have a
17 meeting planned with Q2 and the key to that is that's the
18 foundation for how the two work together going forward.
19 And there's the work associated with the training that is
20 on the agenda for the next meeting. I think it's fair to
21 say that we shouldn't go forward with those things unless
22 you also can feel comfortable in your own thinking that,
23 assuming the report that comes back matches the general
24 description that I've given to you this afternoon.

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I'm going to take comments

1 on that, I don't see how we can do that, but Commissioner
2 Di Giulio, Yao, Parvenu, Raya.

3 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So, there are two
4 things, one is I would like a point of clarification.
5 So, are you saying that we would continue with Gibson,
6 Dunn - when did you anticipate that contract originally
7 being signed? Would it happen between now and our next
8 meeting?

9 MR. MILLER: Oh, I would expect -

10 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: If this issue hadn't
11 come up.

12 MR. MILLER: Next week.

13 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: So, the suggestion is
14 that we would continue on. Would they be able - does the
15 Commission want them to continue on with what they've
16 been doing on the legal side and with Q2 without the
17 contract?

18 MR. MILLER: Well, I would frame the issue a
19 little bit differently. I would frame it this way.
20 Would you be comfortable reaching a conclusion
21 individually that, assuming the conflicts report comes
22 back substantially as it's been described to me, and as I
23 have represented it to you, that that would be a basis
24 upon which you're comfortable continuing the
25 representation?

1 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Well, that speaks to my
2 second point which is, I wanted to, if the information
3 you're giving to us, on the issue of the donations, they
4 may be equal, I don't want to see a number for Democrats,
5 the dollar amount for Democrats and dollar amount for
6 Republicans, what I want to see is who in those Democrats
7 and Republicans, were they people in California? Were
8 they people in Nebraska? You know, I think there are
9 some issues there because the political contribution to
10 someone in Nebraska, I don't see how that would affect
11 us, but if it's to a significant amount of Legislators
12 that are in California, which we are commenting on their
13 boundaries, so I personally - even under the auspices
14 that you're saying, knowing that, I don't want to sign a
15 contract until I can look at that information and make a
16 determination as to whether - it may not, as Commissioner
17 Dai said, and has been referenced, we have the ability to
18 apply these standards, but in the absence, this was the
19 issue we had before, and it was in the absence of this
20 detailed information, we can't - I can't - sign a
21 contract.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Yao, Parvenu,
23 Raya, Ancheta.

24 COMMISSIONER YAO: You know, this is the case
25 where I really would give the delegated authority to the

1 members of the Technical - Legal Advisory Committee to
2 make these kind of decisions in a timely manner, to allow
3 us to stay on track in terms of meeting the schedules
4 that we have to meet, at the earliest that we can notice
5 the meeting, it would be for Friday, the 8th, for the 14
6 days' advance notice. And I do believe that the
7 definition of "emergency" is beyond just a natural
8 disaster, I'm sure you're correct, but I would ask you to
9 check that. I think when it clearly impacts our end
10 product, I think that's enough of a case to treat as a
11 emergency situation. But that's my thought at this point
12 in time. Thank you.

13 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Parvenu?

14 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I concur with Commission
15 Yao. I would not be adverse to meeting on Wednesday the
16 6th if necessary. Oh, it's not noticed, that's a moot
17 point, but I think we're all in agreement that resolving
18 this matter with swiftness is of extreme importance and I
19 just wanted to remind the Commission that, after we meet
20 again on the 7th and 8th, our first Section 5 City is Yuba
21 City, well, actually Marysville across the River, on the
22 10th, and ideally we can have someone on board through
23 this series when we go to Hanford and Merced, so we have
24 to resolve this with swiftness.

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Correct. Those are cities

1 we said we'd like to have the attorneys on board.

2 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Have our attorney with us
3 during those sessions.

4 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Raya and then
5 Ancheta.

6 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Okay, well, I guess I'm sort
7 of expressing the same thing, taken aback, and that
8 accounts for taking a few minutes to gather thoughts. I
9 would have a great concern about going forward and it's
10 not because I think - well, maybe I'm just hopeful that
11 nothing terrible is going to be disclosed in the end, but
12 I just don't think it's a good policy to do that. The
13 position we've taken all along has been a pretty firm one
14 and I just don't want to see us deviate, as terrible as
15 it is to find this out at the last minute, the last
16 minute of the last day of this meeting, and now there's
17 nothing we can do about it until April whatever. That's
18 a tremendous concern. I would not agree that it should
19 be delegated to anyone, in particular, because this was
20 not a unanimous decision and I don't think anybody should
21 be - well, yes, ultimately -- I take that back, you're
22 right -- ultimately, it was a unanimous decision, but
23 there was a great deal of disagreement before that point,
24 and so I don't think it's fair either to the members of
25 that committee, or to the full Commission, to not have it

250

1 acted on by the full Commission.

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Ancheta.

3 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yeah, and I would agree
4 with that in terms of having the full Commission address
5 it. I just wanted to clarify because I think I was a
6 little muddy in my previous - so if I'm repeating what I
7 said earlier, forgive me, but there are two key
8 questions, or sets of questions, one is the failure to
9 disclose, and if it was intentional, I would end the
10 contract, or whatever, I would end it if it was
11 intentional. If it was not intentional, I don't think at
12 this point, given what I know so far, it rises to the
13 level of terminating the relationship, it is sloppy, it
14 is bad - I don't know what they were thinking - but it
15 was - it's troubling to me and this is a firm that should
16 know better. The second set of questions before us goes
17 to the conflicts, and as I've said earlier, if they are
18 as we've got so far, you know, if the lobbying is pretty
19 limited to Washington, D.C. and it doesn't involve any
20 kind of connection to California, that to me, again,
21 that's fine, that's okay. I really want to know more
22 about these California Congressional contributions and
23 the fact that they may be evenly divided, to me, is not
24 critical, it's who did they go to and how much were they,
25 and the role and nature, and how does it affect our

1 current job to draw districts.

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Dai.

3 COMMISSIONER DAI: Is it correct we currently
4 have noticed Legal Advisory Committee meeting on
5 Thursday, April 7th, and it includes an item, Coordination
6 of Work between Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher and Q2, it seems
7 to me, whether the contract should be signed or not
8 certainly seems related to that item, so -

9 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: But the issue is
10 that we have the meeting with Q2 and Gibson, Dunn.

11 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Right, correct.

12 COMMISSIONER DAI: Before then.

13 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: No, I think that's what
14 we're discussing and what I'm hearing is that we can't go
15 forward with that meeting, I mean, it puts us behind the
16 eight ball completely in terms of preparing us for the
17 readying Yuba City hearing, but that how could we go
18 forward as if they were our attorneys without having this
19 information? I just - and I appreciate Mr. Miller's
20 attempt to expedite this, but I don't think that we can
21 sort of proceed given the fact that they haven't been
22 great about disclosure, I can't go forward and say, "In
23 the event that this is the type of thing, that it's not
24 more than what we've heard today," you know, all that
25 conditional stuff, I just don't see being able to go

1 forward.

2 MR. MILLER: Solomon has -

3 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Spoken?!

4 [Laughter]

5 MR. MILLER: -- has made a suggestion that might
6 get us through this couple of weeks here, which would be
7 to initially use them on a procurement contract, which is
8 a very short term situation. That would let us get the
9 disclosure taken care of, have the meeting, and do the
10 preparation for you, which also has a two-fold benefit,
11 which is we get the training and you get an opportunity
12 to speak directly with the partners, rather than to me
13 about it. So that would be one way of avoiding rushing a
14 decision about a long term commitment without changing
15 our schedule in the mean time.

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, in the spirit of time,
17 I'm going to ask for a motion to that effect, and I think
18 we need to vote on this, it's obviously something we need
19 to vote on. Is there somebody that would like to move
20 that we proceed with - what is -

21 MR. CLAYPOOL: A personal services contract.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: -- a personal services
23 contract not to exceed two weeks -

24 MR. CLAYPOOL: It can't exceed five thousand
25 dollars, so that would be about one day of their time.

1 [Laughter]

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Not to exceed five thousand
3 dollars for purposes of getting all the information and -
4 I know this isn't perfect, but we should put it out there
5 - the meeting with Q2. Commissioner Raya.

6 COMMISSIONER RAYA: I'm willing to make that
7 motion, however, I was going to ask, would they do this
8 on a pro bono basis for the purpose of the training and
9 the meeting with Q2?

10 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Given that they've put us in
11 a situation.

12 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I think the penalty for
13 that - it's a possibility.

14 COMMISSIONER RAYA: That was actually, that was
15 why I had my hand up earlier, because I was going to make
16 that proposal.

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay -

18 MR. MILLER: I can't speak for them.

19 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Well, yeah, obviously.

20 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: There is no motion.
21 Commissioner Aguirre.

22 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: So, there is no motion?

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: No.

24 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yeah, well, I was going to
25 second it.

1 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: You've got to make it.

2 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Yeah, you're dismissing
3 me, Madam Chair.

4 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Well, again, I'll make the
5 motion, but \$5,000, I mean, is that really going to get
6 what we need? Because then, ultimately, maybe they are
7 giving us something, as well.

