

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION (CRC)

In the matter of:

CRC BUSINESS MEETING

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 21, 2020

9:30 a.m.

Transcription by:

eScribers, LLC



APPEARANCESCOMMISSIONERS

Linda Akutagawa, Chair
Isra Ahmad, Vice-Chair
Derric Taylor, Commissioner
Trena Turner, Commissioner
Jane Andersen, Commissioner
Alicia Fernandez, Commissioner
Neal Fornaciari, Commissioner
J. Kennedy, Commissioner
Antonio Le Mons, Commissioner
Sara Sadhwani, Commissioner
Patricia Sinay, Commissioner
Pedro Toledo, Commissioner
Angela Vázquez, Commissioner
Russell Yee, Commissioner

STAFF

Alvaro Hernandez, Executive Director
Marian Johnston, Interim Counsel
Fredy Ceja, Communications Director
Marcy Kaplan, Director of Outreach
Sulma Hernandez, Outreach Coordinator
Kimberly Briggs, Field Lead - Southern California, L.A.
Ashleigh Howick, Field Lead - Northern California
Jose Eduardo Chavez, Field Lead - Central California

TECHNICAL CONTRACTORS

Kristian Manoff, AV Technical Director/Comment Moderator

LINE DRAWING TEAM

Jaime Clark, Q2 Data & Research, LLC

STATE LEGISLATURE

Michael Wagaman, Redistricting Consultant

Also PresentPublic Comment

Julia Marks

INDEXPAGE

1. Call to Order and Roll Call

4

P R O C E E D I N G S

October 21, 2022

9:30 a.m.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Everyone, welcome back to day two of our California Redistricting Commission meetings for the week of October 20th and 21st. Thank you for rejoining us and thank you to the Commissioners for being back again. I want to ask Marian to take roll call first. I'm not --

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: -- going to forget this time.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Akutagawa.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Formicary.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: (No audible response.)

MS. JOHNSTON: I thought I saw his --



Commissioner --

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Le Mons --

MS. JOHNSTON: I'm sorry?

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: -- is here. He's off camera.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: (No audible response.)

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: (No audible response.)

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: He's saying yes, thumbs up.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Here.

MS. JOHNSON: Commissioner Vasquez.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: (No audible response.)

MS. JOHNSON: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

MS. JOHNSON: Okay. Commissioner Le Mons? I --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here.

MS. JOHNSON: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here. Sorry.

MS. JOHNSON: And Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: (No audible response.)



MS. JOHNSON: All here except Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Looks like he has just rejoined.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here he is.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: He has just joined us.

MS. JOHNSON: Good. Everyone's here.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right.

Thank you, everyone. Welcome back. All right. I would -- I think I -- just for the sake of everybody's participation, I'm going to call for public comments first up, and then before we actually take the public comments, I'll also -- I'll also give people time to get onto the phones. I will also just outline what our agenda for this morning is going to be.

What we're going to do is we are on agenda Item Number 9. And what we're going to do, is we're going to skip to 9J, the Communities of Interest Subcommittee. And then we're combining that with agenda Item Number 12, which is the communities of interest discussion and possible actions on items related to communities of interest, the tool.

We will have a presentation today from the Statewide Database team. And then at which time after that presentation, we will return to agenda Item Number 9H, which is the VRA compliance. And we will complete the

rest of the subcommittee updates. That will then be followed by the key milestones and the action steps, October through March, and the remainder of the agenda, which is agenda Item Number -- so Key Milestones and Action Steps is agenda Item Number 6, followed by agenda Item Number 10, agenda Item Number 11, and then agenda items number 13 and 14. Is that correct?

(No audible response.)

Okay. All right.

So let's see, Katy, would you please read the instructions, and let us know if you have any (unintelligible).

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes chair?

In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment during their meeting by phone. There will be opportunities to address the Commissioners regarding the items on the agenda. There will also be opportunities for the public to submit general comments about items not on the agenda.

Please note that the Commission is not able to comment or discuss items not on the agenda. The Commission will advise the viewing audience when it is time to submit public comment. The Commissioners will then allow time for those who wish to comment to dial in.



To call in on your phone, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. When prompted, enter in the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed using your dial pad. When prompted to enter a meeting ID, simply press pound.

Once you have dialed in, you'll be placed in a queue from which a moderator will begin unmuting callers to submit their comment. You will also hear an automatic message to press star nine to raise your hand, indicating that you wish to make a comment. When it is your turn to speak, the moderator will unmute you, and you will hear an automatic message, the host would like you to talk and to press star six to speak. You will have two minutes to provide your comments. Please make sure to mute your computer or live stream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your call.

Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when it is your turn to speak, and please turn down the livestream volume. The Commissioners will take comment for every action item on the agenda. As you listen to the online video stream, the Chair will call for public comments. This is your time to call in. The process for making a comment will be the same each time, beginning by the telephone number provided on the livestream feed and following the steps stated above.



And, Chair, at this time, we do not have anyone in the queue.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I'll hold for a minute to let the live stream catch up.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I learned a trick. If you all want to see each other bigger, then hide yourself self -- your self-view, and then everybody else is bigger, and you don't have to see yourself.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: How do you hide yourself?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Go to your box. There'll be three dots, and then at the bottom it says, "Hide Self View".

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: I don't have that as an option or -- oh, I see it. Okay. Wrong box.

Okay, Katy. I think if I'm looking at the participants list correctly, I'm not seeing anybody has called in.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: That is correct.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

All right. Well, let's go ahead, and let's -- let's move on. We have a lot to cover today. I would like to welcome back Michael Wagaman and Jaime Clark. Michael from the legislature and Jaime from the Statewide Database. And thank you for joining us this morning. And we are on agenda Item Number J, and we're combining

it with agenda Item Number 12.

Before I have them start, Commissioner Kennedy, would you like to say anything on the COI tool before we have them begin their presentation? You're on mute.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: No. At this point, just to welcome them and thank them for joining us today. This is, as Commissioner Akutagawa said, essentially, the report of our subcommittee when we met with the Statewide Database team last week and are looking forward to this discussion. Thank you.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Great. Thank you.

Jaime, are you going to show your slides, or -- or is Kristian going to show the slides?

MS. CLARK: I am happy to show the slides, and I believe that Mr. Wagaman might have an intro as well.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Great.

MR. WAGAMAN: Thank you. And I'll keep the intro brief. I just wanted to note that normally as a policy, we would have somebody from both the Democratic and Republican side here, whenever the legislature's before you. My Republican colleagues, unfortunately, had a conflict this morning and asked me to stand in their place for the entire institution. But I just didn't want the Commission to believe that there was anything going on. It was just a scheduling conflict issue.

Also, I just wanted to really briefly clarify a few points that came up yesterday during your conversation about the organizational chart, as it relates to the Statewide Database. So the mandate to provide public access to data and redistricting software by statute falls on the legislature, which is funded -- which has been funded through the UC system. So management of the Statewide Database and its projects is really not part of the Commission's mandate, which is probably a good thing for you. Because the database is not only used for the state redistricting, it's literally used for hundreds of local redistricting, so not probably a headache you want. And of course, you don't have to pay for all this work that's been done. And I think you've identified your limitations of your budget.

But what 8253 of the Government Code does state, which is the governing provision, is that, "Upon the Commission's formation and until its dissolution, the Legislature shall coordinate these efforts with the Commission." As I noted when we first presented the tool, waiting for the Commission to actually form to start this work would have endangered the timely delivery of this project. And it's something that a Statewide Database accurately anticipated would be something potentially beneficial to your work.



But I wanted to also be clear that as soon as your transition staff was identified, even before the first eight were selected, we'd reached out to -- to your transition staff to let them know that your feedback was going to be important and required, we believed, under the mandate to -- to coordinate. So I just wanted to make sure that that coordination mandate is something we take very, very seriously.

Finally, just also clarified that it is not the belief that this tool meets that -- that mandate to provide public access to redistricting software. The Database is continuing to look at options to provide software that will not only allow the public to draw their individual community but for members of the public who want to draw full redistricting plans. So we believe that access is required under Proposition 11 and is something that's still being worked on. So this is just one tool to generate data. The Database is working on other tools, and, obviously, you're going to be working on your own tools to generate testimony and data.

So as far as your organizational chart go, and the -- goes, and the Statewide Database, the real key is to identify how you want to intake that data coming in from the database, whether it's prison adjustment data, CVAP data, community of interest maps, or full



redistricting plans, and how you want to intake that and then process and utilize that data. So with that, I'm looking very forward to shutting up and just smiling while Jaime and the subcommittee guide you through the questions and timeline that are needed for feedback as it relates to this specific tool. Thank you.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Mr. Wagaman.

Ms. Clark?

MS. CLARK: Yes.

Thank you all. I'm happy to be here again today.

And over the past couple weeks -- or rather just before I start my presentation, to back up a bit, over the past couple weeks, the Statewide Database has had the opportunity to use your test, the Community of Interest tool, or COI tool, as I'll probably be referring to it. I know some people have also been calling it the COI toy, so we might hear that as well during this meeting. But we've had the opportunity to use or test the tool with the Commission.

Through the user tests, we gained really valuable and insightful feedback from each Commissioner. And implementation and of the Commission feedback is already in motion. Last week we updated the Subcommittee on the progress of the tools development and discussed next steps to ensure the tool can be ready for public release

in a timely manner. As you know, we've set the goal of having the tool be ready by early January, so it can be made available to the public whenever the CRC begins actively soliciting community of interest input.

And today, we are requesting feedback from you on a series of discussion points that relate to the tool. Today's discussion points really revolve around aspects of the tool that the user will be interacting with. And these are time-sensitive because we need to finalize all the text that's associated with the tool that the user sees, and then fold all of that information into our user guides and our tutorials so we can begin the process of having all of those materials translated. Some of these points require your feedback today and others require feedback later this month and next.

So again, I have a brief presentation for today's meeting. In the presentation, I'll start by introducing each discussion point and where it fits into the COI tool's timeline. The timeline starts today with our meeting today and ends in early January, which, again, is our goal for having it be publicly, or excuse me, ready for public deployment, should the Commission begin to solicit public feedback at that time.

The presentation will outline the feedback that's requested today and then also we'll preview the feedback



necessary for future dates. But we won't go into a discussion today about the future or the feedback that we need for future dates.

And then after we preview the feedback for the future, then I will rewind to discussion points for today's meeting, and then we'll be able to turn to a full discussion -- a full Commission discussion on the feedback for today.

And with that, I'm going to pull up the slides and begin sharing my screen. I won't be able to see you. I won't be able to see you very well, I don't think. I see, like, a couple people on the side here, so please help me out if someone is raising their hand or wants to say something.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Jaime?

MS. CLARK: And can everyone see the screen?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Jaime, it's Commissioner Sinay. If you want, you can grab the double -- the two double lines and move them so you can see more of us. There's two little double lines that separate the video feeds and your PowerPoint slide. If you hover your -- your cursor, like, over the middle, and you should see, like, two double lines that you can move left right. I don't know if it'll show up on yours.

MS. CLARK: Yeah, I -- I'm not sure that I see that.



Maybe it's because I'm presenting. But anyway, we can dive in and -- yeah, and I know that you'll all help me if someone's trying to say something.

So again, here are our discussion points for feedback on the Community of Interest Tool. The feedback points are finding a name for the tool, receiving feedback on questions for the users to explain their communities of interest in the tool, information about the user that the tool should request for the user to provide about themselves, and desired language translation options for all aspects of the tool.

These first four items, we have worked on with the subcommittee to determine dates to receive CRC feedback by. This last point, which is working on issues around reporting and security; that will be an ongoing discussion that we will engage with the Subcommittee on. So these first four points are what we're requesting full Commission feedback on at this time.

I'm having -- here we go. Oh, okay. I am using a different view in the slides than I'm used to, so sorry about that. So again, our feedback that we're requesting and the timeline for that feedback. Today, we are requesting feedback on the name of the tool and what questions to ask the users to explain their communities of interest in the tool.

On October 30th, we will request feedback on what information to request from users about themselves. November 18th will be the last date that the Statewide Database can receive information concerning language translation and not have it compromise our timeline in terms of our early November release date.

Throughout the rest of the calendar year, the Statewide Database and the Subcommittee will work together on issues around reporting and security. And then again, all of this is working towards our early January 2021 goal of having the tool ready for public deployment, subject, of course, to the CRC public input timeline.

So again today we're going to talk about naming the tool. We request your feedback on whether users should go to the CRC website or to a standalone website to access the tool. The Statewide Database has already reserved some names of -- domain names that we can go over. These are options. And if the Commission would like to use a different name, we're happy to receive that feedback today as well.

Also, today, we're going to talk about which questions to ask users about their communities to get users to describe your communities.

And then, looking ahead for future dates, on



October 30th, we will request your feedback around what information to ask users to provide about themselves. So currently in the tool, the user's name and their ZIP code are these items that the tool requests. And also, currently, the name is optional and ZIP code is required for a user to be able to submit to the Commission. And also, of course, email for authenticated or logged-in users is something that we collect.

Just a note for the future is that we will be able to capture the IP addresses of the actual computers that users are submitting their COIs from. We'll ask again what should be optional and what should be required in terms of information that the tool asks users to provide about themselves.

And in terms of languages, we are moving forward in providing the tool in the languages that the Secretary of State provides statewide election materials in as sort of a baseline and as a preexisting standard. Those languages are English, Spanish, simplified Chinese, Hindi, Japanese, Khmer, Korean, Tagalog, Thai, and Vietnamese. And any information around additional languages outside of this list that the Commission will be providing all of your other outreach materials in should be communicated to the Statewide Database by November 18th.

And at that time, we'll be able to sort of assess and -- be able to assess the extent to which we'll be able to implement those languages in the COI tool as well. So again, those are future discussions, just to sort of plant the seed. And I'm going to rewind again to the -- the slide about naming the tool.

So our -- the feedback that we're, again, requesting from you today. Should users go to the Commission website or to a standalone website to access the tool? And the Statewide Database already reserved the following domain names, which is WeShapeCA. That's the name we've been sort of working with and is implemented in the tool currently; WeShapeCalifornia, YouDrawCA, and we have reserved the dot org, dot com, and dot net versions for each of these names.

CRC Staff -- should the Commission choose, CRC staff can request the ca.gov domain name from the Department of Technology. And we, again, request today feedback on whether one of these names -- if we like one of these names, or if we want to reserve a different name, and Statewide Database will be able to reserve dot org, dot com, and dot net for any name that we receive feedback about today.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right. Jaime, just for the sake of perhaps making this question go along a little



faster, the Commission did discuss some of these. We didn't come to a resolution on all, but -- Commissioners, please remind me, but I believe, based on our last discussion that we had when the COI tool subcommittee reported out on this, we did -- I think, all believe or feel that the CRC website would be the most appropriate location for people to be able to access the COI tool, only because it makes it a one-stop kind of location, and it also gives it some trust in where people will be accessing the tool. So I'll just address that part.

And Commissioners, if any comments, suggestions, reactions to any of the names? We did present these previously before during our previous meetings report.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: There --

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Oh, Commissioner Vasquez?

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Yeah. And apologies if I'm misremembering. I agree that it should be on -- embedded on the website. However, I wasn't clear where we stood on sort of this idea of also a standalone website. Like, I'm not sure, in terms of development, there's the redistricting website, where you -- as a portal, so to speak. Is there also -- will there also still be then a standalone website, where I could type in one of these names and just get the tool? Did we decide on that?

Well, I guess I wasn't clear when we were discussing

previously what it meant when we said we wanted it on the website.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I think we just expressed some preferences. I think there were some questions as to which -- I think what you're asking, my recollection is that it would be preferable to have the CRC website be the portal, and then there could be a separate cage. But I guess I do have a question as to if there is a separate domain name, for example, WeShapeCA.ca.gov, will that mean that it is its own standalone web page website?

Commissioner Sadhwani and then Commissioners Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'd like the idea of it being its own separate website, that we would, of course, integrate what -- into whatever website we ultimately develop for ourselves, but that it can kind of be a standalone piece, where people can come, kind of play around.

And I -- and I'm imagining when this rolls out in January -- early January, that this could be up and running and ready to go, even if, in all honesty, if our own website's not quite ready yet, right. And that's one of my concerns. I wouldn't want to embed it onto the current website for us, because, as we discussed yesterday, it is old and need -- in need of repair, so I kind of like the idea of it being on a separate website

that will be embedded into whatever we have in the future, but that by doing so, it wouldn't impede us from moving it forward in early January.

And then to -- just to speak to the piece around dot org, dot com, et cetera, my preference would actually be dot org. I think when we put that CA dot gov, yes, it brings a level of gravitas, if you will, but at the same time, I think for a lot of community members, they might not want to share their information with a dot gov address for a whole variety of reasons of how they've come to the U.S., et cetera. So I kind of prefer the dot org gets standalone. We're still going to receive that information, but I think it might help just break down some of -- some of those barriers of having it be more accessible to folks.

And while I have my moment, I'll just add personally I like YouDrawCA.org, but I could be convinced to anything, so either way, it doesn't really matter.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Sinay and then Commissioner Fernandez and Commissioner Kennedy and Commissioner Turner and then Commissioner Vazquez and then Commissioner Yee.

Okay. I got to write this all down.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I kind of feel that this is one of our biggest challenges right now is that we haven't

branded ourselves, because we don't have the communications. I know that at different times we all said the whole shape California thing -- website is actually prettier, better logo, better colors than WeDrawTheLine. And so -- and I had this conversation when I was going through the Communities of Interest tool, is that we need a certain amount of flexibility because this tool isn't going to be a standalone. It's going to be embedded in everything we do in our outreach, our engagement, in the communities' outreach and engagement.

So whatever we call it, we also need to think about what we're calling ourselves. I don't think that we can say, okay, YouDrawCalifornia -- maybe the tool's called YouDrawCalifornia, and we, you know, WeDrawCalifornia is the bigger website, you know, the Commission. But I don't -- we can't be WeDrawtheLines and YouDrawCalifornia -- I guess you could do that, too.

But I just want -- there is a branding issue here that we need to resolve, and I think we can't resolve till we have our communications person, or we tell them what we want.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. In terms of whether it should be on our website or standalone, I can see the

benefit of having it on our website only, because -- I hate to use this -- but it kind of forces users to go to our website, and then maybe they'll become more aware of upcoming meetings, and maybe if we actually do -- are able to get into communities, it kind of keeps them informed as to where we are, in case they want to show up to one of the meetings or provide a feedback at one of our meetings.

So either way is fine with me. I do understand the issues with our website and whether or not -- I mean, there's issues with it, but --

Anyway, in terms of the name, I really like the YouDrawCalifornia only because we're giving it back to them, because it's going to be their piece of it. I mean, it's going to be their COI or whatever they see their Community of Interest. And I do like the dot org because that is associated with education, like school districts, and in community colleges, they're all dot orgs. So I kind of like that side of it, instead of dot com or dot net.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Just a couple of things. I would propose another option, drawing on these, which would be simply DrawCalifornia, not we, not you, just DrawCalifornia.

As far as the "top-level" domain, we can keep in mind that we can have multiples. We can have all of these. It could be DrawCalifornia dot org, dot com, dot net, and dot CA dot gov. We could have all four of those options. They all, in the end, point to the same place.

The point that I had made previously about dot gov addresses is that in the election community, at large, the feeling is that .gov domain names give people greater confidence that they are dealing with an official website and not a spoof.

Of course, the advantage of reserving all of these is that we then prevent anyone else from reserving something. If we had only dot org, somebody could come in and have dot com or dot net with the same first part of the name and fool people into using their site, rather than our site. So DrawCalifornia, neither we nor you, just DrawCalifornia, and then I would say, let's go for all four options, and maybe even .us. We could have five options, all of which point to the same place. Thank you.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.
Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I appreciate -- I kind of shifted after listening to Commissioner Kennedy. I was going to suggest that



JustMyCommunity.org. But I love DrawCalifornia the suggestion of having all of the domains attached. Also, I am in favor of having the standalone that points back to our site, our site that refers to the standalone. But I like the more options for people to interact. I want to draw people towards our own website, once it's up and running.

But sometimes they can be busy, and if people click on too many things, I think there is a study that talks about how much time people spends on any one site, and I would want -- not want them to get so busy clicking into other areas that they don't do the ultimate of what we need them to do right now as far as drawing their community.

So ultimately, I like reserving all of the domains, and I think now I really am interested in the DrawCalifornia. Thank you.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Vazquez.

And I'll add Commissioner Andersen after Commissioner Yee, and then Commissioner Mr. Taylor and Fornaciari. Sorry.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: No, sorry. Apologies. Thank you, Chair.