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: That's why I sort of stopped
9 because if \$5,000 gets us one day -

10 MR. MILLER: In this instance, because I view the
11 launch as such an important part, which is understanding
12 the respective roles and responsibilities, and planning
13 the work forward, actually doesn't take very much time,
14 it's one of these rare things in law that gives us a
15 disproportionate benefit for the amount of time spent and
16 lays the groundwork for understanding what a contract
17 will be, going forward, that I think there is an unusual
18 value in this meeting occurring.

19 COMMISSIONER RAYA: So, you are saying go ahead
20 with the \$5,000 - the procurement would be - okay. Well,
21 I move that we extend - I'm sorry, what was it called --

22 MR. CLAYPOOL: Personal procurement.

23 COMMISSIONER RAYA: -- the personal procurement
24 contract, which by law, regulation, does not exceed
25 \$5,000 with Gibson, Dunn, to provide us with the VRA

1 training and meeting scheduled with Q2 for April 7th - is
2 that the date? Is that correct?

3 MR. MILLER: Actually, they would like to do the
4 training on April 7th at the end of the day, after the
5 Advisory Committee meetings. The meeting with Q2 is next
6 Thursday, that is still a March date, I think.

7 COMMISSIONER RAYA: So, if you can fill in the
8 dates for me - March -

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: The 31st.

10 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Okay, March 31st, meeting
11 with Q2 -

12 MR. MILLER: Oh, I misspoke, that's actually
13 April - no, if Thursday is the 31st, that is the correct
14 date. I'm sorry, but my calendar is not -

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, is there a second for
16 that motion and then we'll obviously discuss it?

17 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: There is a second.

18 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: A second by Commissioner
19 Aguirre. Discussion? Commissioner Di Giulio,
20 Commissioner Dai -

21 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: This is just a small
22 detail, but with the motion you clarified, does that only
23 limit us to what you've expressed? Or, as opposed to
24 saying that we enter into this procurement contract for
25 what needs to be done between now and August 7th? Would

1 you like to limit it so much that we're giving them
2 specifics about the dates -

3 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Well, I'm willing to amend it
4 to eliminate the specific dates - just for the services
5 of the VRA training and meeting with Q2? Is that -

6 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Is that all staff needs?
7 Is that enough to cover what staff needs? Or, if there's
8 something else that comes up, should we -

9 MR. MILLER: This will certainly cover the Q2
10 meeting, which is the most important, and I think this is
11 our best solution.

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Discussion. Commissioner
13 Dai.

14 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yeah, so of course I would
15 appreciate if our Chief Counsel certainly proposes and
16 they might consider doing this pro bono, but I agree, you
17 can't speak for them, how they might respond. But I
18 absolutely don't want any of these dollars going to
19 having them do their disclosures because, as far as I'm
20 concerned, that's part of the bid process.

21 MR. MILLER: Agreed.

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Parvenu.

23 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I certainly agree with
24 Chief Counsel, I mean, I don't have the legal mind to
25 actually not agree with you, but I still don't want to -

1 [Laughter]

2 MR. MILLER: I wish there were more people like
3 you.

4 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: -- but I don't want to
5 take off the table the possibility of us perhaps meeting
6 on Wednesday the 6th with that emergency -- I didn't
7 specify earlier -- emergency meeting to discuss this with
8 Gibson, Dunn, and agendaizing it for a full Commission
9 vote. We have up until 12 midnight on Friday the 8th to
10 modify our agenda. Is that a possibility, so we can
11 bring closure to this, so that if we decide that we want
12 to proceed with the contract, they will be on board, as
13 we hit our Section 5 cities next week? Is that
14 possibility?

15 MR. MILLER: We have 14 days before the 8th, the
16 weekend, we can amend the agenda to reflect that it would
17 come back?

18 MR. CLAYPOOL: Right, so we have until midnight
19 on Friday the 8th.

20 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Correct, and I would put -
21 it's on there in an indirect way in the Legal Advisory
22 Committee agenda, but maybe we can be a little bit more
23 specific. Commissioner Ancheta.

24 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Well, this is just to
25 reinforce a couple points. I would support the motion to

1 the extent it is clear that the disclosure tasks are not
2 included in that, and I would prioritize the Q2 meeting
3 over the Voting Rights Act training.

4 MR. MILLER: Yes.

5 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Because it's not - we're
6 going to burn that money really fast.

7 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yeah.

8 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: And I don't know if that
9 requires an amendment or not, but I would certainly want
10 to prioritize that meeting over the training.

11 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: More discussion?

12 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Do you want me to accept
13 prioritizing?

14 MR. MILLER: I don't think it's necessary. It's
15 correct, however.

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right, call the
17 question. All in favor? oh, wait, sorry. We need to
18 have the motion read back, sorry. It's late.

19 MS. SARGIS: The motion is to enter into a
20 Personal Service Contract with Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher,
21 not to exceed \$5,000 to provide the Commission with VRA
22 training and participate in the upcoming meeting with Q2.

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Thank you. Public comment.

24 MS. HOWARD: I'm going to offer you the leftover
25 cookies, everyone probably needs a sugar rush --

1 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: We can't eat them.

2 MS. HOWARD: You can pass them and eat them on
3 the airplane. Debra Howard here, and I guess I have a
4 couple of comments, one to the issue that's on the table,
5 this is a really small universe of finding people who are
6 knowledgeable and experienced in Redistricting matters,
7 which is why those people who have participated in these
8 meetings from the beginning, including the League of
9 Women Voters, California Forward, California
10 Redistricting, League of Women Voters, everybody else,
11 literally was in this room and in their written comments,
12 begging you to hire people and organizations that had
13 multiple perspectives. I appreciate that you are all
14 very smart people and very talented and committing
15 enormous amounts of time to something that is really
16 important and will really determine the face of the
17 politics in our state for the next decade. That being
18 said, there was an easier solution than you're finding
19 yourself in now, and that would have been to accept that
20 everybody who submitted anything to you had a political
21 point of view, including those people who we have
22 identified as not being either Republican or Democrat,
23 they might not be political - they may not be Partisan
24 Democrat and they may not be Partisan Republican, but
25 they clearly have a political point of view. So, I look

1 at this opportunity as a big aha moment, and that is
2 that, going forward, assume that the people you are
3 hiring have that level and find that balance, and I'm
4 sorry that Commissioner Barabba isn't here because he has
5 said on any number of times that we, meaning you, are the
6 balance. And the trouble is - I'm a new student to this,
7 I've never been involved in redistricting before, but I
8 am working with people who are, in fact, experts in
9 redistricting, and the issue becomes you don't know
10 enough to know when you're being rolled - I'm saying this
11 much more bluntly than Mr. Sam Walton said it, but that's
12 what he told you, he said, "You are not going to know
13 when somebody is giving you bad information before it's
14 already a done deal." And so, I plead with you to look
15 at this opportunity to make the amendments that you need
16 to. I think you've come up with a really good plan, I
17 appreciate Mr. Ancheta's linear delineation of how you
18 solve the problem, and kind of go through that, so you've
19 kind of worked through this, but I think, to be shocked
20 that you're hiring a VRA attorney who has no political
21 experience is more naïve than we can really believe. So,
22 I would kind of say don't throw the baby out with the
23 bathwater here, do your due diligence, find out what you
24 need to find out, and go forward from there. But then I
25 also think that this is a learning moment where you

1 cannot separate the politics from redistricting. You can
2 take partisanship out of it, but you can't take politics
3 out of it, and I think I've said that before. I've
4 whined at you enough. I appreciate the opportunity to
5 make these comments.

6 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Thank you. More public
7 comment?

8 MR. SALIVARI: I think your last commenter
9 spanked you all in a very nice way. I would just like to
10 say that I am very much hoping - first of all, that I
11 agree with her wholeheartedly, that this is a political
12 process, and to try to pretend that it is not is foolish
13 and will end up causing more problems than otherwise.
14 One of my concerns has been, all along, two of the VRA
15 attorneys who came before you, that would be Mr. Adelson
16 and I believe her name was Ms. Daniels, if I got that
17 right, and I'm just hoping that, if we now have a middle
18 [inaudible] with Gibson, Dunn, that these other two folks
19 don't end up back on the table. When Nielson came before
20 you and was very very careful about firewalling
21 themselves, about disclosing what their lobbying efforts
22 were, which were minor, and you know, that point was
23 ignored by the Commission, and it sounds to me right now
24 like Nielson might have been a much better deal for you
25 guys. First of all, they were \$150,000 everything

1 included, they had the mapping along with them, etc.
2 etc., so again, I'm hoping that if Gibson goes down in
3 flames that the two East Coast attorneys who are much too
4 small for you guys, and who are, to me, pretty obviously
5 political partisans, even though they have carefully
6 disguised their politics behind years and years of being
7 careful about their contributions, etc., that if Gibson,
8 Dunn goes down in flames, that Nielson might be
9 considered again. Thank you.

10 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Thank you. Anymore public
11 comment? Okay, we have a motion on the floor. I'm going
12 to call the question. All in favor of the Personal
13 Services Contract, not to exceed \$5,000 - Procurement
14 Contract - to cover the Q2 meeting and training, in that
15 order of priority, raise your hand and say "Aye."

16 (Ayes.) Any opposed? Abstentions? The motion
17 passes. All right, thank you, Mr. Miller. At this
18 point, we have not finished our report backs. We have
19 some items left of the Legal Advisory and we have not
20 finished the Outreach on the logistics. And we haven't -
21 yes, I know, and we haven't moved the calendar and voted
22 on that. Commissioner Aguirre.

23 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Madam Chair, I request how
24 about a five-minute break so that some of us who need to
25 rearrange flights can do so?

1 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: That would include me, yeah.
2 Can we do that? Some of us have to push our flights
3 back. All right, it might take us more than five
4 minutes, so let's take a 10-minute break until 12 after
5 five.

6 (Recess at 4:53 p.m.)

7 (Reconvene at 5:12 p.m.)

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: We're back. We took about
9 seven minutes more than we had anticipated, making our
10 travel arrangements. The next item on our agenda is -
11 I'm trying to decide whether we should go ahead and just
12 finish the Legal Advisory since we started it with Mr.
13 Miller, and it's just two items. So, Commissioner
14 Filkins Webber, and then we go back to the logistics.

15 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Thank you. I think
16 we can get through it relatively quickly. The next
17 action item that we discussed, and we may seek approval
18 of the Commission, again, goes back to our communication
19 policy, in addition to what we discussed earlier in
20 Legal, tried to facilitate that flow of communication, we
21 just wanted to make sure it was clear to each
22 Commissioner that, at least from the legal standpoint,
23 that it would not be permissible for a Commission member
24 to have direct communications with either the Voting
25 Rights Attorney, or Q2. So, the recommendation is out of

1 Legal, is that if a Commission member has a question for
2 Q2 based on our policy we discussed earlier, it would
3 probably flow to the Chair, and the Chair would take it
4 to Mr. Claypool, who could relay it to Q2. Again, if a
5 Commission member has a legal issue or something that
6 they would like to address, they probably could
7 communicate directly with Mr. Miller, he has allowed
8 himself to be open in that regard, but given the volume
9 that is probably - the volume of communications with Mr.
10 Claypool, we want to again just keep the same flow of
11 communication, so that's what - again, I don't think we
12 need to move on it as a Commission, or maybe we do
13 because apparently there had been some communications
14 going on before Q2 was like a hired contractor or
15 something, so we just want to make sure that it is
16 standard policy, so that there is no appearance of
17 impropriety, everything is full transparency, and so we
18 understand that no Commissioner will have direct
19 communication with our Line Drawer outside of a public
20 hearing, or it would be with necessary staff.

21 The second issue -

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Filkins Webber,
23 are you going to need votes on these?

24 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I don't think we
25 need a vote on that, it's the communication policy which

1 we discussed before, just so that everyone understands it
2 and for the public's benefit, that the Commission
3 understands that no direct communication will be going on
4 with our experts.

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I think we have just on that
6 one a clarification.

7 COMMISSIONER YAO: A question of clarification.
8 Commissioner A requests either the Chair or Mr. Claypool
9 to, let's say, instruct Q2. I'd like that bit of
10 information to be shared after the fact, okay, with all
11 the Commissioners so we all have the same information as
12 to what was requested of Q2. If you don't share with the
13 rest of the Commissioners, then basically it's one bit of
14 information that is absent from our database.

15 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: One way to solve
16 the issue is, again, we're going back as to the
17 discretion of the Chair, but we understand that, if it's
18 improper, or if it's more substantive, that the full
19 Commission would be making a decision on that. But I
20 think you're right, Mr. Yao, or Commissioner Yao, we
21 haven't discussed this before, that maybe the Chair as
22 part of their introductory notes should prove a report
23 back on decisions that have been made since they had been
24 elected Chair on the next meeting that they - well, I
25 don't know, again, this is just a policy communication.

1 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yes.

2 COMMISSIONER YAO: Can I do a little further?

3 Again, we're not soliciting the rest of the Commission to
4 chime in on making a decision as to whether you do or
5 don't ask the Q2 or any contractor to do anything, it's
6 just a fact that whatever decision is made at the next
7 convenient time, it needs to be shared with the rest of
8 the Commissioners.

9 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Okay, you're
10 suggesting that there be at least the disclosure, which
11 Mr. Miller had said before, disclosure is fine because
12 we're not going to be making a decision, so would it be
13 your recommendation for the communications policy that at
14 least the full Commission be advised when there is direct
15 inquiry of our two experts?

16 COMMISSIONER YAO: The best way to do it is
17 request it by email and, then, once it's decided to give
18 instruction to Q2, then either staff or somebody can
19 simply forward that to the rest of the Commission. It's
20 for information only, okay?

21 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I have Commissioner Di
22 Guilio, Commissioner Raya, and myself in the queue.

23 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I'd just like to comment
24 to Commissioner Yao's. I like the underlying philosophy
25 of what you're asking, is for the inclusion, but maybe we

1 should suggest like a summary of what the initial request
2 was, what the discussion was, what the results were, and
3 then we can all have it. I'm just concerned that if,
4 each time there is a correspondence between the
5 contractor and the Chair or the person who had it, that
6 until whatever the issue is, is resolved, there could be
7 a lot of communication, and I would just suggest that you
8 simplify that by, say, a summary of what the issue was,
9 what the discussion was, and what the conclusion? Is
10 that -

11 COMMISSIONER YAO: Yeah, again, if any of us find
12 the topic interesting, I'm sure we'll find ways to dig
13 into it deeper, but at the minimum, I want to know that
14 such and such instruction was given to Q2, or whoever the
15 contractor is, whoever it is that we're giving the
16 direction to, not knowing that the direction was given is
17 problematic.

18 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Chair's prerogative. I
19 don't think we're talking about instructions to Q2 and,
20 in fact, if there's any clarification that you need to
21 make, Commissioner Filkins Webber, about the
22 communications, even if - there should be no
23 communication, period, by any individual Commissioner,
24 through a Chair or not through the Chair, with Q2 -

25 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: It wasn't an

1 instruction, we would have it phrased as "question."

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I know it wasn't on your -
3 because I was at the meeting and we weren't talking about
4 that, but Commissioner Yao seems to be talking about
5 instructions to the Line Drawer, and which raises the
6 issue that nobody should be doing that through anybody,
7 Chair or staff, with Q2, so I think that's a whole
8 different issue. We're just talking about communications
9 with Q2 that aren't instructions about lines or anything,
10 it should go through the Chair or the Vice Chair, or to
11 the staff, right? I don't think we envisioned in our
12 recommendation anything about instructions about lines.

13 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Correct, no, that
14 was not part of our discussion.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, our recommendation about
16 what communication goes to Q2 is not about lines or maps.

17 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Correct. We were
18 just thinking if an individual Commission member had a
19 question of the technical expert, how the communication
20 flow would go. But it certainly wasn't intended - we
21 didn't have the discussion, obviously because I think we
22 all implied we understand that no direction would be
23 provided, no instructions would be provided, to our Line
24 Drawer outside of a public hearing.

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, with that clarification,

1 Commissioner Yao -

2 COMMISSIONER YAO: I would ask for a sample of
3 what kind of communication that you would ask of Q2
4 because they are our Line Drawers, and -

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Mr. Claypool.

6 MR. CLAYPOOL: I think that what we're referring
7 to is a coordination function, that you all have a lot of
8 questions about what will you do when you're at the
9 meetings, what will you do here, what will you do there,
10 and those are coordination questions that are coming from
11 a lot of different directions, and I think that those
12 should flow through and go out and come back, things that
13 aren't instructions, things that are more informative to
14 this Commission, but probably need to be channeled so
15 that Karin or our lawyers aren't getting questions from
16 eight different directions, they're getting it pretty
17 well focused, and then it's being disseminated back out
18 to the Commission through your Chair.

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Correct, I think that was
20 the intent, like with the lawyers, that we wouldn't want
21 a Commissioner to just pick up the phone and say, "I
22 think we need training on...", blah blah. I mean, it seems
23 obvious, but we are now really getting to the point where
24 we're designing policies for our relationships with our
25 consultants, and that's a little different than what

270

1 we've done up to now. Commissioner Raya?

2 COMMISSIONER RAYA: You've already answered my
3 question.

4 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: With that clarification, is
5 that policy something that Commission wants to adopt as a
6 policy, that communications that do not involve
7 instructions, because those will not occur through
8 anybody other than the full Commission, that they go
9 through the Chair or the Vice Chair? Yes?

10 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: So moved.

11 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I don't think we need a
12 motion, do we?