I like DrawCalifornia. Love the idea of reserving

everything and have it point to the same place. My comment was going to be because we're currently WeDrawtheLines, my concern with only using either WeShapeCalifornia, either iteration of those, it could potentially be confusing and frustrating in people's brains.

If they're trying to get to our website, and they keep getting the tool, that could be frustrating. And vice versa, if you're trying to get to the tool, but keep just getting our website, I think, could be frustrating. But I like the idea of DrawCalifornia and have all of these reserved to point to the right place.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Vasquez. Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. I just want to echo Commissioner Kennedy's thoughts. You know, every -- all -- we had all different people out there, right? So that some people will be more wary of dot CA dot gov. I myself would feel much -- more confident if I saw dot CA dot gov and more inclined to give it time and attention, if I felt it were official.

But we need to -- marketing. You need to reach all kinds of different people, all kinds of different ways, right? So different domains have it standalone and embedded, just because people are going to find us all

different ways. In terms of language, the ShapeCaliforniaFuture, that was the branding for the auditor's selection website, which is still up. The WeDrawtheLines, of course, is the one we inherited and still have. So shape versus draw, I do like the DrawCalifornia, just as simple as possible, and make it as accessible as possible.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

Commissioner Andersen is next, and then I'll add Commissioner Ahmad, too, after Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair.

And I totally agree with the -- Commissioner Kennedy. It's absolutely right. We have to reserve all of them, so -- all the domain names, I mean all the dot CA, all the gov to prevent people from corrupting and trying to put somebody else in this place and taking the information.

And in terms of which one we actually go with, I'm also kind of agreeable. I also think there are too many .gov, dot com, in terms of, is this the right one? I think dot CA kind of tends -- ca.gov tends to be the official one, but I understand the other issues.

In terms of it being a standalone, there is the issue of being confused. But regardless, it -- we have to have a link on ours that takes them to it and vice

versa. Now -- and I really understand and appreciate why everyone's saying I like that WeDraw. WeDraw. WeDraw.

But the problem is, is they are not -- and that's for participation. We want them to be participating, but they're not drawing the district lines. They're drawing their communities of interest. And I really think if you say WeDraw, they're going to think, well, I'm drawing my assembly lines, I'm drawing my Senate lines, I'm drawing. And it's too confusing.

They're actually shaping the lines, the ultimate lines. So for that reason, I mean, I -- it's going to get too confusing, because we are actually drawing lines. The public is not drawing the lines. We are drawing the lines with their help, with their input, with their shaping. They are shaping California.

So -- but I understand that there's confusion now, like, Commissioner Sinay said. We need to pick a title. We've had a couple of titles out there, and now we're kind of introducing another title. So since shape is already out there, in terms of participation, I'm leaning towards -- I think it really should be they're shaping California as the applicant pool is shaping. But the WeDrawtheLines is the Assembly line, the Senate line, the. Legislature line, and the Board of Equalization.

So I, I really think we need to make ShapeCalifornia



or WeShape as opposed to draw. So I hate to put the kibosh on it, but I think it's, ultimately, it's going to be confusing if they -- if they're drawing, but then they're not drawing.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: So Commissioner -- Commissioner Andersen, for clarity, if I'm hearing you correctly, what your feeling is, in terms of the name, it should be either WeShapeShapeCA or WeShapeCalifornia.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Absolutely correct.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I just want to make sure.

Thank you very much.

Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: And good morning. I'm going to hop on the Kennedy train. And he had some similar thoughts as I did. From a security standpoint, we need to have control over a number of the names to prevent spoofing as well as just misguided. You don't want to lose a misguided person that's trying to find the website.

And I'll use the YouDraw as a good example. It could be you or you or you multiple spellings of you. We can't assume, although it's rudimentary, we can assume at times that a person will correctly spell you. And that

being the case, I think it's common practice that some companies would capture all of those domain -- domain names so that it would generate where they'd want to go.

So if we use you, we have to be mindful that a person might not correctly spell you, and we don't want them to end up on the dark web somewhere, because they put in the wrong you. But yes, from a security standpoint, I think that we have to be mindful that we might have to have a number of domains that points to the same place. Thank you.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.
Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Let's see. I had to step out for a minute, so I missed a little bit of the conversation. I do like the idea of getting all the dot extensions that are appropriate. I think -- I mean -- so I just want to clarify something here. You know, if a website is a URL, somebody can just type in that URL and get there, right?

So this discussion about embedding versus standalone -- embedding, I mean, it's just going to be a link on our website that'll take somebody there. But it's still going to be a standalone because if it's got a URL, somebody can type it in. So just to kind of clarify that discussion. And I kind of fall on the DrawCA. I

still kind of like that idea.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Commissioner Ahmad and then Jaime.

Jaime, do -- is this something that you want to comment on? Okay.

MS. CLARK: No, it's --

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Sorry. Commissioner Ahmad, then let's have Jaime.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you. So sorry to interrupt. So some -- somebody at StateWideDatabase. I'm communicating with them to look into the domain names to make sure they're available. It sounds like DrawCA.org net, com, and DrawCalifornia are both taken. Draw-California is available. So yeah, I just wanted to add that because I feel like that may change this discussion.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. That is helpful.

Commissioner Ahmad, and then to -- back to Commissioner Fornaciari and then Commissioner -- Turner and then Commissioner Andersen. Okay.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you for your presentation, Jaime and Michael.

I might suggest that, if not, given what Commissioner Fornaciari just taught us about the URLs, if

this URL or website standalone tool is going to be specifically and only about the tool, it might be worth considering more descriptive URL, so that folks know that they are going to an actual tool in which they would be inputting their information about their COIs rather than a broad-shaping California type URL just for consideration.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad. Do you have a suggestion in terms of what would be descriptive?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I would not want to use COI tool, because people don't know what COI is, and spelling COI might be problematic, but something tool -- inputtool.com or something more generically about what you're going to be doing on that website, related to the actual tool itself, rather than our overall objective as a Commission, if that makes sense. I'll have to think through a little bit more about what kinds of descriptive URLs would be helpful.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.

Okay. I have Commissioner Fornaciari next, then Commissioner Turner, Commissioner Andersen, and Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I went. I'm done.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Okay.

All right. Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Two things. With the domain name of DrawCalifornia already being taken, I would not want to do a Draw-, because I think that would be the confusion and draw people to the wrong area, to the previous website that's already taken.

And then, having it be more descriptive then, I would perhaps go back to suggesting MyCommunity.org and all of the various suffixes, or -- because it gets too long to say MyCommunityofInterest or MyChosenCommunity. But maybe MyCommunity or something along those lines, so that people are clear that that is what they're going there for -- MyCommunityTool, MyCommunity.

Yeah. My community, I guess, is what -- something that says there is something that denotes their choice. My -- MyCommunityShape -- I don't know. Okay.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Okay. Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'm jumping right on the Commissioner Turner's there. I actually have CommunitiesShapeCalifornia or MyCommunityShapeCalifornia. Because I totally agree. If Draw California is already taken and we try to use any kind of Draw, like Draw-, we risk the security -- security risk. So I would like

it -- and with -- and then, again, grabbing all the dot CA, dot com, dot net, but maybe either -- I don't think communities could be misspelled. MyCommunity -- is that too long -- ShapeCalifornia.

I like community and -- but I also like the idea that they're kind of -- the communities are shaping. You know, MyCommunityShapesCalifornia kind of. You know, MyCommunity -- anyway, that's my idea.

CommunitiesShapeCalifornnia or
MyCommunityShapeCalifornia. No CA -- dot CA -- no CA.
MYCommunnityCA, CommunitiesShapeCA.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So Commissioner Andersen, I think what I'm hearing, the two keywords that you like are community and shape. We'll build upon that.

Okay. We're going to go to Commissioner -- to Kennedy and then to Commissioner Fernandez and then Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Couple things. One, I just looked up DrawCalifornia.org, dot com, dot net. It looks like those are being held by a domain name broker. It's not that they are active, it's that we might have to pay a little bit more for them. So it may still be worthwhile to check with the domain name broker as to what they're willing to let it go for.

I would be happy with ShapeCalifornia rather than

DrawCalifornia, if we don't find -- if we're not able to get the DrawCalifornia options. I think if we have a something like WeShapeCA, once we have the CA, and then you have to put dot CA dot gov, that's going to be confusing. So I think we should avoid a -- anything CA.ca.gov. Even though it would be easy with the others, I just think that's a bad way to go on that. I'll stop there. Thank you.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.
Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I liked Commissioner Ahmad's suggestion. So my thing -- my suggested name potentially could be DrawMyCACommunity, because then it's pretty specific to community and I -- shape versus draw, I think, for me, I guess, because English is my second language, I think draw would be easier for me to remember, and that's what I'm doing is drawing versus shaping. So it's kind of just a -- I think it's just a preference of either way.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.
Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: All right. Could she say that again, please? I missed it, what it was? DrawMy --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh. DrawMyCACommunity -- California, instead of draw -- spelling out California, just DrawMyCACommunity. But it's just long. That's the only unfortunate -- I still -- my preference would be YouDrawCA is number one. But if you want to put community in there, that's fine.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I'll take that one step further. How about just DrawMyCommunity.ca.gov? Community is -- we're talking about communities of interest, right. That is our focus. That's the language that is embedded in the task, so communities -- so DrawMyCommunity.ca.gov.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I love that. I -- just putting on my professor hat. Sadly, many people spell community wrong. But just want to throw that out there. The double m is just very confusing to people.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Turner and then Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. And so with that, I like DrawMyCACommunity instead of CommunityCA to get into -- to avoid that dot CA that Commissioner Kennedy was talking about.

And I'm wondering if indeed we end up with DrawMyCACommunity to Commissioner Sadhwani's point, can we have both spellings, the correct and the incorrect spelling of community with one m and still point to the same website.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No, I like that. And I was just going to respond to Commissioner Sadhwani. Yes, it is misspelled many times. You're absolutely correct.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Ms. Clarke, I believe you need an answer from us today on this question. Is this one of the ones that you were hoping to get an answer today?

MS. CLARK: Yeah. We need feedback about this today so that we can, again, reserve all domain names and also fold the name into all of the materials that we're producing around this. We could also come away with a list of names from the Commission, and then, you know, next time we see you or report back to the subcommittee around what names were available and what name is integrated into the tool.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

I see that Mr. Wagaman is going to weigh -- wants to weigh in on this. Okay.

MR. WAGAMAN: I just wanted to -- and to keep your conversation moving along, it sounds like there's some consensus potentially around some variant of DrawMyCACommunity and DrawMyCommunity. You know, if you're -- if you're if the Commission is comfortable leaving us a little -- well, we can use that as generalized direction, see what domains are available, understanding the feedback about trying to reserve any variance on community that people might misspell. Statewide Database can staff on working -- on reserving the multiple dot orgs, dot -- dot coms, etc. And then -- then and then they can work with your staff on working on reserving that dot CA, dot gov.

And when we come back on the 30th, report on where that finally landed. But that would give us the direction of just generalized what the branding is and knowing what your generalized feedback is. So if that is a consensus, that's how I can implement this item.

MS. CLARK: And a quick follow up. I just got a communication that I think that all of these are available; MyCommunity, DrawMyCACommunity, DrawMyCommunity, et cetera. So we can look into folding all of those in for now, and as well, again, as Mr. Wagaman stated, as well as the misspelling of "community" and then report back to the subcommittee, in

terms of which name became integrated. Taking the general direction of one of these names is requested or is a point of feedback.

MR. WAGAMAN: Thank you.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right.

Okay, Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Just can you also see if DMC is available?

MS. CLARK: D-M-C?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

MS. CLARK: DrawMyCommunity.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: DMCC. So as we --

MS. CLARK: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- talked about this morning --

MS. CLARK: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- we may be able to just tell people DMCC.

MS. CLARK: Thank you.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. All right. I think I will take this as some consensus that Mr. Wagaman, your suggestion is acceptable to work out some variation of the keywords that were attractive to all the Commissioners.

Perhaps this is also a time to consider, Ms. Clarke, maybe trying to reserve as many of the variations as quickly as possible so that if somebody is listening and does not have a positive intent, doesn't try to tie up all these names and try to sell it back to us, so --

MS. CLARK: Yes.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Then we're back to square one.

MS. CLARK: Thank you. I just think -- I just made that precise request to our staff member who's on standby to reserve all of these. So, yeah. Fingers crossed. We get all of them.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Excellent.

MS. CLARK: And they could all eventually redirect to the same place.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yes, I think that that would be ideal. I think that's what we were hearing, we -- and perhaps if you could also ask your staff member to think about other variations, in terms of -- besides the dot com, the dot net, the dot org, are -- is there like -- I've seen dot us. So perhaps they could also look at all of those so that it all feeds into the same place.

MS. CLARK: Thank you.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So are you -- are -- so I think we're okay on this. We can move on to the next question that you need an answer from -- from us today.

Okay?

MS. CLARK: Yes, please. And the next point of feedback is around what questions or prompts are in the tool to get users thinking about and describing their communities of interest. Currently, the -- currently, these prompts for users are the name of the community, what is the mutual interest, and why should it be kept together? Based on current feedback, the name of the community and what is the mutual interest are required fields for submission and why should it be kept together is optional.

Our -- we request feedback today from the Commission around should the questions change, or should they remain the same, and which questions should be required, and which questions should be optional?

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: And I would say I'm happy with the name of community and what is the mutual interest being required? That does seem to be the fundamental thing that we're going for.

I do believe that it would be useful for us to ask our questions -- to further questions that can be useful for us in either creating coalition districts or, if necessary, depending on how large or how big someone goes in defining their community of interest, if it has to be

split.

So I would propose that we also ask something along the lines of, if your district -- if your community of interest is not large enough to be its own district, which of your neighboring communities of interest are you most interested in being grouped with? Because some people may be happy to be grouped with -- over here, but not the people over there.

And secondly, if your community is larger than the district size, are there considerations that you would like us to have in mind when we split it?

MS. CLARK: I'm -- pardon me, quickly. One note for the Commission to keep in mind when discussing this suggestion is that users will not be able to see submissions of communities of interest that have been submitted by other users. So asking what other communities of interest, with that specific phrasing, would require or, I guess, would imply that users are aware of which communities of interest have already been submitted. And I guess a suggestion around that could just be to change the phrasing to be something like what other neighborhoods or what areas close to your community of interest, but not necessarily use the phrase communities of interest.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I see Commissioner Sinay

and then also Commissioner -- Mr. Wagaman and then Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Hi. I just -- just for clarification, I kind of see that there's two steps in the -- in what we're doing. One is the input where we're getting input from as many people as possible for communities of interest. And then the second step is, yeah, we -- obviously, we take that, we bring it together, we draw the first set of maps.

And then there's a second step of getting that input on the actual maps. I see this one as we need to keep it as simple as possible and accessible as possible to individuals. And the more questions we ask, the more likely people are just going to throw up their arms and say, forget it.

I also think that the second question, no one understands except for academics. I mean, we need -- anything and everything we create, we need to do a language check to make sure it's not higher than eighth-grade level, if not even more simplified. My recommendation is name of your community, what brings you together, and that allows that -- it builds on that idea of community, what brings you together, and why should it -- why should you be kept together, how should you be kept together?

And I don't know -- and that might explain more of the geographic, who are the neighbors, what other communities. I'm not sure. But mutual interest is something I would take out. And I do think that the third question should be optional, because some people may be like, I already told you what brings us together, what do you -- what's the difference? So is the only thing I can think of.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Mr. Wagaman.

MR. WAGAMAN: Very happy not to be a commissioner. So one thing just to clarify, we're not going to be looking for exact language out of feedback for today, as I think Commissioner Sinay just pointed out. What makes sense to 14 highly-educated people on this call, may not make sense when we go back and do usability testing. If there's generalized feedback of like language or words to look at like those just provided, that is helpful feedback. So on that piece, we should note that not less to hear what there is going to be a generalized note field for when they actually submit. So that is an option if people want to submit additional information that is not a specific prompted question.

And then so really the key thing is in this discussion that you are having is, is there a question you want to ask? Is there a question you don't want to

ask? Is that something helpful or is there something that's a hindrance? And that is where we are looking for feedback.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right. Thank you. That was helpful.

Commissioner -- looks like Commissioner Turner's next, followed by Taylor and then Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. And that is helpful. The suggestion that I have for this, to bring clarity, would be the first one, name of more desired community followed with what is your shared interest, followed with why should this community be kept together. I think would be clear for anyone to understand and get what we need.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Commissioner Turner was clairvoyant. What is your interest as mutual -- I think mutual can be exclusive. And yes, Commissioner Turner said it just as I would have put it. Thank you.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor. Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I kind of agree with Commissioner Sinay. Once we know what the

mutual interest is, I think we have a clue, a good clue, of why the user would want it to be kept together. And on the two additional questions that I had proposed, I believe that if we organize the input screen properly, the two are mandatory questions being, you know, front and center, highlighted, et cetera, and any other questions being lower, much less prominent on the screen, I don't think we're going to have a problem with drop off. I mean that may just be me, but that's my thinking on that.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

Commissioner Andersen, followed by Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So sorry. So I'm next?

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you.

Yeah, I do like your name of community, and then I actually would not put "Why should you be kept together?", something like that, because that immediately goes, wait, you're trying to break me up? You're -- that's like a little kid. Don't put beans in your nose. Oh, I can put beans in my nose. You know, these are basic things you just don't say, which you don't do.

And it immediately implies to me -- when I read

that, I thought, uh-oh, we're going to -- we're trying to cut the communities apart, and we're not. We want to -- so I would actually go with three different things; one is "Name the community" and then on your -- the -- about the mutual interest, I like the "What's your shared interest?"

I would also, though, put a couple of short questions there, not just one, because then they -- to give them a little bit more information, I would say, "What is your shared interest?" "What does your group do?" or "What brings you together?" Those three -- and then -- because then they're typing in what they do.

But then I would put, and it could be named, and then this, a drop-down. And that would be "Pick your type of community", with the categorizations being social, business, landmark, advocates, other, and a line that then they would say whatever it is.

And the reason I'm doing that is because I feel what we're trying to get out of this is who are the communities? We're trying to understand what the communities are. Then we also have to sort the communities. And so, I'd kind of like them to kind of think what kind they are.

Also, drop-downs are really easy to do, and we're already asking them to write quite a bit; the name sort

of a drop-down with the "other" there that they can write in whatever they want. And then that general, "Who are you?" Tell us about yourself almost. But short -- like three short little questions, because I figure on the different questions, how they translate to different languages, you're going to get the idea across.

So just those kind of three things. And I think then we're getting -- certainly getting enough information.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Sadhwani is next.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I was just going to offer another alternative to "mutual", might be "common". But I'd also like to share that I like Commissioner Andersen's thoughts around the three questions for the drop-down box. I could see how that could be helpful in terms of sorting the comments as they come in or the shape files and such as they come in. But I also think that we would need to work on the draft on that.

I don't understand what an advocate community of interest really would be. Like, maybe as a linguist. You know, I think that that could work. I'd have to think about that.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I remember thinking about doing something like that with the drop-down when I was going through the tool. My only concern is would others interpret it as some types are more important than others? So let's say they give their input, and we don't listen to it later, and they say, oh yeah, they only cared about economic interests. I know that I put "advocacy" or whatever.

So I kind of see keeping things simple on this and so that later people don't have -- they don't use whatever we're asking them against us or make judgments that we chose not to listen to them for x, y, z, reason. That was kind of where I was coming from when it was You -- yeah, YouDraw -- the tool is a you draw, and it all comes together, and it's a we draw. It's a bigger effort.

So a lot of the input I had also given to the tool was this idea of when they -- when it gets inputted, they go to a map on our site that shows all the dots. It does -- they can't go in, but they can see the communities and stuff where a lot of input has come in so that they can see I'm one dot in all these other dots. And we -- just that whole feeling of trying to push democracy -- so people understand that democracy.

What I have learned from being on the school board

and being attacked, which is where we're heading at some point, is that people, if you don't do what they say, they will tell you they were not heard. And so, you need to show people that they've been heard all -- every step of the way. And that's why that dot, as much as it's simple -- okay, I think it's simple.

I already saw Mr. Wagaman raise his hand. So maybe it's not that simple. But that idea of, yes, you were heard, but there's all these other people and now we've got to make -- I kept calling it a puzzle, but now we need to bring some clarity to all these pieces.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

I did see Mr. Wagaman, and then after that, Commissioner Yee.