13 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: The second item,
14 then, that Legal discussed is the firewall with Q2. And
15 Mr. Miller is going to draft this, specifically, but we
16 had a discussion, the recommendation is that McCain -
17 excuse me, McCain - MacDonald and Cain -

18 [Laughter]

19 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: That was -
20 MacDonald and Cain will not communicate with each other
21 regarding California Redistricting matters, and Cain is
22 completely excluded from the process, in other words,
23 Cain will not have any involvement whatsoever in
24 redistricting services Q2 performs for the Citizens
25 Redistricting Commission. And specifically, he will not

1 have access, you know, access from Q2 or input to Q2
2 regarding California Redistricting. So, that's the idea.
3 We went a little bit further and we will ask that the
4 firewall also contain confirmation from Q2 that no
5 employees or shareholders will be making any public
6 statements, so obviously this goes to Ms. MacDonald, and
7 all shareholders and all employees. They will not be
8 making any public statements regarding California
9 Redistricting issues, including, but not limited to,
10 maps, decisions of the Commission, etc., etc. The action
11 item that we are asking for from this Commission,
12 because, as I understand, Q2 is chomping at the bit to
13 get a contract, is that we're asking that you delegate
14 the authority to me as the lead of the Legal Advisory
15 Commission, to approve Mr. Miller's final draft of the
16 firewall language.

17 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Could you repeat the
18 requirements regarding public statements, please?

19 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: This is where - we
20 did have a significant discussion about this - the
21 language will be that the firewall will also include a
22 statement that Ms. MacDonald agrees that no employees,
23 shareholders, etc. of Q2 will make any public statements
24 regarding California Redistricting issues, including but
25 not limited to maps, etc. etc. No public statements.

272

1 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Does that apply to Mr. -

2 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Yes, he's a

3 shareholder.

4 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So let me just - so just to

5 -

6 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: We'll flesh this

7 out.

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: -- we'll flesh this out

9 because it took us a long time and I had some

10 reservations about this for probably some of the same

11 reasons you do, which is I noted that it might be very

12 difficult for Professor Cain, who is a professor who

13 specializes in the area of redistricting, you know, he's

14 on TV, he's on the radio, this is his - every 10 years,

15 this is his life blood in terms of his research, etc.

16 He's widely considered a national expert, that it would

17 be difficult to be asking him to not speak publicly about

18 California Redistricting matters, commenting on maps,

19 commenting on the processes, etc., and that, in fact, he

20 might have serious reservations about it from a First

21 Amendment point of view, considering that he is a State

22 employee, and as we all know, so are we, so we're acting

23 here in a State capacity, which raises Government issues,

24 First Amendment issues, the Government cannot limit

25 speech, and we are Government at this point, this body.

273

1 So, I had serious First Amendment concerns, and I just
2 had concerns about whether he would even agree to it.
3 The more we talked about it, I mean, we'll see where this
4 goes, but the more we talked about it, the more I felt
5 comfortable with the fact that this should be asked of
6 him. We don't know what will happen, but that he is a
7 shareholder in the firm, period, he is. And so -- and
8 this is the firm that is doing our work. So, anything he
9 might say, part of - when he speaks, he's not just
10 speaking as Professor Bruce Cain, head of the U.C. Center
11 in D.C., but also, he is speaking as a shareholder in Q2.
12 And that could influence the other shareholders in Q2,
13 you know, when he speaks about redistricting matters.
14 So, I mean, I sort of went through all that and came to a
15 feeling that this was appropriate and we did discuss that
16 this may not - either this Commission may not agree to
17 that, or that he somehow - that Q2, because they have to
18 pose it - it's an issue.

19 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: But just briefly,
20 we have to understand that the way this issue came about
21 is that we're well aware of what his public comments have
22 been, and his public statements regarding Q2, as well as
23 anything else. So, from my perspective, and given the
24 necessity for the firewall, it would be inappropriate for
25 him to attempt to circumvent the general communication

1 prohibition with Ms. MacDonald and do it in a public
2 fashion, because he has access to it, and that would be
3 inappropriate. So, that's why I think, as a shareholder,
4 and as what Mr. Miller had confirmed, as well, as a
5 shareholder of this company, and based on his
6 representations that he made that he would not be
7 involved, then it's certainly permissible for us to go so
8 far as to say that no public comments will be made by an
9 employee or shareholder regarding California
10 redistricting. He certainly can talk about generalized
11 statements of redistricting, principles and philosophies,
12 but we're entitled to limit this, or at least request
13 that. So, at this point, that's what our recommendation
14 is. If he comes back with some other suggestion or a
15 rejection of that, we've got some back-up ideas.

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Ancheta.

17 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: I would like our counsel
18 to check into this because I think there is a definite
19 First Amendment issue regarding an unconstitutional
20 condition placed on a contract because it is a First
21 Amendment right. Now, Professor Cain is an employee of
22 the U.C. system, as well, so there are also certain
23 Government - forgive me if I'm getting too jargony [sic]
24 about this, but there are some Government speech
25 doctrinal questions, as well. But there are some

1 significant problems when you limit on a contract the
2 ability of a contractor to speak, and we are acting as
3 the State of California. So, it does implicate the First
4 Amendment, as well as the California Constitution, as
5 well. So, I have no problem going forward with it, but I
6 would like to see some research on this to see where we
7 stand in terms of insisting on - if we were going to
8 insist on this, before finalizing things.

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yeah. Commissioner Yao and
10 Commissioner Di Guilio after that.

11 COMMISSIONER YAO: Basically, I think we want him
12 to put this - let's call it a business - in a blind
13 trust, okay? I don't think we're asking to limit his
14 free speech. By putting something in a blind trust, he
15 no longer has access to the information, he no longer has
16 direct influence in the operation, and I don't know what
17 language it would take to do that, but in terms of, if he
18 gets the public information by watching our video and
19 commenting on it, that's certainly appropriate. But if
20 he gets inside information on how the lines are drawn,
21 and on and on, then that certainly would not satisfy what
22 my intent is of distancing himself from this particular
23 business, from the employees, and on and on.

24 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Di Guilio.

25 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I had two questions

1 about the limitations on speaking, both for the other
2 members of Q2, as well as for Mr. Cain. For Mr. Cain, if
3 we have a firewall, a clear firewall about that, would
4 that not be enough in terms of the separation? I guess
5 I'm not clear as to - I understand why you're thinking we
6 could take it to the next step, which would be limiting
7 his speech -- or limiting what he could speak on - but
8 I'm wondering if the Commission doesn't feel that the
9 firewall is enough, and because of the potential for
10 other issues in terms of taking it to the next step, I
11 think he is professional, I think Q2 is professional, and
12 that in conjunction with our staff who has professionally
13 shown defines very good resolutions to this issue, that
14 they could all work together to address the legitimate
15 concerns that are raised, but that might be able to
16 provide an option other than limiting his ability to
17 speak on this issue. That's what I would like to
18 propose.

19 But the other question I have is actually about
20 the other members of staff. So, if you're saying they
21 can't speak on issues about redistricting in California,
22 I'm just curious if, because I think they're still
23 wearing some other hats in this statewide database, like
24 right now they're talking, they're speaking about issues
25 of California redistricting because that's their areas of

1 expertise, I would imagine we could ask them to stop
2 doing any presentations, but I don't know if that would
3 mean they can't just go to a conference and do what
4 they've done in the past in terms of providing the
5 information. I guess I'm a little concerned, if you're
6 going to that far an extreme?

7 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: In fact, Mr. Claypool
8 indicated today that they're looking for some guidance
9 from us on the issue of what they can do once they become
10 our contractors, in terms of where they can speak and
11 what they can speak about. I want to put aside the issue
12 right now of the other members of Q2, I think we should
13 go back to it in terms of this issue, but just to keep it
14 on the same conversation, and continue on with the
15 discussion about the limitations on speech that we would
16 put on Professor Cain.

17 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: In light of the
18 time, what I would - I certainly agree with Commissioner
19 Ancheta. We were looking at it, we brought it because we
20 didn't want to necessarily just identify Mr. Cain, but
21 that's why we used "employees and shareholders," but I
22 think you have a good point. Can we, as a Governmental
23 body, make that proposal in a private contract to limit?
24 So, what I would suggest I do, I can convey this
25 information as the lead to ask Mr. Miller to perform this

1 legal research to see if it is permissible to do this,
2 and in doing so, he can probably make a recommendation as
3 to what would be the proper limits of our firewall before
4 we go forward, and I think that we can probably get this
5 resolved before Q2 is really on board. And the worst
6 case scenario is that it goes to our 7th and 8th Legal
7 Advisory to discuss it in full, I don't think it's that
8 pressing, you know, I mean, speaking as a Republican if
9 we want to get partisan about it, I'm okay with waiting
10 for him having a firewall just yet, before we actually
11 get to Region 9. So, I wouldn't mind discussing this
12 with Mr. Miller if you permit me to do so, as the lead,
13 ask him to conduct the legal research, we get some legal
14 guidance better on the firewall, and we'll bring the
15 firewall back up on the 7th and bring it to the full
16 Commission on the 8th.

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I would appreciate that
18 because, when I raised the First Amendment issues
19 yesterday, I had raised them more from the perspective of
20 his free speech as a Professor at the University of
21 California, and where we hadn't closed the loop is that
22 we are functioning in this case as the Government putting
23 the limitation on his speech -

24 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Exactly, yeah.