MR. WAGAMAN: Sure. And just three things. On the dots, that is actually something that is not particularly complicated to translate the polygons into dots, but that's where, again, when we talked earlier about kind of the part that's under the legislature's primary responsibility versus yours, that decision of how you want to synthesize this data is that's the part that would fall under the Commission.

And so, if that's something you desire, would be something to include with the discussions with your staff. To Commissioner Andersen's question about the

dropbox, that's something that has come up previously during development. What we found is that it becomes challenging, because some communities wanted to find themselves in multiple ways, or they wanted to define themselves in a way that maybe you folks haven't thought of, and it ends up becoming very difficult, much more difficult than you might anticipate to kind of do it that way, unfortunately, because communities are not clean objects, like cities and counties and -- which is what you're dealing with here.

And then on that question, just as feedback, these three questions you're seeing here are actually pretty commonly seen in a lot of local redistrictings, where they're looking for these issues. And on the third kind of variant of why is it being kept together, that is something that sometimes decision-making bodies find helpful because you are going to be weighing competing communities of interest and looking at this is clearly community interest, that's clearly a community of interest, which one, if we can't keep them both whole.

I think it came up from Dr. Johnson when he was doing your training, that talking about I think it was a Latino-based community of interest. That's what defined it. But what was really critical to them was a water issue. So what made them a community wasn't necessarily

why they wanted to be kept together. That's a balance for the Commission to decide and provide feedback if that's worthwhile or not. But just so you have that background for your debate and discussion.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Mr. Wagaman. We're going to go to Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, that's -- I thought on the first question, "Name of community", I'm wondering if there would be better "Name for your community". The way it's phrased right now, "Name of community" sort of implies that the name already exists, that it's a known embassy, and we're actually more interested in communities that aren't already named and known, right, because we actually might even have other ways to get to those.

We're interested in communities that people think are out there that should be kept together that aren't as obvious, right. So "Name for your community" makes it more clear that they can't be a community that isn't already widely known and named. And they could make one up.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Okay. Not seeing anything else, I'll just make a last comment.

Mr. Wagaman, I do appreciate what you said about some of these questions being the same as what some of

the other local redistricting commissions have done. I think you may have already realized this by now. We are not necessarily following the same road as everybody else. And we do want to challenge, sometimes perhaps be a little bit more creative in how we want to do things.

And I would agree with, I think, what Commissioner Sinay said about trying to keep the questions as simple as possible. I find that so much can be left up to multiple interpretations, and the more clearer and more simply, something can be stated, I think then we'll be able to ensure that we get better quality data. It's -- there is a saying, garbage in, garbage out.

And if we don't ask the questions in the right way, we may not get the kind of data that we want to see. And so, I think that that's something for all of us to keep in mind. I also appreciate, Commissioner Yee, what your suggestion about the name of the community, instead calling it "name for your community". I think you are right. I think there are communities where it's not named and so best to allow people to think about what do you want to name it, because what you name it may not be what someone else may name.

On the drop-down menu item, I think you already really touched on it. My first reaction is, well, what if I'm not on there. And I'm oftentimes in a place where

I have felt that way. I'm not reflected in this menu of choices. And so I just feel like, well, then you're just not interested in hearing from me.

So I think anything that's going to prevent somebody from feeling like they could be included in this process is not going to be something that we would be interested in seeing. We want to hear from everybody and as many people in whatever ways they can be engaged, I think that that's what we should and what we want to keep in mind.

Commissioner Kennedy, I see your hand up. I'll go to you next.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.

Two things. One, yes, I agree that we want to keep questions simple. I don't know that I -- I still believe that asking or offering users the opportunity to respond to optional questions can significantly improve the quality of the draft maps that we eventually present. And the less controversy there can be over the first set of draft maps, the better.

So I continue to believe that asking one or two more optional questions, designing the screen so that it's very clear that we have, you know, hopefully, two mandatory questions and, hopefully, no more than two optional questions, I think, in the long run, that's going to pay dividends. And yes, I agree with

Commissioner Yee that giving more flexibility in providing a name is a good thing. Thank you.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez and then Mr. Wagaman and then Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Actually, it was just going to be a question for Jaime and Michael.

Will the individuals know if their community of interest is large enough or not? So I mean, I understand what Commissioner Kennedy is getting at, which is important, because I may not want to be grouped with this other group, but they may not know if their group is big enough. Does that make sense?

MR. WAGAMAN: The short answer is they won't know, because the tool is going to be released before the census data is released, so we won't know.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner -- Mr. Wagaman, did you have anything else you wanted to add?

MR. WAGAMAN: I just wanted to really compliment the Commission on the feedback. The key thing I've taken away from this is, and it's tremendous feedback, is the emphasis on phrasing these questions about the user themselves. What is my community? What is your community? What is it that makes your community? What is it that ties you where you work together?

That language, it goes back even to the discussion

on how to name and brand it. So that is clearly good feedback that can be integrated into finalizing the language on that. So I just wanted to compliment you on, on that feedback.

And then to Commissioner Kennedy's feedback, because we'd heard that previously during the work with the subcommittee. I know the database has already been talking about options of ways to potentially integrate those potentially slightly higher, more complicated questions and -- but make them optional, but still prompt people that those are things that they might want to provide additional feedback on without taking away from the core. So that feedback has already been registered and integrated into kind of that final development.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Wagaman. Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you for that. And also, I realize how Commissioner Kennedy is now looking at this, and I totally agree. And then I -- for number one, I would actually say community name. That way it's just easier, simple, rather "name for" "name of" just a "community name" so they can name it whatever they want or if it has a name, put it down, whatever. And that's required.

Then I still sort of like a couple of sentences for

the number two, trying to get at the interest. What keeps them together. I think you totally understand where we're coming from. Tell us about your community.

Then I like -- I do like the idea of optional items, and see though, they'll say they're optional, but it does give people -- might want to give us more information. And I understand exactly what you're saying about the drop-down is too -- it needs to be your categories. But we could say, "What type of community are you?" for example, and just list them or say "such as", because that's a better one to example.

And do a couple -- we could even do like a mix, you know, social business, culture, cultural, a couple of different ones just to give them. And if they don't put anything down, that's no problem, or if they put a combination, because we are expecting them to be combinations. So I think that would give them an option. And then "What binds your community?" in terms of what keeps you together, as opposed -- because we don't -- again, I don't want to go, "What keeps you -- "Why should you be kept together?"

I want it -- I want them to tell us why they need to be together. So it's -- "What binds your community together?" or something like that, as opposed to the difference being, don't approach it as something they

could immediately interpret as you're trying to cut us apart.

But I like the idea of a couple of different optional questions because that's really more the information that we -- we're kind of going to need, or all of it's what we need. But the more we get out of them, the easier it will be for us to evaluate them. And I think if we leave it more generically like that, they won't be able to say, well, you just got rid of this, because we didn't like that.

And as far as putting -- rather than putting dots, could we have when they go in, can they -- on the tool, could they -- if they -- say if they want to go say reflect this area and all of the communities of interest will pop up. Is that an option for them?

MR. WAGAMAN: Right now the --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right.

MR. WAGAMAN: -- the development of the tool is not intended to show multiple communities from other people's submissions? It's really designed to just capture here's yours. Now, again, that is the discussion point for this Commission is how do you want to take all those, and do you want to set up your own tool to then show all the communities that have been submitted by all your fellow citizens.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. So that that would be something that we might have on our website. You know, go here, you know, submit, and then we could go on our website, the conglomeration to date. But that would not be you, that would be us. Is that what I'm -- that's my -- is that --

MR. WAGAMAN: Correct.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Got it. Thank you very much.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. So that would be us just building on that. And just to give part of what I'm -- the reason my brain went there right away, when I went through the exercise, was that will help our partners in our outreach to know what areas we still need to get -- we need to do more work in or -- and we can turn it into a competition. There's a lot of things we can do, kind of like the census did.

So we can talk about when we're talking about visioning later and civic technology, civic design.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. And my understanding, I believe that Commissioner Kennedy and I had this conversation with Jaime, in terms of being able to see the other COIz around a certain area. And I believe the understanding that I had from that was that that the tool

itself cannot do that, but it would have to be embedded in with another software that would be able to show all of that.

And Jaime, I know, Commissioner Turner, I think you had your hand up.

Jaime, if you could answer that question, then we'll go to Commissioner Turner.

MS. CLARK: That's correct. So again, this -- the COI tool will be able to show users their own submissions, their own drafts, or the COI that they're working on in that moment. And then the Commission will be sent files that could be pulled up using different redistricting software.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I just wanted to reiterate. I think at the top where it could -- if we were to change to just community name, I think that would be confusing for a lot of people. I think they would be stumped at that point trying to determine what their community is. What is this area called? I think it would have to say either, as Commissioner Yee suggested, "name for your community", or as I suggested earlier, saying, "What is the desired name for your community?"

But something that says you get to choose and make

it up right now on the spot, as opposed to having a community member thinking there is already a name that they need to figure out what is area called?

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Turner. Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'll make this quick. I know we're nearing our break. Since -- I kept hearing the conversation around a drop-down menu come up, and I just wanted to provide it from a data perspective. When offering categorical choices, you can no longer disaggregate the data. But if you have an open textbox, so to speak, you can always aggregate back up by whatever metric you decide.

And there are qualitative data analysis tools, like Atlas TI to Duce that we can use to kind of pull out the themes based off of variables, whether it be geographic or census tract or whatever we want to look at that time. But putting in a drop-down menu might prohibit us from being able to go back and look deeper into what does it even mean to have a social community or an economic community. So I just offer that perspective.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Great. Thank you very much. That's helpful to know.

Okay. All right, Jaime and Michael, do you -- okay. I was going to say, do you have what you need from us?

Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Just following up on Commissioner Turner's suggestion. If we made it, "Give your community a name", seems like that would achieve what we're looking for. And on the on the types of community, it seems to me that implicitly or explicitly, we're going to be looking at that ourselves on the back end. We can always code it on the back end however we want to, with multiples or combinations or whatever.

So yeah, I like the generic idea, but it may just be easier for us to look at that on the back end than having that on the user interface. Thank you.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: I'll just also comment. In terms of the names of the community, I do like what Commissioner Kennedy just said, but I also do like Commissioner Yee's. I think when you put in a desired name, people will start thinking and thinking hard about it. I -- that was just my reaction. I think if you just say "Name for your community", it almost implies a casualness. So it's whatever people just come up with at that time that it may speed along and encourage greater participation.

I do also wonder, in terms of the kind of the categorizing that Commissioner Kennedy also just mentioned, if that could be elicited from the names that

people choose or the words that people choose for the names of their community as a way of both aggregating and also disaggregating groupings of people based on what they choose to call their communities.

Just trying to think about how not to overcomplicate some things. And I'm sure the data tools are out there that could make that available.

Okay, so Jaime and Michael, do you have what you need on this and -- okay. Sounds good. Shall we move on?

I know the other two items that you presented, Jaime, were not things that you needed decisions from us today. I am also conscious that we are around the time that we should be taking our break. And the question I have is, do you want us to engage in this conversation today around the remaining two issues, or is this a conversation that I can ask the Commissioners to be thinking about and then come ready at a later point, right before it's due or when it's due to then provide some feedback to you all -- to the both of you.

MR. WAGAMAN: It was our --

MS. CLARK: Yes.

MR. WAGAMAN: Go ahead, Jaime.

MS. CLARK: Yes, the latter certainly is -- would be quite welcomed.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. That sounds good. I also know that I'm sure that there's probably quite a bit of public comment that may be desired on the part of those who want to make public comments about this. We do need to take a break. Would the both of you be able to stay on for a little bit, while we go through the break? And then after we come back, we'll take public comment, if there's any. And then right after that, we'll let you go. All right. Thank you.

Let's go ahead. Let's take our 15-minute break and it's 11:16.

All right. Thank you. Welcome back. We'd like to take public comment now on the topic of the tool and the questions that were posed to us by the Statewide Database team and the legislature.

And Katy, shall we go to the instructions?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes.

In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment during their meeting by phone. There will be opportunities to address the Commissioners regarding the items on the agenda. There will also be opportunities for the public to comment, submit general comments about items not on the agenda. Please note that the Commission is not able to comment or discuss items

not on the agenda.

The Commission will advise the viewing audience when it is time to submit public comment. The Commissioners will then allow time for those who wish to submit to public comment, to dial in.

To call in on your phone, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed using your dial pad. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press pound. Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a queue from which a moderator will begin unmuting callers to submit their comment. You will also hear an automatic message to press star nine to raise your hand, indicating you wish to comment.

When it is your turn to speak, the moderator will unmute you, and you will hear an automatic message, the host would like you to talk and to press star six to speak. You will have two minutes to provide your comments. Please make sure to mute your computer or live stream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your call. Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when it is your turn to speak, and please turn down the livestream volume.

The Commissioners will take comment for every action item on the agenda. As you listen to the online video



stream, the Chair will call for public comment. That is the time to call in. The process for making a comment will be the same each time, beginning by the telephone number provided on the livestream feed and following the steps stated above. So the comment will -- the comments are in relation to the COI toll, and we do have someone in the queue. If they will press star nine to raise their hand, which they don't have to, but I will -- and --

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Looks like we have one person.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, I've clicked on their thing. If they'll --

If you'll hit star six to unmute yourself, you'll be able to join the meeting. Please state and spell your name for the court reporter.

MS. MARKS: Hello? Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes. Please state and spell your name --

MS. MARKS: -- Yeah.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- for the court reporter.

MS. MARKS: Thank you. My name is Julia Marks, J-U-L-I-A M-A-R-K-S, and I'm calling from Asian Americans Advancing Justice, Asian Law Caucus. And I just want to start off by saying thank you for all the thoughtfulness

in that previous discussion of the COI tool. The questions in the tool will be very important in getting full and robust community input, as you know. And I just was very pleased with how deeply you're engaging with the word choice and all of those matters.

I did want to say I particularly appreciated the comments about the need to keep saying in general enough that no specific communities are feeling excluded by the tool. So having a specified drop-down, could make some folks feel excluded, like their category of a community doesn't count as a community of interest. And also some of the concerns around asking for the name of a community. I do think some folks don't see their community named by outside forces, and I just want to be sure that they feel like communities without a title account to for redistricting purposes.

So I heard a lot of that in your discussion and just wanted to kind of affirm that piece of what you were talking about. And then secondly, I wanted to highlight the language access issue. I know there will be additional discussion in future meetings, but just a preliminary note that the current plan covers languages that are required by federal law for voting rights purposes. But in California, we also have a large number of languages covered by state law to ensure that more

language communities can fully participate in the democratic process. And we would strongly urge you to consider expanding the list to include all the languages covered under state law.

And then further to seek additional input from community-based organizations on other languages to include. There are some serious gaps in the voting coverage. For example, African languages are not covered, and those folks should be equally included in this process too. So we would just recommend including more languages and soliciting additional input on finalizing that list over the next couple of weeks. Thank you very much.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And that was the only person we have in the queue at this time.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Okay. Looks like no one else is waiting.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: No one else is waiting in the queue.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right. Okay. Well, then I am going to thank Mr. Wagaman -- Michael, and Ms. Clark -- Jaime. Thank you very much for joining us and for this discussion and for your work. I look forward to revisiting with you again on the future questions. All

right.

MR. WAGAMAN: Thank you.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right. So moving on to -- back on to our agenda. I would like to bring us back to agenda Item Number 9, Subagenda H, VRA Compliance. Commissioner Sadhwani and Yee.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. And I hope you don't hear a lot of background noise from those lawnmowers outside. So thank you all. We -- Commissioner, you and I have been busy having conversations about the VRA and about how to go about training for -- additional training for Commissioners for the VRA, as well as thinking about hiring VRA counsel, et cetera. So we're excited to report back a few things and just give you all an update of where we're at.

First of all, we had conversations with Angelo Ancheta, the former Commissioner from 2010, who's also submitted public comments, as you might recall, on the VRA that was very helpful. Last night, we also had a conversation with Rosalind Gold from NALEO, the education fund, the National Association of Latino Elected Officials. And you might recall the name because she's called in numerous times and has been engaged as a community advocate on the Commission since the 2010 time period.

I had also had a conversation -- and I brought this up yesterday for the Line Drawer Committee because it happened in that committee was that in the conversation with Karen McDonald, one of the things -- who was the line drawer, just as a reminder, as under Q2, not under the Statewide Database hat that she also wears, one of her major concerns that she shared with us was about the interaction between the line drawer and VRA council and the Commission and managing that relationship and the expectations of it.

So one of the things that we're learning is that there's a lot of overlap between these two committees, and I'm very thankful and glad to be able to sit on both of them so that we can understand and see that overlap.

In particular, she had mentioned that the VRA council that had been hired last time, Gibson Dunn, was poorly trained, in fact, on the VRA, and that her team, which included an attorney who had previously worked at the Justice Department, was actually running trainings on the VRA for some of the junior attorneys for Gibson Dunn.

Just to kind of verify this, we actually identified -- Marian had helped us identify a letter from 2010 from NALEO from what was then the Asian Pacific American Legal Center, now Advancing Justice Los Angeles, as well as one other group. And I would have to just go

back and find that letter.

It is still, I believe, publicly available, specifically suggesting that the outside counsel that the Commission was seeking was inadequate. In addition, Mr. Ancheta had kind of said about the same thing. So I wanted to flag that for you all. I mentioned yesterday when we were speaking about the line drawer, that there's this overlap. And so I think this is a really important piece for us to kind of know as we move forward that when we're considering hiring VRA counsel, that we have a range of options and that that we really need to ensure -- we need to identify kind of the right questions to be asking and the right kind of background and experience that we're going to want to expect. Some of the feedback that we've had -- and so, of course, Commissioner Yee and I are attempting to do that and compile that for the full Commission's consideration.

One of the reminders actually, that in both of our conversations that we've had was that we do not need to hire someone California-based necessarily, that the VRA and compliance with the VRA. VRA is a national law, and especially during COVID, where much of our work is not in-person, certainly, counsel could come from outside of the state and still be perfectly sufficient and perhaps even better. And that such counsel for the redistricting

that we will do, the actual line drawing can be different from if and when we ever have any litigation that we need to consider.

So I wanted to put that out there, particularly in light of our conversation around the org. chart and such things, as we're starting to think about what our future looks like. I just want to remember that there's flexibility there, that it does not need to look exactly as it did in 2010. It doesn't need to be outside counsel necessarily. It could be someone that we hire as a staff as well.

We also wanted to bring up the -- some of the pieces that we've heard as well. HR4, the Voting Rights Advancement Act of 2019, what -- was passed by the House of Representatives in December 2019. This bill would reauthorize the full Voting Rights Act, as well as expand upon it. And we're working to identify a helpful fact sheet on it. At present, it is not law. It was passed by the House, and I don't believe any action was taken in the Senate. I think what a lot of people are thinking about is whether -- if, after the election, if Senate changes, if the White House changes, would something like this bill move forward?

So I don't think we need to do a ton of research on it at this point, but certainly, I wanted to put it on



the radar of the Commission, because after the election, of course, we'll have a better sense of what changes may or may not occur. But as of right now, Section 5 is dormant. That could change. And that could very well change the process in which we take on our work. If say the former counties become covered again by some sort of new VRA, we would -- might need to do them first, right, in order to have DOJ clearance. So -- pre-clearance. So I'm just putting that out there to be on everyone's radar and we'll continue to kind of monitor that over the next several weeks and months.

Some other pieces, some issues that we might want to face. Again, this is something we'll need to start thinking about. It's been brought up in several conversations is issues around coalition districts and unity mappings on the coalition district, which ultimately are very -- two sides of a very similar stone. The idea of putting various communities who would be protected under the VRA, potentially under Section 2, putting them together in various formulations, unity mapping, and have talked -- several people have talked about this before in some of our trainings, when various communities might come together and request to be kept together.

So these are some of the things that we'll need to



be -- just kind of have on our radar for the future. In terms of counsel, I think that, as I mentioned, we are trying to compile a list of some of the kinds of questions we should be asking. And certainly to Director Claypool's call yesterday, we recognize the importance of moving quickly on this. We feel like we should be setting a timeline for the Commission of early January to be actively recruiting more or already have VRA counsel at least on retainer so that we would be ready to move forward with public outreach.

So hopefully to have identified that person by early January, which is a very similar timeframe as the rollout of the COI tool that we just discussed. That means we'll need to move very quickly. And so we are actively considering what that process should look like.

Our hope, in terms of training, is to do additional training for the Commission. We've had several conversations about what that may or may not look like, and we still welcome feedback from the Commissioners. I had asked for feedback last time. We still haven't received any, and that's okay.

One of the things that we're thinking about is some sort of training regarding the VRA in action. So we've had training on what is the VRA. But I think what our sense is, is that we really want to think about, well,

what did -- what would a VRA litigation look like? What has it looked like? What are some cases that we might want to be aware of?

And then more specifically, taking a look at some examples, right. So what are various kinds of -- what will VRA compliance look like when we're actually in communities trying to draw those lines? So we have not yet reached out to Justin Levitt, who's provided other trainings for us, but that is our next step -- our anticipated next step.

We've also received input. We -- I received an email this morning from Jonathan Mehta from the -- Common Cause California. He's addressed us previously, providing additional ideas about VRA training and individuals. And he had suggested MALDEF and others as possible organizations who are heavily involved in VRA litigation who could come and provide additional training.

Commissioner Yee, have I missed anything on our list?

COMMISSIONER YEE: You have covered it very thoroughly. Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Concretely, you know, in terms of timing to get VRA council in place by early 2021, the question will be, okay, when do we start drafting RFPs -- and RFP for that?

And so I think we need a little bit of direction from the Commission on that as well as eventually the related question of recruiting RPV consultants -- consultant or consultant.

So, yeah. Just commenting on the point about coalition districts or unity mapping. Just to emphasize, that's kind of the frontier. It's not something we're required to do, but something that people are looking at more carefully. And case law seems to be so far that it's allowable but not required. So the VRA mostly has concerned single-identified, mostly racial-ethnic groups. But what if two groups vote similarly or, you know, how would we consider it?

So that's kind of our frontier that we will be exploring, and it's a philosophical and kind of a demographic development for us to consider newly. I think that's about it. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. And I would just add, I know that we're finalizing the agenda for November 4th, 5th, 6th, I believe, so I might just propose that we would have some time potentially for a training, if we can coordinate it quickly enough, for the meeting that follows that. And I don't have those dates in front of me.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. I'm sorry,

Commissioner Sinay -- Sadhwani, you want something on the 4th through the 6th?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think the following meeting so that we don't --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- disturb that -- the wonderful agenda you've already put together and work on it.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: All right. For -- sorry for jumping in without raising my hand, but I'm just about to push the button to send the change to Raul.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No problem. No, that's why I said the next one. The next one so that we have a little bit more time. And we do not -- we have not reached out to anyone yet to confirm such a training, so it'll give us a little bit of extra time.

I don't know, Commissioner Yee, if you if you feel like we would be prepared at that point to start putting together some kind of RFP or other solicitation, given the list that we were -- we received yesterday. But I think by mid-November, we should -- we would probably want to be able to have that out.

So my sense is that meeting after November 4th at 6:00, which -- and I don't have those dates in front of me, I apologize, but that that would be a really kind of

crucial time to kind of move forward some of this VRA work.

COMMISSIONER YEE: If we're not ready now, we need to be. So yeah --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Exactly.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Maybe just emphasize also that -- as background, that the selection of VRA counsel for the 2010 Commission was controversial and did have pushback. So the third party to the particular letter that Commissioner Sadhwani mentioned, along with NALEO and the Malaya Asian Pacific American Legal Center, as it was then named, was the African American Redistricting Collaborative. And it was a quite a strong and detailed letter.

So there was controversy probably because the Commission did not look -- the 2020 Commission did not look outside of California. So did not have a wider range of candidates. So just that's worth keeping in mind, I think.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So just for clarification, the meeting that you're talking about, Commission Sadhwani, is the is the meeting November 16th. And I believe Commissioner Kennedy is the chair of that particular meeting.

Marian, I see that you have your --

MS. JOHNSTON: That's what I was going to say also.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. All right. So just for clarification, and then if there's any comments, we -- let's go ahead and take those. I just want to clarify. I heard two things from you, and we'll also add this to the milestones discussion that we'll also be having so that we can have all of these different actions and/or things like the creation of the selection or the RFP for the VRA council. I think that's what I'm hearing is that we will need to act on RFP and then, hopefully, having hired the VRA council by January.

But that means that, in terms of our process, your drafting of the RFP will begin in mid-November. So that's what I heard. I also heard mention are the -- of the racially polarized voting, the RPV, was the acronym used earlier. Is your intent to also have an RFP out for that role as well too, by mid-November?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think the drafting will begin immediately for the RFP for the chief counsel, just recognizing the length of the --

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Time it takes, yeah.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- the time it takes. And certainly, we could bring that back for everyone to review, as, hopefully, sooner rather than later, just during our subcommittee reports. My sense is for

November 16th is that ideally, we will reserve some space for training at that time.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So training, but you -- are you planning to do the RFP at that time too, and then are you also including the racially-polarized voting consultant as well, in that same vein?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. We need to discuss the racially-polarized voting. We haven't had a chance to do that in-depth. I believe Matt Barreto, who did provide a training for us previously from UCLA, had been the individual who had done that last time. I think it's worth having a follow-up conversation with him, as we have been doing with others, just to kind of learn from that process.

Having done this -- that analysis myself, I also recognize it's actually a fairly small universe, kind of like lie drawers, of individuals who conduct that analysis. So I don't think we'll have a humongous array of people to choose from for RPV consultants.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: And one more clarification question. Is your intent to write the RFP yourself, or do you plan to delegate that to the staff to draft and then come back to the Committee -- Subcommittee to provide input on?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. We haven't had that conversation with staff yet, so my hope is to take everything that we've kind of learned thus far and bring that to staff so that staff can be delegated with that with our close input.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you.

Other comments about their report -- their very thorough report?

That was excellent. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I should mention so you're not wondering. The controversies in 2010 had to do with two different things. One is the level of experience of VRA counsel, was just actually statutory language that such counsel must have extensive experience and expertise in the implementation and enforcement of the VRA and whether that standard was met or not by the candidates.

The other controversy had to do with politics. You know, some firms are perceived as leaning left or leaning right, and apparently, the 2010 Commission had quite strong feelings among Commissioners about selection on those grounds.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Does it make sense for all of us to read that letter, or you're building off of that

letter, and, therefore, it -- we don't. I mean you're building a guide for us for the next one.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Either way. I mean, it -- I believe it's publicly available now, so we can certainly reshare that or repost it as a handout. And I'm certainly open to whatever is easiest for the Commissioners and is most transparent for the public, whatever Commissioners' preference would be for that. It's only like a two-page letter.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Marian?

MS. JOHNSTON: It did take a bit of digging to find it on the 2010 website. So I would suggest if you want it distributed, you can take the letter I sent you and send it to everyone or ask that to be posted.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Perfect. I'll do that.

COMMISSIONER YEE: You should post it, yeah.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'll post it.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Marian, can we post it on the website? I think that that would be appropriate --

MS. JOHNSTON: Sure.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: -- because even though it's already on there, we should just repost it so it's easier to find.

MS. JOHNSTON: Absolutely.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you very much.

I don't see any other questions. Let's -- thank you, Commissioners Sadhwani and Yee.

Let's move on to Subagenda Item I, Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee.

Commissioners Vasquez and Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair. Commissioner Vazquez was going to give our report, but, unfortunately, she's not here this morning. She'll be back. We did -- there is a handout that's been sent out to you all, as well as it's posted. We are giving you homework. So I -- let's everybody say, "awe". But anyway. We wanted -- we created regional teams at the last meeting, and the idea now is just to start digging a little bit and knowing what's working and hearing from different regional leads around the census in each of the regions.

So we've made it really simple. You can click on the links, and it'll give the community administrative leave, which -- lead, sorry, which is the census staffer, and then -- wait. One is the nonprofit that's kind of took over the grantmaking and all that and managed the organizing effort. And the other one is the actual staff from census. So there are two people kind of to talk to. And then we gave some sample questions of what you might want to ask, just to help think through the information

that we can share back with each other.

My partner is so good that she already sent out the invitations -- Commissioner Ahmad. And we already have our meetings set up. So thank you. And there are, as I've said before, a lot of information comes through my email, I guess. So as I see reports that might be helpful or whatever, just to getting a feel of your regions, I will forward them to you. I have no -- there is no expectation that you're going to read them cover to cover. But if you're a nerd, like me, you might. So I'm just sharing.

And please feel free to contact Commissioner Vasquez and I at any point if we can help. I know in some -- I think both of us are just on one team, so I know that some regions were -- this is really big. We have 17 counties. Just tap -- call us, let us know how we can help. Both of us have done organizing and going into communities that we don't know and building relationships, and we can help out in that.

The final piece is that next meeting we will do a visioning exercise. And it's not an exercise to set up our plan. We are trying to do -- we're taking little steps throughout so that that we inform the work that we're doing. This is kind of if had the ideal outreach, and we were able to reach as many or more people as last



time, what would we need to be able to do that?

And the reason we're doing the visioning is to start thinking through where are the budget, where we need to be spending money, how we may -- do we use an RFP, do we use -- just starting to think of some of those pieces.

All of it is really, really difficult without the communications director. It's feeling very -- for all of us, because the tool is going to be -- the tool doesn't do anything unless we've got the outreach material and the partners and others to get it out into the larger community. And so there's -- everything is kind of intertwined and trying to think through what talent we will have on staff versus what we'll need to hire.

But this is the place for us to hear from you all. I know Commissioner Le Mons keeps saying that we've got this great plan, but really I don't want to disappoint anybody. But we have been working with you all to get input, and maybe at the end, we'll share it.

Please don't forget that we did give you a handout a couple of weeks ago, so as you're hearing things, fill out the handout so that you can give us -- give it to staff so they can compile it so that we can also have those pieces of it to remind us or to let us know what you're thinking at different points, and we can get that out to you again.

And then the other great -- we're going to have a great panel next week -- next -- it is next week, really, our next meeting. And their actual grassroots leader. So we've talked a lot to -- the first time, we talked to Grasstops leaders, and now we will talk to Grassroots leaders and leaders who aren't necessarily from civic organizations. So we had a healthcare, healthcare youth, faith-based, and parent education groups and how they got involved in civic education.

And they come from different parts of California. So it'll give you a feel of what are the organizations at the local level at the very, very north part of California -- all the way from the very north to the border. So we're trying to cover a lot of different -- it was a -- it was a fun puzzle to put together. So we're working on that panel.

And then the week following that, we will have a conversation with the director of the census from California. So she has -- she -- we're sending out the invitation right now and we've spoken. So we're slowly getting all the pieces. And that conversation's not just about outreach, but it'll also be about data and data quality so it's the bigger picture.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right. Great. That was a great report. Thank you very much, and thank you for all

of your work. Is there any questions from any of the commissioners? If not -- okay. Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. Thank you for that great report and all the excellent efforts. I see in the October 12th meeting handouts, of course, the region teams and the links that you provide. The suggested questions, I'm sorry, I lost track of where to find those.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: There is a handout for today's meeting that says community outreach report. And on that one, it has the regional team homework and it has the links and then sample questions.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: I do also want to thank and acknowledge that you did send us the reports in in time for us to digest and read through early on, so I do appreciate that. Okay. Let's go ahead. We'll move on to sub agenda item number K, troubleshooting. Le Mons and -- Commissioners Le Mons and Andersen. Is there anything to report? And if there isn't, it's okay to say we could just -- nothing to report.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, we should -- we should give a quick report, and I'm going to speak for Commissioner Le Mons. I believe he's also listening and can participate as well. Very short. Basically, we essentially have three topics, three categories of things

we're doing right now.

One is the website troubleshooting, which we were just assigned. We're going to be working with Raul just to get in contact to work that out. The COVID policy, which we're actually going to present for action next week. And again, we're also working with staff on that. Raul has been facilitating. He just sent us more information and we're kind of updating. We will be sending that ahead so people can comment on that. We'll get input so we will be able to address that and then take action next week.

And the other item, which has actually gone on the agenda for the November meeting is our back to the computer procurement and the details of that, which again, we're also working with staff trying to -- we've already gone through all the details of the problems involved in getting things, and now we're trying to pin down sort of what so we can present that in the first November meeting. And that's the quick summary.

Anything you want to add, Mr. -- Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: No. Thank you very much, Commissioner Andersen. I think that (indiscernible) to it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. So then --

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- any questions?

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right. Looks like -- thank you very much for that report, and looks like no questions. Excellent. Let's go ahead and let's move on to our last subagenda item, L, lessons learned, Commissioners Kennedy and Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Do you want to go, or should I go?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: The only thing that I would say is we are different in nature from the other subcommittees. We are mostly a repository for things that fellow commissioners want to share with us because the lessons learned phase really is 2022. But we need to be keeping these things -- keeping track of these things. So as you come up with thoughts as to how can we make life easier for the 2030 Commission, please channel those through staff to us.

I guess one thing -- and I haven't had a chance to discuss this with Commissioner Ahmad yet, one of the lessons learned exercises that I've led in relation to an election, I basically took a SWOT diagram, strengths to weaknesses, opportunities and threats, and modified it slightly.

So I had participants toss it -- or bring up their

ideas as far as strengths, weaknesses, innovations, and recommendations. So those are -- those are kind of four categories that I think are very useful in a lessons learned exercise, but you know, our real work now is serving as your repository and then we will be leading the effort in actually carrying out a lessons learned activity once we get past the map-drawing and the litigation.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: And just to add to that, we are keeping a running list. We have a shared Google doc. So things that come up, we have them documented, and so once we see the other side, after the maps, we can sit down as a group and figure out how to prioritize that list that is growing each meeting.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Great. That's good to know that that is all being collected and it's all going to be centralized in one place. Excellent.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: We have a -- sorry, Chair. We have a place for it. We need all of you to keep this in mind and to continually feed us raw materials. We're not -- we're not, you know, intending to do this all on our own. We count on all of you to be active participants in this process. So think of us and scoot things our way when you -- when you find something that might make the 2030 commission's life easier.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.
I see Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Just so do you want us to forward -- like, if we have something, to forward it to the subcommittee or to discuss it, like, at meetings? And the only -- I mean, I have a lot of things, but I think I've already talked to, Commissioner Kennedy, about it. But I just want to make sure that we, at some point, the lessons learned, a huge one that we're all going through right now is what fully functional means in terms of when the State Auditor hands everything off to us.

So I think that's something very important that we define, and then potentially -- there could be some potential legislation or something that defines it. So that's -- I just want make sure that -- I know it's captured, but I'm just going to reiterate that piece of it.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: So my feedback on that would be things that require current attention are probably more the purview of the troubleshooting subcommittee and things that are for making the life of the 2030 commission easier are our purview.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I forgot one thing on my report, a question to all of us. So if we can -- after

this report is done, if I can go back.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Sounds good. Okay. Commissioner Kennedy, Commissioner Ahmad, are you -- is your report completed?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: The other document that Commissioner Ahmad is doing a very good job of maintaining is acronyms. So she's capturing things as they come up, and eventually, we'll make that document publicly accessible and easily accessible on the website so that people can more easily follow our discussions.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: I think people would -- I'm sure that both the public and all of us would appreciate that. Thank you. Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: On that, with the mention of the troubleshooting, if that one needs to go on our website at some point and we need to do it before we get the communications person involved, I'm going to nominate us to be happy to help out with connecting that to the website so the public can find out what those are and so we can actually find out what some of them are.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right. Thank you. All right. Commissioner Sinay, I'll come back to you to add to your report.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: It was really a question. We received public comments from individuals asking

questions about their region, you know, specific questions. I didn't know how those were being addressed. And one of the recommendations I had is, since we have region teams, that staff could -- either staff could answer them or they could be forwarded to the region teams and they -- and they send a quick letter and say -- you know, a quick email just saying, we received it, we hear you, the time -- we will -- we will -- we've included you to receive information when we come -- you know, just a general response on some of them, whatever it might be. But I don't want to leave them just hanging that they've asked us a question and we haven't responded.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. And that's a great question. Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Are you referring to the public comments that came in in writing through Raul recently? Some of these are not in our purview at all and -- but I agree, people need to hear back from us. And so even if we have a form letter or postcard or form email or something, I do -- I do agree that we need to get back to the people when they -- when they put these questions to us. Thank you.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Can I direct this to either Director Claypool or Marian, how have you dealt or

handled these kind of comments where there is a question similar to what we received in this week's meeting materials?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Right. And I have to apologize. Could you repeat the question?

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: So we received public comment and there were -- there was one particular one that I'm thinking of that did have a question that was directed to the commission about, I believe, her specific lines and how it was drawn or how it was -- how it's going to be created.

I think what's being asked is when we get public comment that is not just a comment but is actually a question that is being asked of the Commission, how have you dealt with those questions? How have you responded? Did you respond? Were they just ignored? I think we want to be able to be responsive to those questions. And so we're just trying to think about is it best -- or was that taken care of by the staff? Is this something that we need to have the region teams respond to via staff?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: So I haven't actually seen that comment. I haven't gotten into what's coming in on our email address, so that would be -- undoubtedly, Raul would have picked up that comment. Any comment like that should be addressed similarly to the way the State

Auditor addressed comments that came in about the selection process.

And the way that worked was if it's a fairly generic question, you know, when is your next -- you know, where can I find your agenda or something like that, staff should be handling that. But if it's something that's addressing the maps, you know, in a specific way, then that should get elevated. Once we have -- once we have our deputy executive director in outreach would probably fall under that slot, particularly to the media director somewhere to be answering those types of questions.

I will look into whatever we've received as soon as this meeting is over and then I can get back to you and Commissioner Forniciari regarding, you know, what kind of traffic we've had so far, and then we can start addressing it. I just haven't had time to address it at this point.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I go back to making what I think is an important distinction in this, which is comments that are relevant to our work and comments that are not in our purview. The two that came in, one is asking about community college districts. Well, we just need to say, we're sorry, we don't have anything to do

with community college districts.

And the other one was asking if we had access to certain files, and you know, those files may have been used by the 2010 Commission, so you know, we need to see if we can answer that one. But you know, a question about community college districts we need to reply to but we don't need to store for future use. A question about, you know, congressional districts or State Assembly districts or something, you know, we need to both acknowledge and store.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I also see -- Commissioner Sinay, I think you had your hand up again. No? Okay. Okay. Director Claypool, if you can look into that, as you had said, but we'll take into account what Commissioner Kennedy also mentioned as well, too.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Certainly, I will. By the way, I just received these two emails from Commissioner Fernandez. I believe the answer to Ms. Pellaton (ph.) is that those block files and equivalencies would be -- that sounds like something to be stored with the Statewide Database, but I'll check into that and then we can run it from there.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you. Okay. Let's see. We are at 12:04. We will be going to lunch at around 12:45. I -- we can -- I'm going to ask this of

the Commission. We can either start the conversation around the milestones right now. We'll have about half an hour, and then if it goes beyond the half hour, we can continue it after lunch. Or if the preference is to try to get through some of the other items. For example, item -- agenda item number 10 and 11 in the time that we have remaining, we could also do that.

I also -- I apologize. I had also meant to cover yesterday. We did also have a discussion around, let's see, it was materials, the deadline as to when materials should be submitted. I need to come back to that discussion. During the executive director's report, we were having conversations about the ability for not only the commissioners but also the public to be able to digest and to review all of the materials that will be discussed and used during the meetings and to give adequate time for everybody to be able to at least read through it, to be able to think through all of the information that is on the documents.

And so we did talk about giving some advance notice. I think the question that was raised and that we need to discuss amongst all of us is what is considered adequate time given that we have different dates for the meetings. And so when the meetings are going to be towards the end of the week, is the Friday before a reasonable time?

That means it could be almost up to five days. Or do we just want to use a specific time frame?

So Marian or Director Claypool, in terms of our agenda, where -- is it reopening the executive director conversation discussion item?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: That's fine. Yes, it can -- it can be done.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So I am going to ask this of the Commission. What is your preference? Would you like to go into the milestones conversation now and then finish up all of these other items later in the afternoon? Commissioner Sinay, I know I saw your hand earlier, too. No? Okay. Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I think if we can get through, like, 10 or 11, that way, I don't want to say we're done with it, but then when we get into the milestones, we can just continue that conversation.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Sounds good. All right. All right. Let's go to agenda item number 10. We'll try to get through agenda item number 11, and then perhaps we could revisit that question about the -- when the materials should be submitted. Okay. Raul or Director Claypool?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: We're going to bring in Raul.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. And I do apologize. I

think maybe this is a good time. I do need to step away for a presentation. Commissioner Forniciari is going to take over for me for the time being, so I think this may be the best time for us to make this transition. So Commissioner Forniciari, I am giving you the gavel, the virtual gavel.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. And when are you due back?