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: -- and we didn't quite go

1 there in our conversation yesterday, and I think that
2 would be important to follow-up with Mr. Miller, that we
3 are now acting as the State and this really raises First
4 Amendment issues. Okay. Other Q2 employees - what we
5 have to -

6 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: We didn't discuss
7 anything further, but because of the necessity to get
8 Miller's recommendation on the limits, I can ask him to
9 look for that issue, as well, because we haven't
10 addressed it, so we'll expand it to how to deal with the
11 Statewide Database employees.

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Correct. Thank you. And
13 then, when we do that, if - I don't think we need to do
14 this through another meeting, I think if we could
15 communicate to Mr. Claypool, who has been talking to Q2
16 because they need to know what they can do in their other
17 capacities while they're out in the world, if we could
18 just make sure that that communication reaches Mr.
19 Claypool, as well, Commissioner? Thank you.

20 All right, it is now -

21 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: If I may be
22 excused?

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: You don't want to talk about
24 the tour bus?

25 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: I've spoken to Dan

1 about the tour bus, so...

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Thank you. You're excused.

3 COMMISSIONER FILKINS WEBBER: Have a wonderful
4 weekend.

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right, if everybody
6 could just hold on, I think Commissioner Ontai assures me
7 that this is a 15-minute discussion.

8 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: A short presentation. All
9 right, for the month of April, in terms of logistics,
10 saving time and saving resources, the suggestion that I
11 would make is that on our first regional meeting, Region
12 9, which is Redding and Yuba City, possibly the rest of
13 the month, but at least for the first two, Redding and
14 Yuba City, that we all convene here in Sacramento and
15 book our hotels as we usually do, and from here, we rent
16 a van or a bus, we can discuss that, and together along
17 with staff and all the accoutrement that we're going to
18 have to bring along, and possibly put a huge van on the
19 side, and make sure we have a bathroom unit inside the
20 van, too, I guess, it might have to be that we might have
21 to stay up there on Sunday -

22 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Right.

23 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: And find accommodations up
24 there, but then come back when we're done the following
25 day to Sacramento, and then we disperse from here as we

1 usually do. So, what are your thoughts on that?

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Thoughts, I mean, we
3 obviously cannot force people to do this. If people want
4 to drive up because they don't want to be in the bus with
5 other Commissioners, that's up to them. But the idea
6 that we would try to minimize the cost by having some
7 transportation that we could all go in together, that's
8 the thought.

9 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I think that's a
10 great idea, just for the record, as the months go by,
11 given that I have a one-year-old, I will probably have to
12 do a mix of half and half, so just to account for needing
13 a car seat and childcare and all of those things.

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay. Commissioner Yao.

15 COMMISSIONER YAO: The return home flight is
16 likely going to be on a Monday and probably going to be
17 in the afternoon, then? Or are we going to come back on
18 Sunday and be able to take an early flight home on
19 Monday? Are we going to stay up at -

20 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: If I had a crystal ball, I
21 would answer that question.

22 MR. CLAYPOOL: Are you referring to Yuba City?
23 Yuba City is an hour drive, tops, and you'll be - if we
24 do 2:00 to 5:00, you can be back in Sacramento by 7:00.

25 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: There you go.

1 COMMISSIONER YAO: Okay, so staying over in Yuba
2 City, driving back to Sacramento the next morning, and
3 then we'll depart from there? Is that what -

4 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: No, no, it's just the
5 opposite, that it's so close that driving -

6 COMMISSIONER YAO: Oh, I'm sorry, that's a Sunday
7 meeting, I forgot that -

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yeah, we can drive back, and
9 then, if people want to rush and catch a plane, if not,
10 they can stay here and leave in the morning.

11 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Right.

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Mr. Claypool, who is - who
13 will make the van arrangements and all that, in case we
14 need to communicate?

15 MR. CLAYPOOL: Well, have you got the van already
16 arranged?

17 MS. SARGIS: Already arranged.

18 MR. CLAYPOOL: We'll make the arrangements for
19 the vans here.

20 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: You'll need to get a head
21 count and all that kind of stuff.

22 MR. CLAYPOOL: Sure.

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: And you'll go through the
24 Chair.

25 MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes. Yes, the Chair and the Vice

1 Chair.

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: To make all the travel
3 arrangements.

4 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Including lodging?

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: They'll do the lodging, I
6 think. It's just to make sure that you guys do the head
7 count for, yes, for the lodging and the van, so that we
8 can actually get a good count, so that they don't have to
9 be calling all of us -

10 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: You can go on your website
11 and just download your State funded or State approved
12 hotel accommodations up in that area, I think. How many
13 of you have done that?

14 COMMISSIONER RAYA: We all want to be in the same
15 place, though, if we're going to be in one vehicle, so -

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Right. Janeece, Ms. Sargis.

17 MS. SARGIS: We've already thought ahead about
18 the hotel portion of this process and we were hoping to
19 rely on the Department of General Services Meeting
20 Planning Group, and they do this, this is what they do
21 all day long, and as soon as we get the calendar
22 approved, I will be able to submit to them your schedule,
23 and then they will go out and find hotels in the area,
24 and book a block of rooms at the State rate, and then
25 provide us with a reservation code which we will then

1 provide to you, and then you can make your own
2 reservations. That way, you'll all be at the same
3 hotels. And hopefully we'll stay way ahead of the
4 process.

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Great, wonderful.

6 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: All right, okay. Santa
7 Maria, Region 5, 6 and 9, the next four, where should -

8 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Five -

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: No, we changed it, it's a
10 six.

11 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: I'm sorry, I'm getting
12 punchy.

13 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Okay, how do we do that?
14 Shall we do the same process, all meet someplace on the
15 5th, or 4th, or 12th? I'm getting all the dates mixed up.
16 On the 12th, or we can meet on the 13th?

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: We have a hand here with a
18 suggestion.

19 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Well, I think from Southern
20 California, it's going to be easier for us to just get in
21 the car ourselves because there's no - otherwise we're
22 going to be flying somewhere and driving back.

23 MR. CLAYPOOL: Yeah, there's really no easy way
24 to get into San Luis Obispo and Santa Maria, I mean, even
25 a flight into Santa Barbara is cost prohibitive and

1 you're faster driving. So I think we may just be with a
2 lot of cars there. Car pools. I didn't mean a lot of
3 cars.

4 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Well, that raises a question,
5 though, for example, if I wanted to rent a van in LA and
6 bring the five of us, because Gil could come, that's
7 okay?

8 MR. CLAYPOOL: Oh, that's preferred.

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Wonderful.

10 MR. CLAYPOOL: Except that you may need a pillow
11 for most of these vans, but -

12 COMMISSIONER RAYA: That's also assuming that
13 they're all willing to drive with me.

14 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Okay, so that string of
15 days, we're on solo, but Janeece is still going to find
16 accommodations.

17 MS. SARGIS: And I'm assuming that you want to
18 stay where you usually stay in Sacramento?

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: No, no, we're talking now
20 about -

21 MS. SARGIS: I need to go - can I just go back to
22 the prior trip real quick and just get a real quick head
23 count of how many people might be interested in that van,
24 so I can see how big of a van we might need? Up to Yuba
25 City and Redding. So, okay. That gives me an idea,

1 thank you.

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay.

3 MS. SARGIS: And, yes, I will get on the hotel
4 reservations for the next trip.

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, and then we also need
6 the accommodations, even though we're all getting there
7 on our own for hotels, and I don't know how we'll do it,
8 whether we'll just hop from SLO to Hanford, to Merced to
9 Stockton, but we'll have to figure out about those
10 accommodations.

11 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Clarification on the 13th,
12 I'm assuming we'll be leaving Los Angeles at some point
13 in the morning of the 13th by van to go to San Luis
14 Obispo, since our meeting is in the afternoon, so we'll
15 just gather in the morning, okay, as opposed to -

16 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Okay. Is that all right
17 with everybody? Let's go to the last four days in April
18 - actually five, going on to May. So we've got LA -
19 excuse me, Long Beach, LA, San Gabriel, San Fernando
20 Valley, and then what was the last on Sunday? Antelope.
21 So, that's quite a big area.

22 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Okay, I have a suggestion for
23 that area. I think Pasadena is - I think, okay, good,
24 Commissioner Yao is agreeing with me, but Pasadena is a
25 good kind of central place, plus it gives you places,

287

1 things to do during the day, you know, when we're not in
2 session, there are a lot of hotels in that area of all
3 kinds and, again, I would recommend at that point I would
4 be willing to rent a van and just drive because every
5 day's drive is not going to be that big a deal, and those
6 of us who live there are used to doing it, so that's just
7 my suggestion for that portion.

8 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Say that again.

9 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Okay, everybody come - you
10 know, I'm recommending staying in Pasadena and driving
11 from Pasadena to each place.

12 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Solo or with a van?

13 COMMISSIONER RAYA: No, no, no, that - well, I don't
14 know if I could get a van big enough for everybody, but
15 if a couple people - and I did mention this to
16 Commissioner Filkins Webber, like maybe two of us would
17 have, you know, just a regular van, well, probably we
18 would take three, so - and then we would just drive
19 everybody from the hotel to each of the hearings and
20 back.

21 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: And others of us could just
22 get there on our own.