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: I will be back at 2 p.m.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Oh, okay.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Okay. Chair, with regards to the budget update, the interim individual that we have hired for that position says that there -- it's too early to have any material that we can put together to actually give you an update on the budget, that the -- that it hasn't cleared through the Department of General Services and so forth. So there is no budget update at this point.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. Is there a -- okay. Wait. I got the wrong agenda. Is there an update on contracts in procurement?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Only in that we -- the discussion we had yesterday that -- Raul, contracts?

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: We can't hear you.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Right. Go ahead.

RAUL: There really isn't an update. I know with the videographer, we're looking at alternative ways of contracting that, and that's for the webcasting. Part of the issue there is not so much the funding, but the maximum amount that can go on the contract, and so we're currently working with DGS to see what our options are with that.

And then I'm working with Dan now in looking at what kind of a contracting structure can be developed as we start approaching the public input, outreach, and education. That as you work and develop those parts of it, what kind of contracting structure can we use or develop to encompass that and support it?

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. I guess I'm used to when we discuss budget not just what's been spent and what -- now that we have an executive director, I thought we had said that we would actually -- a budget would be presented to us that was a line item budget so we had a better understanding of how we're seeing that funds are going to be spent. And that's really something criti -- it's a piece that I feel we don't have, and it's critical for us to manage everything that's up ahead.

And so I would ask that Director Claypool create -- I don't know -- I mean, in every organization I've been

in, that's kind of one of the first steps is you've got this chunk of change and then you're going to say how you see it spent, and that way, we can -- we know where we're heading. So I would like -- I would like -- I don't know if I have to make a motion or we just instruct the director to please create a line item budget so that we have a better feel of what's happening.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Thank you. Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. Thank you. That is exactly, I think, the point. We had quite a bit of discussion about budget and our desire to not fly in the blind, to be able to know kind of where we were, what's been spent out. There's been a lot of comments made about the amount of money that's been spent, what we have, we're going to need additional money.

And I really was expecting something even high-level at this point as far as where we stand currently, even if it's not the official ran through all of the channels or what have you. I think we need to have something written at this point, and the response, for me, was a little disappointing based on what we -- our discussion and the expectation.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Thank you, Commissioner Turner. Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. And as you'll remember, part of that discussion, also a recommendation was to also -- initially, it would be good to see, like, a side-by-side of 2010 versus 2020, but we do need the expenditure detail information, and that's what I was used to when I was on the board is at least monthly that would be presented so that we see where we are and where we're going. It shows expenditures, encumbrances, and then that's also a flag in terms of if we're running out, we need to not wait until we run out. We need to project -- you know, do some sort of projections as well so that we know when we need to move forward.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Thank you. Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. I just concur with the other commissioners who have already spoken. We've had this conversation before, and just as a reminder, this is millions of dollars of the people of California's money. So we have an obligation to oversee that, and I think -- I don't see why that wouldn't even be a public document so that the people of California can understand how this money is being spent.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Director Claypool.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: So I understand the disappointment in not presenting the line items and that,

for this Commission, I am fully aware of which line items you have funding in, and the setbacks by the legislature. I simply have not had a chance in the seven or eight days that I've worked for you to actually start working through that. I know it's a priority for you and I'll start working on it. Typically, we would have somebody who is working the budgets, and that would be the interim individual that we have working there available to give us or at least tell me how much the expenditure has been, and I'll start working with that person to put together the list that you want.

On the comparison between 2010 and 2020, I'm not entirely certain what you're going to get there. And the reason I say that is because they're two different entities as we keep going and they're two different budgets. So to try to compare an expenditure from a commission that was cash-poor to a commission that has a greatly expanded budget, I just -- I just don't know what's going to be there.

So I hear your -- I hear your concerns and I'm going to work on getting that document for you. If you want it public, that -- it should be public. That's fine, too. But this is, again, in this vein of needing staff to assist in putting these types of things together because, as we discussed yesterday and we're going to discuss

today, I worked a great deal on just trying to put together the contracting methods that are available to you. I'm working on a lot of things, and so -- but I understand this is another thing that has to be added. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: I have Commissioner Sinay, Turner, then Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I don't know if I -- we're being -- I'm used to a budget. It's a one-page revenue and -- you know, the good news is we know the revenue. But what are the expenses? And they don't need to be by line item by each staff, but what's the personnel, what is the benefit, what is copying, what is -- you know, what is travel for commissioners? You know, all the different line items.

Not the budget that was given to us before that the legislature created and it's the lump sum. This is -- what I -- what -- the reason a budget is important to come from the executive director to us -- I mean, we can create it, but it would be better for you to come to us with what you think and then we have a conversation around it.

When it comes to the outreach budget, there may be -- you know, I don't know if that's where we're paying for some of the folks, but we're also going to have a

conversation and that's what we're doing the visioning exercise for next week is so we can create the line items of where we want that money. But to come and tell me that we've spent this much already on the big chunk isn't helping because even when we've been told the cost of things, it's like it costs \$18,000 to do a meeting and staff time was included in that. To me, staff time is another line item that's not a meeting line item.

So I'm not feeling that we're given the right tools to be able to, you know, play the role that Commissioner Sadhwani spoke of. So we're asking for just a traditional budget. I don't know if governments do it differently, but private sector nonprofits, I know both of them kind of have line items, and first, it's a budget. We don't need to know how much has been spent. It's this is what -- how you envision the budget for this fiscal year being spent, and we say yes or no.

And then if things have to change, you have to come to us and we say, okay, yes, you can make -- change that allocation. But we need a budget that we approve so that staff knows where to go with the funding, and that needs -- that's a top priority for me.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Pass.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Commissioner Fernandez?



Pass?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, I'm just frustrated because I continue to ask for this. So I'm just going to stop. And in terms of what I was looking for for the 2010 back -- in our meeting at the end of September, we got this, you know, 12-page document that had a bunch of expenditures. So maybe if I -- if they just consolidate it into one page. I don't need it to be compared to the 2020. I know it's a different time, but for me, I would still be curious as to how the money was spent in 2010.

So that's the only reason. You don't have to do a comparison. That's fine. But yeah, we just -- we really need a budget that's approved by all of us. And that doesn't mean what has already been appropriated or approved. It has to have everything, expenditures, encumbrances. So that's it.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Did you want to go Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I was just going to say to Director Claypool as far as if it will or won't benefit. I think in the absence of information, you start asking for more information. We need something. We need to see. I'm flying here blind not knowing if it's just a way of saying, okay, even if it's different scenarios, different setup, different time period, we

need to have some numbers. And so it may or may not be helpful, but that was some of the kind of background behind trying to determine what can we get, what numbers can we get in front of us.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Director Claypool?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: So in the document that I presented to you, I showed the expenditures from the last commission that came out to the 11 point -- or however much it was -- million dollars that were spent. We can go into greater detail than that, if you'd like, but it was -- it was pretty much done by the categories of expenditures that we had by the phases that we went through.

Insofar as giving a -- giving you a budget for how I think things should be spent, I was told yesterday that we -- that the ideas that I had presented weren't ideas that were going to be considered until we have a deputy executive director and until we have a media director. So I can tell you that I think that we might have an expenditure for a data analytics person, but if we can't decide that we're going to have one, then all I can do is say it might be this amount.

I think I can say that we can have an expense for outreach, but until we have an outreach plan, I really don't have anything that I can work with to tell you I

think outreach is going to cost the \$1.4 million or the \$2 million that the legislature has appropriated for it. I think it will be much greater than that. But without having more specifics from the Commission, it's very difficult for me to give you a traditional line item saying I think that it'll be \$4.3 million. I don't know because right now we're holding those discussions until we have those people.

So I don't want to act like I'm deferring my responsibility to give you information, but I need information from you before I can give you information about what I think it will cost. I've already said that I believe that we're going to go significantly over our budget because of the things that weren't included and because of the robust outreach that I think this Commission wants to have. But I need to know what that robust outreach looks like in order to structure a budget around those expenses. So please don't think that I'm dodging you. I just need to have more information about where I think you're going before I can start attaching costs to those projects.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Any other feedback or comments? So I have a question for Raul, on the videographer contract, we talked about having the finance administrative committee and the outreach committees take

a look at the statement of work for that. Are we at a place where we can -- we can take a look at that?

RAUL: I can send you a draft.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. I think that would be helpful. Okay. Thank you. Any other comments on that topic, those two topics?

Okay. Commissioner Akutagawa had mentioned that -- or that we needed to go back to, I guess, item 5 and talk about how much time ahead for documents to the meetings. So we had you talked about -- one idea mentioned was the Friday before. We have kind of strange meeting starting times, so I don't know if we want to think about three days ahead of time or something like that. So thoughts on that so we come to an agreement on how we want to manage that? Commissioner Sinay, Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I --

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Then Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think, for me, a lot of it was just staff providing good background information ahead of time. I see --

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- that a lot of the commissioners are making their best attempt to create reports, but we don't see much on backup documentation for most of the things that we're asked to discuss.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. Who was next?

Commissioner Sadhwani, then Turner, then Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I would hate to set such a hard and fast rule that if something new comes up that we can't add to it. That being said, I mean, I think it would be helpful to set something in place to say, hey, here's our guideline and try our best to get to that. Because at the -- and I've said this before. Knowledge is power, information is power. You know, we need more than 15 minutes to review a document before we can take action on it. But sometimes that's not always possible, and I recognize that.

For me, I would say two business days so that we have, you know, if it's over the weekend, it's that Friday, and depending on when we're starting. But I would want that flexibility, you know, certainly on things like with the census. Things change rapidly sometimes, and I think as we move forward, we're work -- we are working at a very fast pace. But I certainly agree to the spirit of this, that having as much time as possible is the goal.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. And Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I can certainly agree with two business days, and I'd also like to think

concerning if it's something that would fall in a shorter time period that there is a text notification or something to alert something that was urgent, emergency went out so that we will -- it'll call it to our attention even though it's shorter than the time frame.

And I would like to suggest that if it is something that is, like, within ten, 15 minutes of the meeting, if for whatever reason that needs to keep happening, there needs to be time allotted in the meeting for us to actually read, absorb before discussion is held. Because what we typically will do is, depending on how quick we are or are not at reading, we're trying to read it while the person is talking, while questions then starts flowing.

And so those are my things. Number one, two business days. If it's going to be shorter than that, since some sort of text notification that you've got more -- a last minute email that showed up that was an urgent situation. And if it's going to be the day of that hearing, then let's allot for time to be able to actually read it and absorb it before we start discussion.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. And then Commissioner Fernandez and then Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. I'm good with the

two business days. And in terms of if there are any -- something that comes up, I want that to be the exception, not the norm, in terms of the lesson. And then I also want to make sure that if we're sending it to all of us, that it's also posted at that time instead of waiting until the day of and we realize it's not posted. So that's all I wanted to mention.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'm in concurment (sic) with everybody so far. I do think we should probably get some feedback from staff in terms of just the time it takes to post onto the website, right? So there's the process of them receiving it, going through the -- so maybe just going through the workflow and making sure that the workflow gets us to the two days.

Or if two days is -- I would hope that two days would be enough, but if it's not, given that the website has some issues and we are down on staff, right, that we have a realistic time frame for posting for public notification as well as getting it to us. But I in concurment (sic) with everything that Commissioner Sadhwani and Turner and Fernandez and others have said.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Director Claypool?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: The two days shouldn't be an issue. Right now, the person that is on contract, and

it's probably an interim contract, needs a little more lead time. Once we get somebody that's in-house and that we have that we can lean on, it should be a -- it should go a lot further than -- or a lot faster than that. As far as posting it at the same time, it's an excellent idea and it should be our goal, and that's what we intend to try to do.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. Any other comments on this topic at this point? So then I guess we'll adopt -- adopt the idea that we'd like to have documents to us two days in advance of the -- two business days in advance of the meeting and have them posted at that time. And if something urgent comes out, we'd like a notification.

I mean, ideally, I like Commissioner Turner's idea of a group text. Yeah, one of the things we didn't -- I need to figure out what's happening with our phones because we should have -- Marian -- Marian, can you grab Raul so he can give us an update on our phones? And then I have Commissioner Toledo and Turner.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: The question, I think if we're going to put this two-day rule, it should also apply to the committees that we would have -- you know, that we would be providing the documentation for posting two days ahead of time. And I just wanted to be very clear about that just -- whether it does apply to us or if it's only

applying to staff.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Yeah. I (indiscernible) --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I would hope that --

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: -- (indiscernible) --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- it'd apply to --

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: -- (indiscernible) --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- would apply on both ends,
right?

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: It is --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Both to the commission --

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: I --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- and to --

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: I felt it was kind of
implied --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- the staff.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: -- but I'm glad you brought
that out explicitly. Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I was going to say,
since you brought up the equipment, I think with the
newer equipment, perhaps it will be a mute (sic) point.
On most of my other equipment in -- that I have, if I get
emails, I'm automatically notified, and so I can quickly
see that. But since we're trying to keep things off of
our personal, it doesn't work that way on my phone, my
Commission phone, at least. So with the new equipment,

we may not even have to worry so much about a group text. We'll see things when it comes in as well.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: All right. Very good. Raul, how about an update on the phone situation?

RAUL: Okay. So if you're frustrated, I reflect it. Right now, the cell phones are caught up with porting the telephone numbers. I've reached out to them and reached out to them again yesterday trying to get assurance that this can get resolved quickly. So as soon as I hear back from them. As far as the office, I'm trying to get that scheduled. So I've reached out to them three, four times to get them to come in here and get our Centrex up, and why it's taking so long, I don't know. It shouldn't.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: So as far as porting the numbers go --

RAUL: For the cell phone.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: -- I'm not married to the number that I have. I don't think I've ever used it. And I don't know. I mean, if porting the numbers is holding it up, for me, personally, I don't know how others feel, a new number is fine. How -- do I have -- I'm seeing a lot of nods. I see pretty much everyone nodding, thumbs up. So if --

RAUL: That's what I'm seeing, too.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: -- porting -- if porting

numbers --

RAUL: So I will --

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: -- is holding this --

RAUL: I will stop that.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: -- this thing up, no port.

RAUL: Okay. No ports.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. All right. Good deal. I think I saw Commissioner Toledo. Did you have your hand up?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: No, that was my -- I was going to suggest that as well.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. All right. Yeah. So yeah. If that -- okay. And then just --

RAUL: Very good.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: -- let us know what's happening next week. The sooner the better because, yeah, I'd really love to be able to check my email on a phone. That would make my life a lot easier. I think all of our lives. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And at some point, it might -- we may have to wait till we have the IT person. I know I sent something out a long time ago. I was trying to set up Outlook so that Gmail could go into Outlook and I could organize it better because the Gmail interface isn't very good for storing and stuff. So at some point

we need to figure out who to work with so we can get all that stuff done, even if it means we -- you know, we do a Zoom class to figure it out. But Gmail is not the best way to -- for a lot of stuff.

RAUL: No.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Yeah. And the mail, I use the mail client -- the Microsoft mail client. That's -- it's --

RAUL: It's just bad.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: -- worse than Gmail, but you know.

RAUL: I interviewed someone today for a prospective IT and they're not going to work out, but just know that I'm spending a lot of time trying to find these people because I'm with you. If we could do Outlook -- I have nothing happy to say about using Google Office. We inherited it and it's helped us get this far. That's the positive. And -- but it is frustrating to use.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. I -- is there anything else, Raul?

RAUL: No.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. Thank you for -- thank you for the update.

RAUL: You're welcome.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. So I think we're in

agreement. Back to the agreement, two business days ahead of time for staff and for commissioners to get their information and their updates out and posted. And then we'll allot time -- if it's -- if it's late, we'll try to get a notification out. Yeah, I'm not sure about the logistics of that part of it, but at least we'll definitely, Commissioner Turner, try to allot time to read it over before. And do I -- is everyone -- can I have a nod? Okay. Thank you.

So that covers everything. So I think we'll -- at this point, we'll go to lunch, and then, when we come back, we'll take up item number 6 and talk about the key milestones and action steps. Is that good? Okay? So it's 1 --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: One quick question.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Yes, Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: On that -- for that item, are we supposed to have the Gantt chart up or what are we supposed to be working with?

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: I'm -- okay. I'm not sure how Commissioner Akutagawa kind of envisioned this part of the agenda. I don't know. We'll -- let me -- and she won't -- will she be back?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: 2.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: 2:15. I think, let me think

about it over lunch and --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Commissioner Kennedy?

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: -- everybody has some ideas. So somebody's pointing somewhere. Oh, Kennedy. There we go. He's over here.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Oh, sorry.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. Yeah. You know, from my perspective, it would probably be helpful to have the Gantt chart in front of you. What I had said, I believe, last week was that Commissioner Taylor and I will be paying very close attention to capture the new input to incorporate it into the Gantt chart before we turn it over to the executive director. But yes, it might be helpful for you to have it in front of you as we go through the discussion.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. Any other thoughts or comments on that? All right. So it's -- I'm round -- I'm going to round. It's 12:40, so we'll be back at 1:40.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Well, welcome back from lunch. I guess, typically, we've been taking public comment after lunch, so if we can go and do public comment. If you could read the instructions for us, please.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the commissioners will take -- excuse me -- will be taking public comment during their meeting by phone. There will be opportunities to address the commissioners regarding the items on the agenda. There will also be opportunities for the public to submit general comments about items not on the agenda.

Please note that the Commission is not able to comment or discuss items not on the agenda. The Commission will advise the viewing audience when it is time to submit public comment. The Commissioners will then follow -- will then allow time for those who wish to comment to dial in.

To call in on your phone, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed using your dial pad. When prompted enter -- to enter a participant ID, simply press pound. Once you're dialed in, you will be placed in a queue from which a moderator will begin unmuting callers to submit their comment. You will also hear an automatic message to press star nine to raise your hand indicating that you wish to comment.

When it is your turn to speak, the moderator will unmute you and you will hear an automatic message the



host would like you to talk and to press star six to speak. You will have two minutes to provide your comments. Please make sure to mute your computer or a livestream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your call. Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when it is your turn to speak and please turn down the livestream volume.

The Commissioners will take comment for every action item on the agenda. As you -- as you listen to the on the -- online video stream, the Chair will call for public comments. That is the time to call in. The process for making a comment will be the same each time, beginning by the telephone number provided on the livestream feed and following the steps stated above.

And Chair, there is no one in the queue at this time.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Yeah. I'm just -- I'm watching the livestream now and it's -- the instructions aren't quite completed.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: So when they're done, we'll wait a couple of minutes.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. They just -- they just finished.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I was thinking, rather than, you know, having someone have to restate these instructions every single time, not that -- you do a wonderful job -- but that it might be fun to just make, like, a video that we could play that has the number and we can just repeat it every time.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We actually just got the go-ahead today to do a recording.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We are on point.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Good.

COMMISSIONER YEE: We should have cute kids do it, really cute kids.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I'm hoping that the recording can include at least Spanish, if not all other languages as well.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We will work on that.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. It's been a couple of minutes. We still have no one in the queue at this point, so I guess we will go ahead to agenda item 6, key milestones and action steps, October through March. So I guess what we'll do in -- for this is just go back through the -- each of the subcommittees and then have

them share.

I mean, this would have been a really good opportunity to have everybody kind of submit what they had in mind in writing so we could all see it, but you know, we weren't that far ahead in our thinking, unfortunately. And so we'll capture it as we go forward. So I'll just go through the list of all the subcommittees and see if they have any action items that they are -- milestones or action steps that they feel they want to include. So I'll start with the action on census subcommittee, Sadhwani and Toledo.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I mean, I think the amicus brief that we discussed yesterday.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I know that an external deadline is November 16th, so we might want to think about -- we might want to think more strategically about what that would mean in terms of when we have a draft to you all to -- for approval before we send. In all honesty, since our conversation yesterday, we haven't had a chance for the subcommittee to --

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Right.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- meet and discuss that.

So --

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay.



COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- you know, I would want to just be able to check in. My sense is Marian's probably going to do the lion's share of the writing on this, although I'm happy to help out. I have worked up a couple previously, but I wouldn't put myself as the go-to person for the actual drafting. So I don't know if that's helpful. November 16th is a drop dead deadline, though.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. As far as a bigger picture on this, one of the things that I wanted to put on the table for discussion, if we -- if we look back at the Gantt chart, I really did not have -- or I guess I did have some dates in there for public education and then RPV data and Communities of Interest input, some of those key dates falling in this period that we're talking about.

My sense, and I guess you heard it before, is that we really need to do some amount of public education before we launch the Communities of Interest tool. I think we can -- we can tease the Community of Interest tool, we can build interest in it before we launch it. So you know, one of the things that I've been saying is I understand the Statewide Database is working towards a 1 January or 2 January availability for launch.

I would rather see us use January to do this public education and be looking more at a 1 February launch date for the COI tool and just really go out heavy on the public education, what is redistricting, why is it important for you to take part, how can you take part. And then by the 1st of February be ready to launch into heavy duty COI data gathering. We can -- we can, you know, launch the RPV data-gathering effort and the -- yeah, I guess the RPV data collection effort before then, if that's possible, or that'll be running simultaneously. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Sorry. I'm thinking what would -- how would be the most effective way to do this. You know, I'd like to look at the Gantt chart while we're doing it, if we could, but I'm not sure we can -- how effectively we can see it. Do you want to -- Commissioner Kennedy, can try to share the Gantt charts so we can take a look at it? And then maybe we can just go through the Gantt chart and see if -- what items need to be added and in what -- maybe we should go by sections in the Gantt chart and see what items need to be added and how we might set some milestones. Does that sound reasonable? Does anyone else have a better idea? Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: This is more in general, and



hopefully Kristian can help us on this because we need to figure out what tools we can use to do workshopping and to do brainstorming and all that. I was looking at Miro and there's other tools out there, and what we need is -- we need, first, legal understanding of, in the virtual world, if we did breakout rooms and every breakout room had a phone number and people could call in, that would be similar to the break -- you know, going to different rooms the way the Commission, you know, has done in the past to work on things.

But we just need better tools because we can't -- you know, I was trying to figure out the same issue for the visioning, and I -- you know, we were all together on awesome facilitator and using a lot of sticky pads and all that, but I'm trying to -- you know, so what can we do, what can't we do, and all that.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Yeah. Okay. So we've got -- okay. I'm going to need some help here if someone could volunteer to look at -- look at the folks, maybe, or -- because I got two things going on. Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, no. I was going to volunteer to help because I've got the big -- bigger screen over here, so I --

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay.



COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- could probably see people.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Can you keep track of who's raising their hand --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: -- for us? All right. So do we -- so Commissioner Kennedy, this is you sharing?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: It is.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Can you -- is that the first -- okay. Yeah. Public education would be the first section we're looking at right now.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And I have Commissioners Sinay and Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I guess I would like to hear from the Gantt committee what -- how they came up with the time line and, you know, and what was the thinking. I mean, I know that, as a commission, we haven't gone -- we haven't had this conversation yet. We've been -- we've been holding back on having it. The subcommittee hasn't provided any of this, so I just wanted to understand the thinking behind it.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I mean, this was to put something on paper that could be a conversation starter. This was -- this was not intended to be the be-all and end-all, but just so that we can get a sense, year by

year, quarter by quarter, month by month, week by week what we might need to be doing. And so the first thing is we need to build this out as far as what additional tasks need to be reflected, and then we can start playing with the -- with the bars and dates.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Yeah. I think -- I mean, I think the spirit of today was kind of look at the big milestones, the deliverable, and when we want to have the deliverables, and then work backwards and fill in, you know, all the steps to get there in what the time -- and understand how long each of those steps are going to take. But you know, big picture milestone as we go along.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So my comment is actually just in response to Commissioner Kennedy's substantive comments. So if we're ready for that, I'm ready there, but if we're still talking about the process, that's totally fine.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: I think -- no, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. So in -- I -- first of all, I just to say, I love the idea of a public education campaign using the COI tool, definitely in support of that. In terms of that public education, I think if our target is to be doing that education in

January, then I think it would be really helpful to have a plan for what that looks like.

So is that commissioners going out and doing that? Is it, like, the regional teams perhaps doing kind of regional outreach? I mean, I think there's a million different ways in which that could be done, but I'm -- you know, I'm not -- and I'm sorry, I'm not really sure where exactly that would be in terms of what I'm seeing, but I think that it would be great to really just prioritize what that plan would be, and recognizing, of course, there's all this staff that's going to be coming in, hopefully, in the next few weeks that can also help coordinate that. But just really having a strong plan.

And then the second piece was around the RPV data. So I see here that we talk about collecting data. RPV analysis is done using vote data, and that's already all held by the Statewide Database. So there's not much to do in terms of collection of data. Of course, we do need to identify the regions and areas in which we would want to do that analysis, and I -- and I think that the VRA discussions will hopefully help inform that process, right, in terms of where we see the need to be VRA-compliant kind of as we're going in. But data collection, I don't -- I don't think is as much of a concern because it's all that data is already held at the

State Database.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: So we're -- so let's just talk a little bit more about that section -- this section right here. It's pretty narrowly focused, collect and analyze RPV data. That section should probably be a bigger sort of picture section, voters right -- VRA because we don't have anywhere captured, you know, hiring a VRA consultant, do the VRA analysis, all that stuff. So I -- it seems to me, in that section, we could -- we could expand that, make that a broader section, include, you know, all this -- all the -- all the steps in hiring and executing on the VRA.

So Commissioner Sadhwani, do you -- I mean, have you guys -- have you been able to kind of think out a little bit ways of what are the big milestones along the path to get us where we want to be, and kind of roughly what are those big milestones or when those big milestones would take place?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, absolutely. So we're definitely still sketching that out, but I'm happy to share with you what we -- what we've discussed. I think framing in mid-November, right, additional training. And actually, just to report, on my lunch break, I sent an email to Justin Lovett with our request to find out more about such a training.

Hiring VRA legal counsel and recognizing that that could take a different form from 2010, and that that would be early January, hopefully. To me, the hiring of the RPV analysts is secondary, that the legal counsel will help guide us to some extent around, like, where we need to be thinking about VRA compliance. And you know, if Marian has different thoughts on that, I would certainly welcome them, but that's kind of how -- more of the flow that I'm seeing there. The RPV analysis is super important, but I kind of feel like that having the -- having a VRA compliance plan kind of first would probably -- would inform the hiring of that person.

MS. JOHNSTON: I just wonder if the availability of a VRA expert consultant is going to be -- you need to pin that down sooner rather than later because of people being grabbed up by other census projects.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: In terms of counsel or in terms of the --

MS. JOHNSTON: In terms of --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- RPV --

MS. JOHNSTON: -- the consultant. Well, counsel also, but I don't know if putting off hiring the consultant should be put off. I --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: I think maybe the work would be put

off, but getting someone on contract, I would urge you to do it as soon as possible.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Got it. Okay. I -- from my knowledge of the field, there's really not that many people that do that analysis, so certainly we can -- we can work on that very soon.

MS. JOHNSTON: And the other suggestion of places to start to look would certainly be the three counties that were Section 5 counties before.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Exactly.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner --

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- Vazquez?

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: So --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh. Sorry. Commissioner Vazquez is in queue also.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. Okay. So but in both those cases, hiring this VRA legal counsel and an RPV analyst, those are both -- well, the -- or the RPV consultant, that is a -- that's probably a Request for Proposal requirement. And then Commissioner Sadhwani, you guys had -- you had mentioned a couple of times earlier maybe actually hiring a VRA consultant. Is that -- I mean, are you thinking a contractor or hiring somebody, or are you just -- that's still in the air?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think that -- I think that we should be nimble on that, that it could be out -- external counsel. It could be someone we hire. I think that was -- I mean, that was the feedback that we had received, particularly in speaking with Mr. Ancheta from 2010, is that we can hire out external counsel, but we could also hire someone internally if we so choose -- chose to do so.

So I -- and you know, I think we need to have that conversation with staff, with the executive director about how we're going to -- how we're -- you know, what's the best way to advertise for such a position if we want to attract, you know, a broader array of folks, right? Larger firms would want an R -- an RFP, a Request for Proposals, right, where -- to be outside counsel, whereas the process, it sounds like, is quite different if we're hiring. So we have yet to have that conversation.

MS. JOHNSTON: I don't know if --

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. And then --

MS. JOHNSTON: -- hiring -- I'm sorry.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Go ahead, Marian.

MS. JOHNSTON: I don't know if hiring someone, if that's going to -- if there would be enough work for a VRA attorney to be hired full-time.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah.



VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: So we -- so I'm just -- so I'm going to -- I'm going to keep on this thread for long -- a little bit longer so we get a -- we can get to a better place in sort of the picture of understanding where we're going. And realize it -- excuse me -- you haven't got the details thought -- all thought out, and that's completely understandable. But I want to reflect back on the conversation we had yesterday with Director Claypool and, you know, his comment about if we -- if we're going down the RFP route, the Request for Proposals, you know, now, end-of-year kind of thing, that's the -- that's about the duration.

So you had mentioned coming back at the beginning -- at the second meeting in November with kind of more details on this. And is that kind of when you envision having a decision on the path forward, and maybe -- so I'm just -- I'm not trying to kill you here, but I'm just trying to figure out what our plan looks like.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. My hope is to have -- to be able to come back to the full commission prior to that, right? So in an ordinary subcommittee report --

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- we could bring back an R -- an RFP. The second week of November, I'd like to reserve as hopefully having an additional VRA training --

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: I --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- for --

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: -- (indiscernible).

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- you know, and bringing in an additional speaker, whether that be Justin Lovett or somebody else, to have training during that week.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: We have Commissioner Vazquez, Director Claypool, and Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I was just going to remind folks to be mindful of acronyms and jargon. So VRA, Voting Rights Act, RPV, racially polarized voting. That last one took me a few minutes, so I figured I would -- you know, I would help educate others and the public.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Thank you. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Director Claypool?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: So the last Commission used the outside counsel as a vehicle to wrap their VRA consultant into it, and then they just -- it just became part of their contract. And then as the VRA counsel -- or as the counsel was needed, they brought them on, which is a way to keep out of the continual Request for Proposal loop with a lot of things.

So I don't know if it's possible to put the polarized voting analyst under that as well, but if you

think about just expanding yourself into a larger contract with one entity and have them provide the services, it'll save a lot of time.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay?

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. So you're going to loop back and -- loop back with us in a few weeks, then, with kind of what a fleshed out, more detailed plan would be, okay? And then we could update -- we'll work on updating this part in more detail, then, too. Okay. Thank you. And thank you for being the first -- the first one through the ringer.

All right. Next. So we have a -- we have public edu --so let's -- are we ready, Commissioner Sinay, I guess, would be public education. Are you ready? I see you're writing furiously.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, I -- I'm -- this is kind of where I expressed my concern --

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- before this all came up was I feel like we weren't really given enough instructions on what was wanted for us to be here and enough time to think it through. Also, I don't have a good sense -- you know, Commissioner Vazquez and I have talked about this several times, and it's really hard for us to know do you all want us to run ahead of you and create a plan?

Because we kind of started that, and then we're like, nope, we got to bring people with us and they've got to be part of creating the plan. And then we're like, well, maybe we create a straw plan and have people address it. And so I think that's part of why I'm stuck right now, and maybe Commissioner Vazquez has all the answers for this and I can just hide, but you know, I was actually -- you know, the whole public education piece, that's -- that was very helpful. I understand that this is just time lines and stuff, but I don't think we've given each other enough instructions so we know what we can do on our own and what we need to do in a workshop together.

MS. JOHNSTON: I can answer that --

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: -- a little bit in that the subcommittees are purely advisory. If they had decision-making authority, they would have to comply with Bagley-Keene. So you can come forward with a plan that you advise the rest of the Commission to adopt, but the action of deciding on the plan has to be by the full Commission.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: We haven't even gotten to -- we're asking the step even before that. Can we even bring a proposed plan to you all, or do you all want to

get your -- roll up your arm -- arms, sorry. English is my second language, Alicia. Roll up our sleeves and get messy together. I mean, and I think that's where I have been really stuck to this point, and so that's why we've been doing panels and giving people different ideas and thinking and all that.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: I mean, would you mind if we have that conversation right now?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I would love it because I think I'm not the only one.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: So I mean, taking off on what Marian said, yes, I would very much see the subcommittee as, you know, using November to develop some recommendations. We'll get our hands -- all of us will get our hands dirty, you know, come December when we get your recommendations and have input into the process. But I would be quite happy and I think it really does reflect the spirit of subcommittees for your subcommittee to take November to develop recommendations to the full Commission.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: The only challenge we have is that, for some of us, we're going to have to create material. We're going to have to -- you know, there will

be a need for RFPs and all that. And so if we all agree to -- you know, to present a plan and to -- this is where I was getting stuck because if we decided yes and everyone said yes in December, and then we have six weeks for an RFP and we have the holidays, that's two months later. And so that's where everything gets complex.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: So what --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: So what do you feel like -- so unmute, Commissioner Sinay, because we're going to have a conversation. So what do you feel like -- I mean, what do you feel like you need -- what kind of guidance do you feel like you need from the rest of the Commission? What questions do you have for us that you -- that you'd like us to provide guidance for you to move this forward? I mean, to -- I -- to ease your -- ease your uncertainty or however we want to put it. I can't hear you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm sorry. I thought I unmuted myself. I saw that my colleague, Vazquez, is unmuted, so I was going to let her start.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. I --

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- have Commissioner Vazquez and Andersen also waiting.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Well, I -- another big challenge is that we had thought at this point we'd have at least the deputy director -- deputy executive director on staff, which has also been sort of -- we have intentionally been holding ourselves back from fully baking out a plan because I, personally, would like to co-plan and co-develop something with the person who we are going charge with implementing it.

And along with that, you know, a communications director. Like, as our staffing has been somewhat delayed, so has the actual planning. So I think -- I mean, part of it is that we know that this is a group that can tend to get in the weeds. I think we're happy to create a straw plan and have it ready in some form or another for discussion.

I think what -- for me, what I would like, I would like folks to sort of dig deep and think through in that -- in that sort of review discussion, input/feedback discussion, be very mindful of the time constraints in terms of, like, your -- our collective decision-making on how to do that. Because again, part of our plan, we're not sort of giving anything away, but we do think part of our plan really is that we're going to need community partners to do this work.

Philanthropy did it last time around, and philanthropy did the coordination and the administration and support, support meaning resources and support meaning technical assistance, and you know, sort of, like, what are we doing next, and what should -- you know, what should community groups be planning for next month and next week, and what have you? Philanthropy did the heavy lifting on that piece last time around. We have the money, but we don't necessarily have the expertise or the staff.

So we're -- what we are trying to do is, honestly, really make the case that to us, to ourselves, that we can't do this alone and we're going to need a really robust plan to pull the community in using the funds that we have. And it's not -- it seems very much like it can't just be a simple, we'll just have, like, 20 contracts with 20 regional leads to do this work because who is managing the contractor? Who is -- you know, who is providing that capacity-building and technical assistance? Who is -- you know, there's all this other mid-level infrastructure that was there last time that is not necessarily here this time.

So when we present, we have some thoughts about how to do that, how to achieve that, but honestly, I'm not sure everyone is -- will be -- is in a place in terms of

understanding how community outreach functions, the -- and how sort of -- how community-based organizations are resourced and supported in the private sector to do this kind of work. So part of our plan has been to sort of, again, as Commissioner Sinay said, bring everybody up to speed so that you all have a general sense of how community organizing and community working function -- community work functions as it relates to civic engagement.

And that way, when we present the full plan, everyone -- we can get into the weeds and already be in agreement about the general approach. My fear is that if we just present you a plan, we will get into the weeds and we will stray far from the general -- we won't have, like, a general framework or understanding of how community organizing works and how we should partner with that system. Any -- I hope I didn't get out in front of -- of you, Commissioner Sinay.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. I'm going to be the first to say, no, this is not a field that I understand. And I keep on getting the feeling that you have actual ideas. We'd like to kind of do this, this, this, and this, and this. And then we kind of go, oh, that's where

you're coming from. But I keep on getting the feeling that it's a field that -- I was sort of expecting -- I'm kind of a little bit more used to kind of a straw idea of this is what we're thinking and this is why.

And I feel that you guys are -- totally understand this and are just trying to -- the people we're bringing in who are wonderful and great, but like, remember we were talking about sort of an overview of why we're looking -- listening to the different people. I think we could do kind of a summary that we could give you better feedback on.

And essentially, assume that we really -- well, don't assume we don't know anything because we do, but we need an outline to follow and -- because that will give us a much better idea of -- you know, I think you're being very, very wonderful and I really appreciate how you're considering -- you don't want to be doing it for us. You want the whole Commission to do this. But I think the Commission needs a little bit more direction in terms of what you're even thinking.

You know, I -- because I keep on getting impression you're, okay we need -- we need to pay people to help us do this, but I'm not quite sure what the rule -- what the roles are that you're planning. So if you could do more of an outline of what your ideas are. Like, remember, I

keep on throwing up the idea of workshops, how that might actually function, what -- the functionality of it, I guess, is what I think would help -- certainly, it'd help me, and I'm expecting it would help others. So then we can really jump in and get into the weeds. I hope that -- I don't know if that gives any direction or if that helps anyone else.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sadhwani and Sinay?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Le Mons would like in the queue.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: If Commissioner Sinay wanted to respond to that, I think she can go first.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Why don't I respond after everybody speaks? So it might be easier than you guys having to hear me over and over again.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. I -- you know, I -- it's been many years -- it's been, like, a decade -- or no, maybe it's not that long. I don't know. Anyway, it's been a long time since I've worked in community-based organizations and advocacy groups. But you know, I hear what you both are saying because, in that world, right, things are done very differently, right?

It is a collaborative process to develop a plan, particularly a strategic plan. There is a lot of time

and emphasis that goes into kind of big picture vision and mission that drives -- that then drives the actual deliverables and the actual components that -- of a work plan. And I just wanted to -- first, I fully appreciate, like, that you're even bringing that lens to the Commission. I think that's so powerful, actually.

However, you know, I also -- I think that the challenge for us is that we aren't one of those organizations. As much as we want to be able to interact with them and fully hear the voices of various communities across California, given all of the rules that we have on us, you know, the 14-day meeting rules, the 30, 45 days, however long it's going to be for RFPs, et cetera, I think because of that kind of infrastructure that's placed upon us, we're going to have to function differently.

And so I just want to empower both of you to run with it. And I think as Commissioner Andersen said, I agree. Like, go ahead. Put together your -- you know, your dream plan, what that -- what you both think would look great. I think the two of you are amazingly situated to do that work, given your backgrounds both in organizations and in philanthropy. So I would very much welcome your recommendation because as we've said before, we're trying to build this ship while we're flying it.



So you know, I so appreciate this process, but at the same time, I think we -- I think time is of the essence, and so we've got -- we got to -- we got to move it forward, and I would welcome a draft plan that we can all -- we can all think about. And that being said, and I mentioned -- you know, Commissioner Andersen and I both mentioned this before, things like line-drawing, VRA, all of that will probably have a lot to say about what the -- what an actual plan will look like. So you know, I think it's okay if it's a -- you know, you bring a plan and be prepared for feedback, right? I don't think this group has any problem providing feedback and discussion and dialog.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: I think we have Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: This is Commissioner Le Mons. Did I get in the queue?

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Yeah. You're up.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I'm up. Oh, thank you. My apologies. I guess what I'm not clear on is the, quote unquote, urgency. Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez, for your comments a few moments ago. I think that having our communications people and our outreach person is critical. I mean, I really think that they should be a part of those conversations. I don't know why we're

asking the subcommittee to come back with a plan. I don't think they should be coming back with a plan.

I think that they have been doing noble and great foundational work, and I think that's what they've been really wanting to make sure that we're up to speed in terms of understanding how to take in what's presented to us so that we don't go in the kinds of weeds that's driven by our confusion that will be the time suck. So I guess I'm not understanding why we really cannot pump the brakes a little bit.

We created a whole position in the spirit of this, and I think to get too far out in front of that is a big mistake. So I really do not support a deeper plan. I think that the high ideas and all of that is great. I would love to get a plan from staff, again, informed by our guidance and direction, and we continue in the meantime, as we work through the delays, getting ourselves personally up to speed to be able to see that --

I happen to have worked in this space quite a lot in my career, so I know what they're trying to do here. And so, you know I am all for let's get it done, let's move, why are we wasting time, you know. And I'm that guy. In the context of this, I don't feel like we're in that position. So I just wanted to share that as another

perspective and support the very methodical approach that Commissioners Vazquez and Sinay.

And Sinay -- Commissioner Sinay, I don't think you should have a plan. I -- what I -- but you guys have high ideas, and I -- and you have experience, and I know that that's going to result in, with this what I think was a -- and we're going to come to find, I really believe -- was a smart and pivotal move in creating the role that we created, which is going to really position us to bring to life the things that I know are to come.