23 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Yeah, if you live there or,
24 otherwise, if you want to have your own car, that's fine,
25 but once we figure it out, I'm just saying I'm willing to

1 do that, as well, because I think it's easier.

2 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Okay, go ahead.

3 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I like the idea of a
4 hub, very much. I stepped out for a moment, so maybe I
5 missed this conversation because it sounds like you're
6 talking about vans, I didn't know if you considered
7 buses, partly? Commissioner Parvenu raised the point, is
8 we're not just talking about vans big enough to hold us,
9 but all of our luggage, so you may have to have an extra
10 - and staff, so the suggestion was a van for
11 Commissioners, a van for staff, a van for luggage. Can
12 we look into the option for cost-effectiveness for other
13 options, as well? We assume there's a mode of
14 transportation and have staff search some options?

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I would really encourage
16 that some of us were discussing that, that when all is
17 said and done, it could be cheaper to charter a bus with
18 a driver, and yeah, not in all of them, but in some of
19 them, instead of four vans, one with luggage, staff,
20 everything together. I mean, we don't know that, but it's
21 worth exploring whether that actually ends up being less
22 expensive.

23 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Okay, so we'll let staff
24 look at it. And then, again, Janeece is going to make
25 all the accommodations for these five areas. Okay, shall

1 we stop there?

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I think we've got enough for
3 April, yes.

4 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: All right.

5 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Di Giulio.

6 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I had stepped out, I
7 wasn't sure if you were going to vote on the full
8 calendar, if there -

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yes, now that we've got this
10 out of the way, we've got to vote on the calendar and I'm
11 going to subsume in that vote the times that we agreed
12 upon, 2:00 to 5:00 on weekends, and 6:00 to 9:00 on week
13 days.

14 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And how many - how far
15 out are we going -

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: We are going to vote in
17 April and May and all the way to June 27th.

18 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Because there was just
19 one point of clarification that I think Mr. Claypool
20 could talk to, that we had asked Q2 for clarification on
21 the southern community of input and the northern part for
22 community input meetings, and she [sic] had suggested
23 that it would be easiest to have them as close as
24 possible together, and then we could work on the spacing
25 - we had discussed just letting staff work that out, to

1 have some spacing as needed in consultation, but if you
2 look at the end of May, we were talking about either
3 right before Memorial or after for the Northern
4 California part, I would like to suggest that, since we
5 were ending May 23rd at San Jose, that maybe we would
6 consider the 24th being the Northern California community
7 input location, a break on the 25th, and then go down to
8 Northridge on the 26th. And I would - that way, we still
9 have to do a Northern and a Southern, and I'm trying to
10 minimize the travel, if we're already in Northern
11 California, let's stay here, get the Northern input, take
12 a day's break for travel, and we probably won't need two
13 days at Northridge if we're going to split them, I would
14 imagine we'd have enough time in Northridge to capture
15 Southern California enough in Northern. So, having those
16 modifications, that would be my suggestion.

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: And what that accomplishes
18 is it gives Q2 more time to compile the statewide
19 information and come back with -

20 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Correct, they'll
21 incorporate that into all the previous inputs, so that we
22 could have that break we talked about, we would come
23 together and meet, and then we'd have maybe a small
24 little break before they present and come back to us and
25 present the last meeting, which I believe Commissioner

1 Barabba suggested would be June 9th. So, between - I
2 guess it would be May 31st and the 9th, we could direct
3 staff to do the appropriate amount of spacing and the
4 availability for us to do the line drawing in that
5 period, knowing that we would release the first drafts on
6 the 10th, and at least come back for one more meeting on
7 the 9th to review that. Does that sound acceptable?

8 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Is that acceptable?

9 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Could I just have
10 you repeat the sequence of the days, then? The 23rd were
11 at San Jose, 24th would be Northern California -

12 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: The location, yes. That
13 would be the Northern California for community
14 organizations to do their input. I believe we would need
15 a day to travel, to get back down to Southern California,
16 that would be the 25th would be a travel day, and then we
17 would go to Northridge on the 26th to receive the Southern
18 California community organizations statewide input, and
19 then we would break from the 27th of May, that's over the
20 Memorial Day weekend, and then what I would suggest,
21 again, is that the staff at Q2 work out those next two
22 weeks, knowing that our end goal is to have the first
23 release of the draft maps on June 10th, and, as
24 Commissioner Barabba mentioned, we need at least one day
25 prior to that to review that as a Commission. So, where

1 those other breaks happen and what they're needed for Q2,
2 we could have Q2 and staff work that out? Is that
3 acceptable?

4 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yes, Commissioner Raya.

5 COMMISSIONER RAYA: When you say "break," meet on
6 the 27th and then leave? Or not meet on the 27th?

7 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: I'm assuming that, since
8 we're - I think originally we gave the option of two days
9 because there may be so many presentations, but if we
10 have a northern and a southern, we might be able to just
11 get it done all day, but I think we should reserve the
12 option to have a business meeting down there, I think
13 that was staff's recommendation, is to at least have it
14 on the books. Is that correct? So, the 26th would be
15 Northridge - is that correct, or not?

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yes.

17 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Okay, the Southern
18 California community statewide organizations to give
19 their input on the 26th, with the addition of the business
20 meeting, as needed.

21 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: My only - oh, I'm
22 sorry.

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Mr. Claypool.

24 MR. CLAYPOOL: I was just going to - now,
25 Northridge, this is the place where we've done the most

1 extensive planning and Northridge has gone out of their
2 way to start lining up a lot of things for us. If I
3 understand Commissioner Di Giulio's plan for the Nor Cal
4 Commission - that the community organizations, and that
5 organized groups, and that's a good plan, it condenses
6 it, I would suggest that we, at most, cancel the 25th, but
7 keep the 26th and 27th. We don't know how many people
8 we're going to have on the 26th and we need the business
9 meeting, and you need your time with your line drawer on
10 the 27th to give them the instructions that you want them
11 to have to start the process of drawing those lines. So,
12 I know everybody wants to get out of there early on
13 Friday, but I think you need that second day in
14 Northridge to make sure that we've covered our business
15 needs and that we've covered the needs of our line
16 drawer.

17 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And I'll defer to staff.
18 I think they have a better handle of that than -

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, so does that mean that
20 you are withdrawing the idea of meeting the statewide
21 organized group meeting in Northern California on the
22 24th?

23 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: No, I'm sorry, I do
24 believe we should still do the Northern California input
25 on the 24th, take the travel day on the 25th. Originally,

1 I said just one day o the 26th for Northridge, but based
2 on staff's recommendation, let's keep two days in
3 Northridge, one maybe dedicated to the community input,
4 and the other one for business meeting and issues that we
5 need to - ways we need to direct the line drawing. Does
6 that sound reasonable?

7 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: We're getting there.
8 Commissioner Yao.

9 COMMISSIONER YAO: You know, as far as
10 organizational groups are concerned, whether that's in
11 Northern California or in Southern California, I don't
12 think it really would make an awful lot of difference to
13 them. Why don't we just stick with the schedule that
14 staff presented to us and just open up the 26th as an
15 overflow for any organized group presentations to us if
16 needed, and just have the break on the 24th, have all the
17 organizations make presentations all day on the 25th, and
18 as much time as we need to dedicate to them, on the 26th,
19 then immediately go into the business meeting and just
20 basically stay with the schedule that we have.

21 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: You're saying no
22 Northern California opportunity for community input on a
23 statewide basis?

24 COMMISSIONER YAO: As far as the organized groups
25 are concerned, I don't think whether it's Northern

1 California or Southern California is really an added
2 feature one way or the other. They have plenty of input
3 opportunities, you know, during all the events that we
4 plan around Northern California, Southern California, and
5 this is - I suspect that they probably would want to hear
6 what everybody else says anyway, so just limiting it to
7 Northern California or Southern California, to me, it's
8 not that big a deal.

9 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I believe we did
10 discuss this as a Commission earlier and we have received
11 public comment that, having our only opportunities at
12 that key stage in the process for organized groups only
13 in Northridge really favors the Southern portion of the
14 State, so I thought -- we didn't take a vote, but we had
15 agreed in principle that we wanted to have one either in
16 the Bay Area or in Sacramento to allow that flexibility
17 for groups who are in the northern side. And the other
18 observation I'd have around the 24th and going an input
19 groups meeting, I don't think it's insurmountable, but I
20 know that a lot of the best locations that actually can
21 do livestreaming, they're typically your City Halls, like
22 I know in Oakland and Richmond, that's what they've
23 offered. And on Tuesday nights, that tends to be council
24 meetings.

25 COMMISSIONER YAO: Right.

1 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: So, that may
2 impact our ability. Again, it's not necessarily that the
3 groups we want there wouldn't be able to come, but will
4 the space be available?

5 COMMISSIONER DI GUILIO: Are there any academic
6 institutions that are options?

7 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: Yeah, sure.
8 That's a possibility.

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So, where are we? Do we
10 want to insert the Northern statewide group meeting on
11 the 24th and eliminate the 25th, and have that be a travel
12 day, to let us get down to Northridge and start the two
13 days of Northridge meetings?