So I just unless there's some compelling drop dead deadline num -- date that I'm not aware of, which could be the case, I don't think it's the kind of urgency that I'm kind of hearing in this discussion. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: So I've got Kennedy and Turner. I'm not sure who was first.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Kennedy was first, and then Turner.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Kennedy, Turner, Toledo?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. On -- first of all, I'd like to fully endorse Commissioner Sadhwani's comments a few moments ago. Second, on production of materials and contracting for that and so forth, I mean, I could -- I could easily see a situation where -- yeah, ideally, I would like us to be able to

provide some quantity of materials to -- particularly to smaller grassroots groups that aren't going to have or be able to get funding to produce their own.

But if we develop materials collaboratively, whatever, and hand over a master to one of the larger groups that does have access to funding, I'm perfectly happy with them producing as many copies of it as they want, and you know, going out and using it. So I mean, I think we can -- we can be creative and flexible in how we go about this.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: I've got Turner, Toledo, then I have a comment.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. Thank you. I wanted to say that, first of all, I'm really excited about the depth and detail that commissioners -- that the commissioners are working on, Ms. Vazquez and Sinay. Totally trust their plan or their vision of what should happen being deeply rooted in civic engagement and in the community and what have you.

Now having said that, I don't -- I agree that we shouldn't get too far out, but I also think that there is some urgency. I come from this world. I am -- I was the ACBL in Region 4 and one of the partners in Region 6. We're not just waiting around to wonder if we'll have work to do. Those organizations are extremely busy and

we're planning now what we will be doing post-election, which will -- which, either way it goes, there's lots of work to be done.

So I think reaching out, at least formulating a thought or a plan enough to say, here is -- we're saying we want them to help us with the work. There's already tons of work that we're engaged in and will be engaged in, and this will be compelling. We will want to also be able to support and help, but we cannot just spring it on the last minute. I think conversations should be had now as far as if there is even interest.

As I look at the documents that were prepared and the contact names that are on the sheet, there are some that does one level of engagement with the community that could be just, you know, some phone-banking stuff, and then there are those that are the trusted partners that are actually out in the communities that's able to host via the workshops or what have you. And again, those things need to be planned out.

For nonprofits, as I know a lot of you know, right now we are planning for our next quarter, our next year looks like, which things will be the priority. We're always spread thin, always tons of work to do.

Everything is a great and urgent idea to work on, but we're deciding now which things we will work on. And I

think the partners that have the deepest connections are those that get inundated quickest with requests and what have you.

And so I think like everything else, similar to when we talked about the importance and the scarcity of a line drawer, we think there's tons of community partners out there that's doing great work, and I'm sure there is a lot, but there are some that we'd want to work with that can probably go deeper and broader, and those are the ones that we stand to lose if we take too long in this process.

So my only other thing is, is that I'm -- I am also hopeful that as plans are being thought out, ideas that they are posted back for the full team, so for those of us that are also working in that area, we can respond to some of the suggestions. And other than that, go forward, make it happen. I know it's going to be wonderful.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Thank you. Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I would concur with Commissioner Turner. I think some of the other urgency, right, and the established -- navigating the established governmental rules that we're -- we must follow is going to take up quite a bit of time. And I think that's where

we're feeling the pressure to move forward, while at the same time -- because we know that everything takes time when you're working with -- through the established governmental rules, and we'll be in April in no time, given the holidays and everything else. And so I understand the urgency.

I'm also thinking maybe we -- in terms of just getting us all up to speed, perhaps some kind of draft concept paper or logic model might help get us all aligned and going in the -- moving in the right -- in the -- in the same direction and give guidance to staff. Because I agree with Commissioner Le Mons that we have to have staff to help us navigate those government-established rules, and then put plan together in alignment so that it does go through as quickly as possible and meets the needs that we want to achieve.

But we really do need to understand what our -- what our end outcomes, what the outcomes we want to achieve, measurable outcomes, are going to be. And I think that would be helpful for all of us to kind of establish -- begin with the process of establishing those things.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah, I'd like to get in the queue.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. Commissioner Le Mons, I have a comment first, and then we'll go to you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Vazquez was also in the queue.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: Okay. Where was she in the queue?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: She's after you.

VICE-CHAIR FORNICIARI: After me. Okay. Okay. So first of all, Commissioner Akutagawa is back, and I'm going to turn it over to her to take back Chair responsibilities. I wanted -- she came back a little while ago, and I wanted to allow her time to get in the flow of the conversation before I dumped it back on her.

But so love the conversation. Think we've been needing to have this conversation for a long time. Love the perspectives. I think we're right on -- heading in the right direction. So one of -- the thing that is kind of rattling around in the back of my mind is the interplay between a lot of these decisions that we need to make.

So for instance, you know, what is the vision and the model we're going to use in the COVID environment for eliciting public comment? What is the model we're going to use for interacting with the -- with our partners? You know, what are the different models we're going to use to gather the information and do the interaction we're going to do, and how do those models play into our

contract for a videographer, our contract for a line drawer, our other contracts that we got to put -- that we have to put together?

And so, you know, I can see that we probably aren't going to have the exact answer to how we're going to do those interactions because I don't think we're close to answering those questions, but I think, in some way, we have to have some idea of what we're going to do in order to help facilitate us writing those contracts in a way that they can be flexible enough to support the work we're going to do.

Because you know, we got Raul right now working on the videographer contract and we got to pull the trigger on that, and maybe we can go back and revisit it later, but if we can have -- at least have some idea of what those engagement models are going to be, I think that would help inform or be very helpful when we're putting those contracts together.

And I'm sorry. I'm completely lost. Commissioner Vazquez, I think, and then Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I will defer to Commissioner Le Mons so that Commissioner Sinay and I can respond all -- altogether now.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay. Thank you for that. I'll just start by saying I think that -- I guess I'm

uncomfortable with this conversation. I feel like we're putting undue responsibility and burden on Commissioners Vazquez and Sinay. So I'll start with that.

And when I use the term staff, I'm not just talking about people who just go off and do what we planned and what we want to do. We're talking about expertise. Like, and we're paying good money for expertise. We happen to have people on the Commission in Vazquez and Sinay who can make sure that what we're shepherding in our hired expertise is going to deliver what we want. But I feel like what we're saying is we expect them to figure out the plan and lay out the plan, and I disagree.

I don't think it is their plan to have to figure out. I think that they certainly inform it, bring vision to it. I think we all participate in the planning process, but we're hiring expertise. And so they're going to bring -- they -- they've done -- I hope we've hired these people because their experience and have done these things before. So they're going to be -- they should be leading from our direction, but they should be bringing us the plan to review, to give feedback to based upon the direction that we gave them, not just execute.

We can just hire a field team, then, much cheaper to lay out what Commissioners Sinay and Vazquez creates. So I think that I'm looking at this a little bit different.

And I feel the pressure of the bureaucracy and what that requires in terms of timing. And yes, we're going to have to work with that. But we don't want to have the bureaucracy back us into a situation where we're not creating what we want to create because we're trying to get an RFP done because it takes six weeks to get the RFP.

So we've got a balance between these two approaches. And so this urgency -- and I get -- I get, we're doing our strategic planning, too, and I get that everybody is planning, and they need to know. And those that are going to be interested and can do it, will do it. And those that don't have the capacity or are not interested or their bandwidth is already full -- and nonprofits' bandwidth are always full anyway -- they won't participate.

So maybe there is some communication we could put out it at a high, high level introducing the Commission to those organizations that are not watching us, that are not engaged, saying this is who we are, this is what's going to be happening, we'll be reaching out to you in support. We're currently developing our plan. Maybe we could release some media around that. Maybe we can do some direct communication to the kinds of organizations to get on their radar in anticipation of that. But I

think the planning piece is going to be a bit of a process, and I think that we should participate in a planning process that includes our high-level staff who are not on board, as we speak, and nor is the organization that they're going to want to create.

And this kind of hearkens back to Commi -- Director -- senator, director -- Director Claypool's comments earlier about the budget in terms of that detailed budget. Until we know exactly -- this is very similar. Until we know exactly what our outreach strategy is going to be, which tools we're going to use, et cetera, it's very difficult to put prices to that, but it's going to -- that part's coming. And that's the part that I think that's not up to Commissioners Vazquez and Sinay to go off and figure out all that stuff and bring the plan back and say, this is what -- this is what I think we should do. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And then Director Claypool.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: You know, I'm listening and I'm hearing all of us trying to figure out how this is going to move forward. And I do think that you all bring amazing expertise. I think that it's possible for -- when we get to where Commissioner Le Mons wants us to be -- and I agree that that the deputy executive director and the media director need to have great input into how

we proceed forward -- but it's hard for me to imagine that the 14 of you, once they have a plan, won't have modifications and little tweaks that you're going to want to see because I see a group that knows generally where you want to head.

For some of these contracts that we need to get into place or start right now, and I'm going to go back to data analytics, I think that, regardless of who our deputy executive director is or our media director, they're going to follow that lead because we all know that there's a fundamental need for capturing this information and then putting it out so people can use it.

So I believe that, for many of these things, you can say, we need this component, and we can get started on the -- in the review, who's available, get the RFP out there, and then it will coincide with these other individuals coming onboard and saying, this is what I need. They can be written generally enough so that we can work within the parameters when we start dealing with these people on giving them both their vision and your vision and merging them.

So there is a great need. I said it yesterday and I say it again today, anything you want in January needs to start right now. And so I'm just hoping that we can merge both these visions and get to the same place.



That's all.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioners Sinay and Vazquez, do you want to respond now?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I have a specific point that I wanted to respond to. Thank you, Commissioner Turner, I think, for highlighting the idea that work is happening. It might not be on redistricting, but work is happening. Communities are organizing around the election; you know, as of a week ago, it was the census.

And I think last week, you may -- I'm not sure how much you've been able to catch up on the discussions from last week, but we closed last week's meeting with a discussion around adopting sort of a reconnaissance, for lack of a better term, framework effort for the Commission to sort of begin what I am seeing.

We didn't frame it this way last week, but what I am seeing now in light of your comments is also a sig -- a way for the Commission to do some signaling in each of these census regions to say, hey, we're here, we're doing this, this is what's coming starting January to a community near you. Do you want to be involved? Are -- you know, are you planning to be involved? Do you know that this is happening? Are you planning on being involved? Do you have capacity and expertise to be involved?

If one of those two things isn't true, but you still want to be involved, either you don't have the capacity, you know, money, staff, whatever, or maybe you don't quite have the expertise, maybe you're still trying to figure out how to connect with your community in a COVID environment because you work with rural communities and you're trying to figure out the internet access piece. What do you need to participate in the redistricting process organization?

And then each of these regional teams that we set up last week, after doing that sort of very initial needs assessment, comes back to the Commission to inform, again, this plan, this visioning. We're -- I think sometimes, not always, but some of us, when we're using plan, including myself, there's more talking about a general vision, talking about our big goals and objectives, and less so about the weeds.

And again, I think to trust that this committee is very, very aware of the deadlines and very, very aware that we, as a Commission, and we, as a subcommittee, are volunteering to make sure we get us to a place at the right time so that we can press go on any plan that we come to consensus on. So we are mindful of that.

That being said, I do want to reiterate again, because we are a Commission that likes to go in the

weeds, there is a real risk of coming up with our -- coming up with our best guess, our best first pass at a plan with goals and objectives and time lines and having this group spend a whole day clawing at that and be so sort of back in disarray with all the weeds that we lose -- we lose any progress we've made on big -- any potential progress for coming to, like, a real solid, like, commitment by everybody that these are our big four goals and these are how we're going to know we -- this is how we're going to know that we've been successful at these four goals.

So next week's visioning exercise, in my mind, is a way to get us really rock solid on what are our big four goals or five or what have you. Here's how we'll know that we've been successful so that then we can go back. Hopefully, by then we'll have at least a deputy executive director and we can think through the strategies to get to those goals and metrics.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Turner. Oh. Commissioner Sinay, do want to say something first before -- okay. Commissioner Turner and then Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I was just going to say I love that. Thank you so much. And was going to make a quick suggestion that may help with the -- like, a

placeholder and a time kind of stamp for everyone. You -- we already obviously have the lists of the regions as was stated, and since census is over and they're kind of winding down, most of these regions are made up of several partners and not just one. So even in spaces where you have a single name, and if the determined person from our Commission reaches out to that one person, that's probably one of ten that actually --

So I'm wondering if there is an appetite of the subcommittee to create just one very general letter that can go out to the whole of them that says, and we will be reaching out to the partners. Those of you that are interested in redistricting work, right now while they're still meeting, doing their winding-down lessons, that would be an -- meetings -- that would be an easy message for them to disseminate out and would also mark time for the partners that were involved in each of the ACBLs and to begin thinking if they want to engage in, you know, later on in our efforts of redistricting or not.

As opposed to each person reaching perhaps one person, I was just thinking that might be a way that everyone -- I mean, and we still would do that to ask the questions. I'm talking about a generic letter that would just say, and hold, please. We'll be coming back at you to see if you want to do redistricting work.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'll start back -- Commissioner Turner, I think you have a great point, but I think every region kind of functions differently. And so, in some regions, that's why we're calling kind of the CBO -- the organizer and the government people and get a feel from them on what works best, and so maybe a letter will work best. A thought we've also had is that we actually get on their agenda -- the regional directors get the -- the regional teams get on the agenda of the census and just have a conversation on one of their meetings.

So we're kind of waiting till you all talk to each of the regions because they're very different to see what the regions are recommending to us on how to approach them. But you're right. It's not just one -- it's not just one and it's great.

I do want to share that I was on a call with the Orange County Grantmakers did -- had a four-day summit on race and equity, and one of the panels was on civic engagement after the census, so I just kind of sat in. And I did throw out a question saying, are you thinking about redistricting or what are your thoughts about redistricting? And these were different organizations.

And the response was really interesting. They all were thinking about it. They don't have time right now.

They -- it's like, what we're going to do in November or December. Don't even ask us anything right now. So they -- there is that desire of we know it's there but. And these were healthcare organizations. They weren't necessarily civic organizations.

But what I -- my aha moment on all of it was that a lot of people are young. You know, they -- a lot of the organizers and a lot of the leaders that are involved were not involved in 2010 and some of the misinformation that was being shared about how the process worked in 2010. And so it made me very aware that we do need a public education campaign but a little different than -- I mean, similar to what Commissioner Kennedy was saying, but just one that's just straight to those groups, those -- the census tables, just to have that conversation and they see our faces and we start creating those relationships.

And I know I'm going into the plan versus the weeds, but I just wanted to share that just being in on these conversations is kind of on the background. I did eventually -- the facilitator is one of my clients and I said, if you want to help me as a commissioner, feel free to. And she did out me, so it wasn't -- I wasn't -- they did know that -- who asked the question.

I agree that we just need to develop a template of

our materials and that others can copy them and print them. And last time, the Commission didn't have the money and a lot of that was done by Common Cause and other nonprofits. I would rather see us create a lot of that material so we have a say on it, but I don't think, right now, we have the staff or the expertise to design something and be -- create it simple and be really good.

And so when I'm saying collateral matter and all that, I'm not talking about printing and copying. Those days are gone. Everything now is digital. I'm talking about someone who knows how to create that material digitally.

I also feel that we need to deal with this brand thing sooner rather than later. We need to figure out what our look is going to be. And yes, we're not using business cards right now and -- because none of us are out -- you know, we're not out as much. But we do need to know what's our logo? Can we have a virtual business card that's on our thing? Can we have little cards that are thank you cards that we send out to people after we've talked to them so that we're creating those relationships? There's a whole piece of this that isn't even there, and we can't do until we have the right staff.

And I think I wanted to say, the urgency,



Commissioner Le Mons, I think a few people answered it and you get it. It's really that urgency of bureaucracy. And I really appreciated how Commissioner Forniciari was saying, hey, we need to understand at least the model and how they're going to interact with some of this other stuff. Because I know every once while you'll see me and Commissioner Le Mons go but, but, but, but, but because we have stuff in our heads that we haven't put out and we are seeing the intersection between the tool, the VRA, you know, all those different intersections. So that may be a place where we spend some time thinking through, and some of our wish list on what we see under that. I do also want to remind you all that we did create a tool that is kind of a theory of change. I'm kind of getting past theories of change because they drive everybody crazy. But I did -- we did create a tool that kind of gave you our outline of what we were thinking of the different stages in this and the different -- who is the partners and who's -- and that was done purposely so that you all could fill it in as well as you're listening and send things to us as you have ideas.

So we didn't put names and things on there but we basically gave you our -- an outline of what we see happening. We didn't put, yeah -- we can put more info into that that, but I think will be helpful. But that

was the first thing we created because we knew you all had some great ideas as well because I always tell everybody that at least half of this commission are organizers. So I don't -- we don't see ourselves as the only ones who understand the community and have rolled up our sleeves.

And I wanted to -- I agree with Commissioner Vazquez. We actually do have the expertise to do a lot of this work. We -- yeah, we got -- we could -- I could set up a great grantmaking program for us in a heartbeat. Yeah, we could, we got the expertise. We don't have the time, you know, we don't have the time. I have to keep reminding myself that I do have another life and -- because I love doing this stuff, I'm enjoying myself. But we don't have the time. And there is a state bureaucracy. The state bureaucracy is my biggest fear on how we can do this the best way possible. And so I'm thinking part of the visioning is that we need to be clear on why we keep -- Commissioner Vazquez and I keep going back to stumbling on that -- on that piece.

I think I hit all my Post-its.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Well, I think I'm -- not seeing any other comments, I'll weigh in with my comment. I do want to agree with what Commissioner Turner started with. I am very much mindful of that, working with the

organizations that I do work with. And I think right now we're -- all the organizations, as has been said already, you know, it's kind of like what's in front, elections first and then I think you'll think about what's next after that.

I do also want to -- not to put a damper on this -- this conversation about the community-based organizations but I also want to also say, in addition to the planning that is going on, COVID has done a number on a lot of nonprofit organizations, particularly smaller organizations. There is, I think, lots of discussions happening. I think people are literally hanging on at least through the elections right now. I think what happens after the elections, maybe after this -- when the new year hits, that's where there's a lot of questions about how many of these organizations will be able to survive. I'm not saying that because we shouldn't use them. I'm saying it because we need to establish these relationships with them sooner rather than later. And especially if there's going to be the possibility of funding that will enable them to do this work, whatever that's going to look like.

I don't want to create more issues and everything but I think if they know that there's going to be the possibility of funding for this, I think it will help

them in terms of their planning, at least for the next several months, too. And that's also going to be important because I think, as has been said, it's -- we need their partnership. And there's going to be all manner of organizations that we may not even realize that we'll need to be engaging. Not just the big ones but there's also a lot of the small ones who really are going to be those conduits to those really hard-to-reach communities that the larger ones will be relying on to reach those hard-to-reach communities.

So I just wanted to add that in there as well too. If I can also ask Commissioners Sinay and Vazquez, I have a question for you that I -- that Commissioner Le Mons did bring up that I didn't hear completely addressed. And maybe you did in a different way. But I understand what he's saying. He says -- he made a comment. He says if there -- "it seems to me that we're putting undue burden on you, the subcommittee." And so I wanted to be able to both clarify and also perhaps have you address that.

I think it would be helpful for, at least for me, and I would think that maybe for some of the other commissioners to know. Does it feel like an undue burden? Is this something that you feel like, I know you are excited about -- Commissioner Sinay said that -- but at

the same time I think we should address that question as well, too? Commissioner Sinay or Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Do you want to speak for first, Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I can. I don't think it's an -- I wouldn't characterize it as an undue burden. I do think, in my experience with boards, there is always this tension of how much of a working board versus a strategic directional oversight. It's the philosophy of leadership of -- so that said, I think we're all trying to figure out, especially if we have not been on a board before. Sort of what our orientation to the work is.

I am a bit more of the mind that I do think that some of the planning -- we should at least be in partnership with the staff who is going to be assigned to execute it. That being said, you know, I'm more -- personally, I have -- I enjoyed this process. I'm enjoying this process. I wouldn't call it a burden at all but it is a lot of work. And I'm not sure if that that question from anyone is in reference to my health. I had a really rough September. I'm feeling much better now and feeling like I have more literal brain space to be committing to the work. So that has been nice.