14 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: I agree with Commissioner
15 Di Giulio's point to have a representation in the North,
16 as well, for the community organizations.

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right. So, we are ready
18 to vote on this map - calendar!

19 [Laughing]

20 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, there's a motion to
21 adopt this calendar through - oh, Janeece does that, I
22 don't need to summarize the motion, that is what we
23 agreed upon. Ms. Sargent. The motion? Did you catch
24 it?

25 MS. SARGENT: The motion was just to approve the

1 calendar as discussed, but -

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: And I would just say that -
3 just for the record, so that it's clear, this is through
4 June 27th. Is there a second?

5 MS. SARGENT: Was that an amendment to the
6 motion?

7 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: No, my motion is to approve
8 the schedule as discussed, carrying it all the way to
9 June 27th.

10 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Is there a second?

11 COMMISSIONER PARVENU: Second.

12 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Public comment. All right,
13 discussion? All right, call for -

14 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Mr. Wright, come on up.

15 MR. WRIGHT: I'm sorry. I think your motion
16 needs to include more detail than just approved this
17 thing we've discussed, there's a lot of confusion in the
18 audience here and I'm quite sure there is a lot of
19 confusion of people that are watching on line, as well,
20 as to just exactly what it is you're proposing.

21 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Okay, thank you.

22 MR. WRIGHT: Thank you.

23 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Okay, so to what specificity
24 do we want to include in this motion?

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Here is what I would

1 suggest. This calendar is going to be posted online the
2 minute we approve it, but for the record, so that people
3 know - it's going to be posted, so this is the hearing
4 schedule for the California Redistricting Commission
5 first round of hearings that will be conducted in all our
6 regions that we have agreed upon as the regions we
7 previously agreed upon that would be the regions we would
8 hold hearings in. It includes meetings in Northern
9 California, Central California, Southern California, and
10 takes us all the way through June 27th, at which point we
11 will take a break and begin the work of processing all
12 the information we received, and then we will be
13 reconvening and issuing a first draft of our maps. So,
14 this is the second draft?

15 MR. CLAYPOOL: This is actually the third
16 iteration of this calendar.

17 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: No, I was talking about the
18 maps. Second draft. So, that is what we're adopting.
19 It will be posted.

20 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: And that's what I said.
21 That's exactly what I said.

22 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: What I think the
23 comment was, was whether --it will be posted, but whether
24 we should review to ensure that we're on the same page
25 about what we're voting for, the actual dates and

1 locations.

2 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Sure, let's go through it.

3 I thought we had been doing that all along, but it's a
4 good suggestion, we'll go through starting with -

5 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: Could we add as much
6 detail as possible, like the times, even?

7 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yes, times, everything,
8 cities, you name it.

9 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: You ready, Janeece?

10 MS. SARGIS: Yes. Do you want me to go through
11 it?

12 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: No, you go through it.

13 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Do you have it?

14 MS. SARGIS: Yes.

15 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Good.

16 MS. SARGIS: Do you want me to also announce the
17 times?

18 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yes, please.

19 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Take your time, we're all
20 floating now.

21 MS. SARGIS: On April 7th, we are having an all
22 day business meeting in Sacramento, and on April 8th, an
23 all day business meeting in Sacramento. I believe it's
24 been agendized for 9:00 to 6:30, both days. On Saturday,
25 April 9th, we will be in -

1 COMMISSIONER YAO: Please mention the location
2 also.

3 MS. SARGIS: In Sacramento. On Saturday, April
4 9th, we will be in Redding, and that will be from 2:00 to
5 5:00 in the afternoon. On April 10th, we'll be in Yuba
6 City and that also will be 2:00 to 5:00 in the afternoon.
7 On April 13th, we will be in San Luis Obispo, Santa Maria
8 area, and that will be from 6:00 to 9:00 in the evening.
9 On April 14th, we will be in Hanford, and that will be
10 from 6:00 to 9:00 in the evening. On April 15th, we will
11 be in Merced, that will be from 6:00 to 9:00 in the
12 evening. April 16th, Stockton, from 2:00 to 5:00 in the
13 afternoon. April 27th, we will be in Long Beach, 6:00 to
14 9:00 in the evening. April 28th, Downtown LA, we will
15 also have a business meeting that day, and the business
16 meeting time is yet to be determined, but we will have
17 the meeting in Downtown LA from 6:00 to 9:00 in the
18 evening. April 29th, San Gabriel, 6:00 to 9:00 in the
19 evening, April 30th, San Fernando Valley, 6:00 to 9:00 in
20 the evening.

21 COMMISSIONER YAO: Incorrect.

22 MS. SARGIS: I'm sorry, 2:00 to 5:00 in the
23 afternoon. Thank you. Sunday, May 1st, we will be in
24 Antelope Valley from 2:00 to 5:00 in the afternoon. May
25 5th, Riverside, we will hold that meeting from 6:00 to

1 9:00 in the evening and we will also possibly have a
2 business meeting that day, time to be determined. May
3 6th, Santa Ana, possible business meeting that day, yet to
4 be determined as far as time, the Santa Ana public
5 hearing will be from 6:00 to 9:00 in the evening. On May
6 12th, we will be in the Escondido - San Marcos Area, 6:00
7 to 9:00 in the evening.

8 COMMISSIONER YAO: I thought it was in Palm
9 Springs.

10 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: I believe - what I
11 have written down, and correct me if I'm wrong, but on
12 the 12th, that we would be in Palm Springs, Indio, in the
13 evening, which is the 6:00 to 9:00. On the 13th, we would
14 be in the San Marcos - Escondido area, also from 6:00 to
15 9:00, and then, on Saturday the 14th, that we would be in
16 San Diego from 2:00 to 5:00, although anticipating that
17 we're doing this - I don't know if there are any
18 implications for the time if we're doing a regional wrap-
19 up. Again, the hearing would be from 2:00 to 5:00, but
20 then we may have a business meeting that's attached to
21 that.

22 MS. SARGIS: Clarification, on May 12th, we'll be
23 in Palm Springs, Indio area from 6:00 to 9:00 in the
24 evening, on May 13th, Escondido San Marcos, from 6:00 to
25 9:00 in the evening, May 14th, San Diego, from 2:00 to

1 5:00 in the afternoon. May 19th, Auburn, 6:00 to 9:00 in
2 the evening, May 20th, Santa Rosa, 6:00 to 9:00 in the
3 evening with a possible business meeting, time yet to be
4 determined. May 21st, Oakland, 6:00 to 9:00 in - I'm
5 sorry - 2:00 to 5:00 in the afternoon, possible business
6 meeting time to be determined. May 22nd, Salinas, that's
7 a Sunday, 2:00 to 5:00 in the afternoon, May 23rd, San
8 Jose, 6:00 to 9:00 in the evening. On May 24th, we will
9 be in Northern California, location to be determined, and
10 that will be for the purpose of organized groups to make
11 a presentation - statewide organized groups to make a
12 presentation to the Commission. On May 26th, we will be
13 in Northridge, and we will hold the meeting for the
14 purpose of statewide organized groups to make
15 presentations to the Commission.

16 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: At 6:00 to 9:00.

17 MS. SARGIS: Excuse me, 6:00 to 9:00 in the
18 evening. Uh -

19 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: That will be an all day
20 meeting.

21 MS. SARGIS: Yeah, that will be an all day
22 meeting.

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: So the 24th is all day?

24 MS. SARGIS: Yes, the 24th will be all day, thank
25 you. May 27th, we will be in Northridge all day, possible

1 business meeting, times to be determined, and that will
2 be for the purpose of the Commission having gathered
3 information, to work with their Line Drawers. The next
4 two weeks, the time and location and the activities will
5 be determined by Q2. June 16th, we will be in Culver
6 City, 6:00 to 9:00 in the evening, June 17th, Whittier -
7 Cerritos Area, 6:00 to 9:00 in the evening, June 18th,
8 Fullerton, 2:00 to 5:00 in the afternoon, Sunday, June
9 19th, San Bernardino, 2:00 to 5:00 in the afternoon,
10 Monday, June 20th, San Diego, 6:00 to 9:00 in the evening,
11 June 22nd, Oxnard, 6:00 to 9:00 in the evening, June 23rd,
12 Bakersfield, 6:00 to 9:00 in the evening, possible
13 business meeting, time to be determined. June 24th,
14 Fresno, 6:00 to 9:00 in the evening, possible business
15 meeting, time to be determined, June 25th, San Jose, 2:00
16 to 5:00 in the afternoon, June 26th, San Francisco, 2:00
17 to 5:00 in the afternoon, June 27th, we will be having a
18 public input hearing in Region 9, place to be determined,
19 6:00 to 9:00 in the evening, also a possible business
20 meeting that day, time to be determined.

21 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Thank you so very much,
22 really, thank you so so much. [Applause]

23 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: And thank you, Bill [sic],
24 you were absolutely right - I mean, Jim! Jim.

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right, so with that

1 clarification, and with public comment on that
2 clarification, asking us to make that clarification,
3 there is a motion and it has been seconded. And I move
4 the question, all those in favor of adopting the maps
5 [sic] as just described by Ms. Sargent - schedule - as
6 just described by Ms. Sargent, just raise your hand and
7 say "Aye."

8 (Ayes.) Opposed? Abstentions? The motion
9 carries.

10 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Madam Chair?

11 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Yes.

12 COMMISSIONER RAYA: There was one item that I
13 think did not come up in any of our reporting out and
14 that was that, if members of the Commission have people
15 they would like to have receive contact from our
16 Communications Director, to be able to spread the word
17 and get people to the hearings, to please provide the
18 names and addresses to Mr. Wilcox ASAP.

19 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Do we do that directly? We
20 will do that directly.

21 COMMISSIONER DI GIULIO: And along those same
22 lines, can we communicate directly with Ms. Sargis about
23 recommendations for the logistical aspects we've kind of
24 been -

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Absolutely. All right, we

1 stand - oh, the meeting wrap up. Oh, Public Information
2 and Report Out, no, no, no, this is Public Information
3 Report out. Website.

4 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes. Mr. Wilcox is handing
5 out our new website design that was based on input from
6 the Commission last time. Commissioner Raya already
7 provided another update for the public information which
8 is -

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I was going to say, that was
10 public information.

11 COMMISSIONER DAI: That was part of public
12 information. Yes, if you have lists of organizations
13 that you - first of all, you should encourage them to
14 sign up directly on our list, our newsletter list,
15 anyway, but certainly if you give Mr. Wilcox the
16 information, he will make sure to contact them as we fan
17 out around California.

18 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: This is just the Public
19 Information Advisory report out.

20 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes, a couple of things,
21 because of the comment about blue, we ended up with
22 purple, instead, and the contrast color, it kind of looks
23 a little pukey here, but it's actually supposed to be
24 gold, so that's the contrast color, and you'll notice
25 "Independent" is misspelled, and instead of "First,"

1 we're using California's Independent Citizens
2 Redistricting Commission, and we have our brand new
3 tagline underneath that, "Fair Representation - Democracy
4 at Work," so that is just for your information. The
5 website will be up on the 31st is the goal, with our newly
6 approved content and the toolkit, and let's see, a couple
7 other things, that we will be having ethnic media
8 briefings in San Francisco, San Diego, other major
9 locations, and they're also helping us with translation.
10 And I think I mentioned earlier the automatic translation
11 feature, too, to kind of keep us going. Mr. Wilcox, do
12 you have something else to add?

13 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR WILCOX: Well, just other
14 than the website on March 31st and the editorial boards
15 are continuing, the ethnic media, you've hit that, and
16 then just now we're into the heavy phase of publicizing
17 our meetings and I just want everyone to know that we're
18 reaching out to all print, TV, and radio, and customizing
19 the news releases that will start going out right now,
20 starting in Redding, and I will be working the phones and
21 establishing to get actual interviews on all of those
22 programs and in the print, and also working with the
23 organizations, including business and community-based
24 organizations, our statewide organizations, to help us
25 get on the ground, but then also reaching out to the

1 organizations -

2 COMMISSIONER DAI: Community groups, civic

3 organizations -

4 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR WILCOX: Absolutely.

5 COMMISSIONER DAI: And if you have organizations

6 you would like to suggest, please contact Mr. Wilcox.

7 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR WILCOX: All right, thank

8 you.

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: No action items?

10 COMMISSIONER DAI: No.

11 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right. Yes,

12 Commissioner Yao.

13 COMMISSIONER YAO: This is the first time I see

14 the name California's Independent Citizen Redistricting

15 Commission. Is that really the name that we want to use?

16 COMMISSIONER DAI: We had "First" and you didn't

17 like that, so we replaced it with "Independent."

18 COMMISSIONER YAO: I understand it's descriptive,

19 but usually the top line is the official name of the

20 organization. Is that what we want to be known as from

21 this point on, is not just California Citizens

22 Redistricting Commission, we are now calling ourselves

23 California Independent Citizens Redistricting Commission?

24 It's okay for me, I just want to make sure that we indeed

25 look at it as our official name from this point on, okay?

308

1 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I actually agree with
2 Commissioner Yao. I had just wanted "First" out, I
3 didn't feel like anything needed to be replaced, to
4 replace it when we took it out. And I agree with you
5 that it's almost like we've created a new name, and we
6 should just stick with our name and just have that be
7 what's at the top, that's my feeling. More comments?

8 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yeah, I agree with that.

9 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR WILCOX: Good,
10 "Independent" is misspelled anyway.

11 COMMISSIONER DAI: Yes, that will get rid of the
12 misspelling!

13 [Laughter]

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Thank you, Commissioner Yao,
15 for late hour, you know, staying alert. Anything else on
16 this?

17 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Excellent job.

18 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right, Mr. -

19 COMMISSIONER DAI: One item. The Finance and
20 Administration Committee did not get to meet, but the
21 Committee took on the responsibility of providing our
22 Executive Director with feedback and it's about that
23 time, some time has passed, so I wanted to encourage any
24 Commissioners who had feedback for Mr. Claypool to send
25 it to any of the members of the Finance and

1 Administration Committee so that we can provide that
2 feedback to Mr. Claypool in closed session at the next
3 meeting.

4 COMMISSIONER GALAMBOS MALLOY: If it's okay with
5 the other members, perhaps to streamline since I'm the
6 delegate between now and the next meeting, if I could
7 request feedback for Mr. Claypool to come through me, and
8 then I'll compile it all and we can work that way.

9 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right. Thank you. That
10 was the administration side of the Finance and
11 Administration Advisory Committee. Any other items? Mr.
12 Wilcox, our wrap-up.

13 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR WILCOX: The Commission
14 approved the proposed toolkit as a first draft, they also
15 at each Regional Public Input Meeting, each presenter
16 will have up to five minutes, and the Chair has
17 discretion if the crowd warrants, to have presenters time
18 be limited to three minutes. Week night regional input
19 hearings will be held from 6:00 to 9:00 p.m., the weekend
20 regional input hearings will be held from 2:00 to 5:00
21 p.m. And there was the Chief Counsel presented some
22 information discovered since yesterday's meeting
23 regarding the Commission's selected VRA counsel and that
24 the firm is a registered lobbyist and has made political
25 campaign contributions to California Congressional

1 Candidates. The Commission expressed concern and has
2 asked for a full and complete accounting so it can take
3 up this matter for their April 7th meeting. In the mean
4 time, to be able to ready the Commission for its first
5 public input meetings, they approved a Personal Services
6 Contract not to exceed \$5,000 to provide services to
7 prepare for those meetings. The Commission approved the
8 first rounds of public input hearings through June 27th.
9 Did I miss something?

10 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Commissioner Ancheta.

11 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: This is a correction, I
12 think - well, actually, I don't know if they are - I
13 don't think they are a registered lobbying firm -

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: We don't know that.

15 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: Yeah, we don't know that
16 for sure.

17 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR WILCOX: Okay - to award
18 to -

19 COMMISSIONER ANCHETA: You just want to drop that
20 part -

21 COMMISSIONER DAI: Take out registered - we know
22 they have lobbied, we don't know if they registered.

23 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: And we will don't know about
24 the candidates, correct? I mean, all we have now is a
25 verbal report from our Chief Counsel, who is going to go

1 - who said this is what he knows now, but that it's not -
2 he hasn't gotten names, dates, anything, so I would just
3 be careful not to - I'm just always careful about
4 slander, all kinds of issues. He is going to go gather
5 the facts for us, was my understanding. This is what he
6 has heard and what he read on the Internet, but that he
7 wants to actually do an investigation of the facts and
8 come back to us with the facts. I think I'd rather be
9 careful about not saying that we already know these
10 things to be true.

11 COMMISSIONER RAYA: Would it be better to just
12 say that an apparent failure to disclose potential
13 conflicts was -

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: I think that's a more
15 accurate representation. I mean, I think if we want to
16 say what appeared to be the apparent conflicts, we can
17 say that, I just don't want to say that we know what we
18 are yet, or that we've done our full investigation.

19 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR WILCOX: Okay.

20 COMMISSIONER RAYA: One other question. Is it
21 "Personal Services" or "Personal Procurement?" I don't
22 know if there's a technical difference or a legal
23 difference or -

24 MR. CLAYPOOL: It's "Personal Services Contract."

25 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Does that - is that helpful,

1 Mr. Wilcox?

2 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR WILCOX: Thank you very
3 much, yes.

4 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: Any other items.
5 Commissioner Aguirre?

6 COMMISSIONER AGUIRRE: Just that I appreciate
7 Commissioner Parvenu's suggestion on a mock agenda for
8 the Input Hearings, so I kind of drafted one up and sent
9 it to all of you, so, of course, look at it and change it
10 as appropriate.

11 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right, and these are two
12 incoming Chair and Vice Chair.

13 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: So we'll see you all.

14 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: With your suitcases!

15 COMMISSIONER ONTAI: Backpacks, suitcases!

16 CHAIRPERSON BLANCO: All right, thank you,
17 everybody.

18 (Adjourned at 6:19 p.m.)

19

20

21

22

23

24

25