So yeah, there's going to be a tension between -- for all of us, between how much time we can commit and

brain space we can commit. It's going to ebb and flow. Right now, I do feel like I have the capacity and the interests to do the planning work. But my philosophy is really also that we should be doing some of the finer points with our staff on a lot of these pieces. But I do think we absolutely have the responsibility of the Commission to do the big goal setting and the metrics for our success for ourselves. And that is the stuff that I think we can do without -- in advance of staff getting on board. And that is where I'm trying to prioritize our subcommittee time.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think I would just add, you know, I this has been an interesting experience for me because I've been a consultant now for 18 years, I think. I have worked and did -- there was a point where I was a consultant and a school board member and an executive -- on the executive team of a national nonprofit and I was running for school board. But I tried to forget those -- that period of my life. Oh, yeah, and as a mom. But -- so a lot of times I've tried to figure out, am I a consultant helping you all get there, or am I allowed to step forward? And that's where I think Commissioner Vazquez and I make a good team because, you know, all the -- we're -- yeah, we're messy together and that's

what democracy is.

And -- but we're messy in a really positive way because we each are building on each other's strengths. And we have pulled in -- like I brought in Commissioner Turner to listen -- sit in on a call with me. And I and I've brought -- Commissioner Sadhwani and I were going to sit on another call. And, you know, so we're kind of running around but also trying to bring people in at different times because we know that this is bigger than just us. Us meaning the outreach piece.

I guess, Commissioner Le Mons, I really appreciate you saying that because I personally think for all 14 of us, no one can put more undue stress on us than we do ourselves. And that's how we got to where we are, is we are the type of individuals that are never happy with the work that we have done. You know, we're probably our worst critics.

So that's why I say out loud a lot of times, let's be nice to each other. It's a reminder for me to be nice to myself as well as to each other. So when you said that I just -- I took it kind of as a wash. I'm going to use the "L" word but I did take it as it was just a gift of -- a lovely gift to hear you say that.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: That was my intention.



CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons. All right, okay. So just so I am aware, it seems like that was just one part of this larger milestone conversation is my sense -- okay? Was that the first? All right. And I think I heard it acknowledged earlier that the intersections with the other pieces, I think we've been talking or beginning to talk a lot around the VRA about the line drawer. Those are at least some of the other major areas. We also have the Communities of Interest that has its own deadlines as well, too, or kind of timelines.

So let me just -- so on this, I know we had the conversations earlier on this, but is there any other input on any of these major milestones that we should be specifically noting, keeping in mind at least raising up so that we're all aware and be mindful of how all of that intersects together so that we don't lose track?

And perhaps if I can ask, I know that we have the Gantt charts here. We got the timeline on the Communities of Interest. So I'm a little less worried about that. In terms of the line drawers, perhaps I can ask that subcommittee, Commissioners Sadhwani, and Andersen. Do you have any thoughts yet about timeline, things that we should be keeping in mind at this point right now? Have you had a chance to talk about that yet?

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I mean, I think -- I'm just trying -- I can't -- can you scroll down just a little bit under map drawings so I can see that. Okay, thank you. That, I mean, I think we could add if you want, you know, put up the RFP. I think that's a part of higher line drawers. Our goal is to have a draft RFP right at the November 4th meeting, as mentioned.

My only thought about this timeline is that it includes the holidays. So my guess is just given the RFP timelines, et cetera, we might actually go to like mid-January before we -- or end of January even before we can finalize something, just being realistic. But obviously, we will push for sooner.

But yeah, I mean, I think all of this is in broad strokes, fine. We haven't had a chance to discuss a timeline in this great of detail but certainly, we can after this meeting and can come back with, you know, additional pieces. I think that some of this -- these overlap, right. So we had talked before about the RPV and that racially polarized voting analysis question. I think that connects with develop VRA districts. And I think our RPV analyst will help us identify those places. But yeah, I think this is fine as a draft.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I think what I've seen is

there's two things that we need to consider. One is there's the education of the commissioner's piece. So, you know, thinking about how do we bring in the right experts to help us get up to speed and be further educated on it? And then there's what I would call the actual nuts and bolts of making sure that we can get the people hired that we need. And what is -- what are all those things?

There's something that I think when we were planning out the agenda, Commissioner Fornaciari had said, you know, perhaps it might help to just think about what is the drop-dead that we would need to have anybody on board, whether it's the line drawer, the RPV consultant, whether it's the legal counsel, and maybe use that as kind of our line in the sand and then try to work backwards from there, instead of just trying to say, well, we want a target around here.

But if we know that we absolutely must have somebody on board by a certain time and work backwards from there, it may make kind of trying to think out the timeline a little bit easier for each of -- each piece that's going to happen.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. My sense and you know, I don't know if Director Claypool or Marian had different thoughts about this but my sense is that

there's -- we're up against two different pieces, right. On the one hand, drop-dead timeline -- and we want to have them in place before we start going out and doing any kinds of meetings, regardless if that's on Zoom or in person. But that being said, it's a narrow field to identify these folks.

So I think that there's like a -- there's our drop-dead timeline of when we are prepared to go out. But then there's also like the competition to find a line drawer, to find our RPV analysis, et cetera. So I think that we're up against both. But I think our outreach plan can to some extent help inform, like, when this person actually needs to be fully on board, contract starts, that kind of thing.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: If I could kind of add in terms of -- just to add in on top of that is ideally, I think we'd like to have all of them essentially coming on board mid-January. And then when -- because as we use them, they're going to be interacting. Now, in terms of their full time -- they won't be acting that way because we'll fluctuate. But I know personally I would really like to have us have the line drawer working a little bit with the COI tool as we're taking in the information, this data person, all as we are kind of learning and we're kind of doing trial runs or a workshop.

You know, Commissioner Fornaciari has talked about models. We need to practice creating models because we're going to try a couple of them and they're not going to work. And then we're going to try -- then we're going to revise. And I'd like to -- when we're -- well, actually rolling things out in February, it's because we've already, kind of January-ish or early February, we've tried models with our different partners. And that's including the connection of, like, the VRA and the line drawer together. The COI tool with the line drawer with our -- with our partners. And trying bits of this and seeing what combination works and what combination does not work.

And as Commissioner Le Mons said, get our experts to help us refine our models. And so by the time we start rolling things out to the public, it looks like we know what we're doing. And with the education part being upfront so -- and this -- as the outreach committee has done an exceptional job of -- we're trying to touch base with everybody and say, get ready, we're going to be coming around this time. And so in terms of our preparation, I think we're trying to get people on board and do our rough prep through January. So we're starting things in February. So our education does basically happen now and our touching base happens now. So that's

kind of how I see things. Thanks.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: I saw Commissioner Sinay, Commissioner Yee, and Commissioner Sadhwani, and Director Claypool.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. I'm going to backtrack a little bit just because I need this said in public, is that we do -- we do want to acknowledge that we know that the community groups are sending their recommendations for outreach engagement and all that. And we haven't forgotten that they said that they were -- be sending that. That was one of my Post-its.

Going back to this conversation. There is nothing wrong with putting out an RFP and not giving -- and the person doesn't have to start work for two or three months, you know, two or three months. I mean, that consultants love to know that, out there they do have -- the money is coming in. So it doesn't have to be, you know, linear, like, hiring someone is all I wanted to make sure we knew.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, that's helpful. Let's see, Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. On the deadlines for the map drawing, especially getting later in the year. I mean, I wonder if we need two different scenarios because, you know, we don't know when the census data is

going to be released. And we don't know the quality of it and complications and how much we can or can't expedite as we've been asked to do the production of the draft maps, you know, based on that release date.

So, I mean, it looks like the ranges we have here kind of are the maximum ranges, right. Taking us pretty close to the December 15th, absolute deadline currently in place. But, you know, there's that language about expediting it as much as possible. And I guess I'd just like to see that reflected somewhere in perhaps a different scenario, you know, depending on things that we don't know yet.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Great point. Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think that's a great point, Commissioner Yee. Maybe just even in the Gantt chart, we can kind of, you know, lighter-shade or, I don't want to mess with the system but just to acknowledge that or a secondary line or some scenario or something of that nature. I completely agree.

The thing I wanted to actually raise, which I forgot to mention previously, and this is -- actually connects to our previous conversation about the community outreach. In the RFP, one of the things that we are actively trying to figure out, one of the biggest is --

and let me just -- sorry -- one of the things we have to figure out is either the rough number of meetings that we are going to do and expect our line drawers to do that. Or we need to have a lot of flexibility about how we structure that RFP.

And that is definitely something that is on our minds. One of the pieces of feedback that we received was that in 2010, one set number of meetings was listed in the RFP and then in reality it was actually almost double that number that occurred. And so that is a huge level of undertaking for the line drawer. So in terms of coordinating and collaborating with the community outreach piece, as we've mentioned, we got to get this RFP out soon. That's something that once we put out there, it matters.

And so I just want to put that on everyone's radar. We don't have to discuss it now. I can follow up, you know, Commissioner Andersen and I can do our follow ups with the community outreach or with whomever. Or if anyone wants to provide input, that would be fine. But I just wanted to flag that that was a major source of contention for the -- in 2010 for the line drawer and something we definitely need to keep on our radar.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: And then you've got -- Director Claypool is next.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Excuse me. The time to take a break is now.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yes. Is that a -- are we at the 90-minute mark?

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: A little past it?

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay, then, yes. Let's go ahead. Let's take our 15-minute break. And then when we come back, Director Claypool, perhaps you could address what was just brought up as well as your comment?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Certainly.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Welcome back, everyone. And right before we went to break, Director Claypool was going to make a comment. I also want to just acknowledge that we've been having quite a bit of a discussion around the milestones. What I'd like to do is finish out this part of the discussion and then we'll go to public comment right after that.

Director Claypool, I believe you had a comment that you wanted to make.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: I do. So you've all been -- sort of been beating the RFP drum to death and -- and I've been listening to you. And I think that all of you feel this sense of urgency based on bureaucracy.

Commissioner Sadhwani is absolutely correct. There are very limited pools for almost everyone that you're talking about. This happens once every ten years, every -- these groups, like, line drawers and VRA council, this is where they make their money and they're going to -- they're all going to be, hopefully, contracting out with people.

I would say the sooner we can do all of the contracts, the better. There's -- all of these contracts, line drawers, your legal counsel, they're bill-by-services contracts. You'll set the contract in place and you'll say, well, we won't need our legal counsel until next January, when we have the, you know, the litigation. But you'll start using their services almost immediately. You're going to ask them about their opinion regarding what's going on with the Supreme Court. Or you're going to, you know, you're going to reach out to them. You're going to use them more than you think.

Your line drawer, you're going to use to -- even in your public meetings before you actually get the public law data, people will call in and they'll want to tell you what they're -- this is what occurred last time. I shouldn't say -- I would envision it working this way again, that they'll call in and want to tell you what their neighborhood looks like. And the line drawer would

say, okay, is this the northern boundary? And yes, that's a northern boundary. And then they would save that iteration. And we -- and last time we tied their testimony to that iteration.

I would envision that whomever is collecting our data for us this time would do much the same thing. So your data collection group, your analytics, your line drawer, your counsel, your VRA people, they almost all merge together and start together. And some you will use more at first and less later and vice versa. But it's not like any of them will fallow, waiting for you to give them a call. All of them will know that they're kind of on call and you'll start using them.

The last thing I'd like to do is address the line drawer contract and something that Commissioner Sadhwani said. It's absolutely true last time that Karin ended up doing far more meetings than she had anticipated. We'd never done one of these contracts before. And we leaned on the line drawers. And so put it out as an all-inclusive. You need to, you know, give us all the line drawer services we need until we're done. And so we had two contractors who in theory gave us that bid because we never opened the bid from RDA (ph.) down south because prior to opening the sealed bid, they were determined to be non-responsive.

Their part of their contract didn't meet what we had asked them to give us. And so Karin was in fact, Q2 was in fact, the only the only bidder. If you look at the contract that the state auditor put together for the line drawer, and I have my own theories as to why no one bid, but it was -- there was an attempt to address that. And the way -- the way it was attempted to be addressed was, we asked for a bid for a set number, like, 40 meetings. And that would give you the basis of comparison against all line drawers. Well, these people are charging us this for 40. These are charging us that for 40. And then there was a clause in there that said we need a per-meeting bid. So that then when we go way over that number, we can pay you fairly per meeting. And I think that's one of the ways to kind of get around that.

There was also the same clause in there for having to give counsel any type of instruction. Yes, our Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher asked for a lot of assistance. What they asked for were iterations. They wanted to see how line drawing worked to make sure that they were correctly addressing it in their -- in their legal briefs and so forth. So there are ways to make sure that the line drawer gets paid fairly. And that needs to definitely be addressed. And I just wanted to call your attention to those clauses. So that's all I have to say,



thanks. Unless somebody has a question.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Director Claypool, maybe I'll ask you a question. Did you do the -- do these roles, the line drawer particularly -- I think I heard -- I came in and I heard that the VRA council does not have to be drawn from within California and that that may give us a greater flexibility in terms of being able to go out to a wider pool. Is that also same for the line drawer?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: So Doug Johnson (ph.) with RDA did the line drawing for Arizona, I think twice. So clearly they travel. I do -- I think that there's always that feeling that in any state that you have to live, you know, you have to be from California to know California. I do not believe that it's necessarily exclusive. I think that you can go out as far as you can to get the pool you want to make sure that you're making an informed decision. So I think you can go out of state for this contract.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: The only limitation on that, if I may add, is that if it's going to involve litigation, it's got to be someone who's licensed in California, which could be an outside lawyer who's licensed here.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: I'm sorry, Marian, I didn't hear you very well. So you said that anybody for the Council,

it would have to be someone who is licensed in California?

MARY: If they're going to be involved in litigation.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Got it, okay. Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Just to -- yeah, just to note the list of line drawers that we have and have been adding to most certainly does have some line drawers from outside of the state. So I agree with Director Claypool.

Just one piece of -- you mentioned RDC with Ben (ph.) Johnson? I believe his company here is National Demographics Corporation -- NDC. Maybe I'm --

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: No, I think you're probably correct. I just was going off memory. And so if you have that right there, it's correct. But he was the only other line drawer. And we never opened his bid, so.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So I do not see any comments. I am going to assume then that you're all okay with where we are right now. And we thank the VRA Committee for the work that they will be doing on the line drawer and what they decide about council. I know that we had several options.

And I know we're getting towards the end of the day so people are getting tired. I looked at the remainder

of the Gantt chart. Perhaps we could just do a quick look at everything. But I did not see anything else that required any timing out. And please, if anybody sees something differently, please correct me. But I believe that we've covered pretty much everything that is on the Gantt chart and anything that is requiring of being -- at least major milestones being identified so that we can make sure that we are mindful of that as we go forward over the next few months.

Because the other major piece I see on there is litigation, but that falls under VRA council and the VRA subcommittee. Okay. In terms of timeline, I know I just said that. I don't see anything else. There is one other thing, and that is the data analytics. And that's also going to be a contract that I believe we're going to need to need to engage. We don't -- I don't know, Commissioner Kennedy, I don't know if that's something that's on there right now because it's a combination of the data from the COI tool. But it's also all of the other data that we'll be receiving in.

I know that Commissioner Sinay was also talking about the civics' technology as well, too, which we'll also be collecting additional data that is not just going to come through the COI tool itself. And there is technology that is available now that was not available

in 2010. So part of what we should also be thinking about is having some mechanism for, not only collecting the data but how the data will be analyzed and how someone is going to help us understand the data that we will have.

So there is a data analytics piece that will need to be mindful of. I know that there was a suggestion, I believe, from Director Claypool, that we also consider perhaps creating a subcommittee that will be focused on this data analytics piece. Unless the desire is to have it fall under one of the existing subcommittees.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I was hoping you would.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Oh, me?

(Laughter)

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Because I was, you know, it's like, I wonder if this is one that will fall under the VRA subcommittee.

(Laughter)

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: More to your point.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I just wanted offer that I sent out an email this morning a listserv. I got a couple recommendations of names. One is actually someone who's at the Ash Center at Harvard. The 2010 Commission received the Ash grant from them. I forget, the other

one is where -- at Georgetown, I think, and runs some sort of civic data, something or other. I'm sorry, I shouldn't phrase it that way, but it's a new field for me, so, you know, I included the -- Commissioner Sinay on that -- in that email, knowing that this was an area she was interested in. If someone else would like to take it on, you know, I'm happy to hand that off to someone else. If not, I can work on it because I think it does need to get done. But I'm also very involved in these other pieces.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, I actually thought that you and I made a good team on this Sara, since we're looking at it from two different -- oh, sorry, Commissioner Sadhwani. I guess I'm getting tired. But you are on about six other subcommittees. So if someone else is interested in learning about this as well.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Now, there is a whole field of data analytics that is being utilized -- Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I would volunteer for tribute.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Anyone -- no one got the reference. Okay, never mind. Commissioner Vazquez got the reference. But, yeah, data analytics is something

that I'm interested in. I am more than happy to take the reins with someone else as a subcommittee if the chair chooses to appoint one.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Turner, is that -- is that you're volunteering? All right. Thank you very much, Commissioner Turner. Okay, so Commissioner Ahmad and Commissioner Turner, thank you very much for volunteering. I think I would like to appoint a data analytics subcommittee. I think it is something that's going to cut across many of the different pieces and I think it would be helpful to have someone looking at, not only the resource we'll need to engage in terms of a consultant but also what as a commission we should be looking at around that, so that we can put that as one of our milestones to be also considering.

Another one that I also want to add to the milestones that was brought up by Commissioner Fornaciari, and I think that this has come up in different ways, is one focused on language. I know that a lot of it -- initially, I know that there is an intersection with the COI tool. I know there's an intersection with outreach and engagement. Is there a perspective as to whether or not it should be its own separate subcommittee that then works across the various subcommittees? Or is there a preference to keep it

within one of the current subcommittees? Commissioner Kennedy. You're on mute.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: So I was not muted, to begin with -- okay. I believe we put this on the agenda for the 4th to the 6th of November to have a longer discussion on the whole language issue.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: The intent is to -- actually next week we will be bringing that up as part of a larger language access. But we -- to give ourselves some flexibility we renamed that agenda item, general access. And so in preparation for that, I think the question is, does it make sense? Because like -- it was observed before, there is an education piece for all of the commissioners.

But I think there's also the details and the work and the process piece as well, too, that's going to be coordinating the work across all these various subcommittees as well, too. And there was an observation and a recommendation that perhaps we consider one that is going to be focused on language access across all of the different areas that we're looking at, rather than trying to just have it housed under one area and expand what is already quite a bit of work.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right. It is a cross-cutting issue, very much.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: And I'm happy to work on that myself. If anybody else would be interested in working on that, too. Commissioner Fernandez or Commissioner Kennedy -- I comment or query.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No. I was just saying I could volunteer as well, so. But I know it's dear to Commissioner Kennedy's heart, so I'm not going to take it away from him.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Do the two of you also want to work together as well, too? I will not necessarily say I'm interested but I'm also happy to have the two of you work together as well, too. Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: In this case, I am thinking having someone Spanish bilingual would be pretty important for this. It certainly is one that you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, how would be both of us if it's --

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Can I say this, though, perhaps also then to that point, I wonder if it would also then be helpful to have someone who is also, maybe -- I'm not bilingual in a formal way, but perhaps somebody who's also aware of Asian languages, too might be helpful because that's going to be a big piece as well. So then Commissioner Fernandez and Commissioner Kennedy, if you don't mind, then perhaps Commissioner Fernandez and I

could be part of that language subcommittee and we will move forward on that. Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: All right, I apologize. I just wanted to go back and -- I know it's the end of the day but the scope of this data analytics -- my understanding is that that's dealing with the input of submissions that we receive, am I correct in that?

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: That is my understanding. So at the very least, looking at what kind of needs we'll have for that resource, I'll say the -- a consultant to help us, I guess somebody -- I guess a subcommittee to help scope out the larger kinds of pieces of what kind, I mean, someone to help us make sense of it is what I'm understanding.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay, I -- that was my initial impression. And then after another comment, I thought, wait a second, that's not it? So I might just -- I would ask if maybe we can find a different name rather than data analytics, only because that kind of connects to, like, census, RPV analysis -- we're talking about lots of different kinds of data.

So maybe it's something a little bit more descriptive regarding, like, I don't -- I don't know, I don't have a good name at the top of my mind but just something a little bit more descriptive of what it's

doing. Only so we don't -- so we can keep clear, all these different subcommittees.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: That is totally fine. We were calling it data collection and data mining but that's not necessarily accurate either. Perhaps we can ask Commissioner Ahmad and Commissioner Turner, would you determine what would be the best appropriate name for this subcommittee and the work that you're doing so that it is descriptive but is also not going to be confusing with the other pieces that we have going on.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And I don't think we have to do that now.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. All right. Thank you, everyone. I think we can bring this piece to a close. Director Claypool.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Because we don't have enough subcommittees, may I suggest that at some point you're going to need a legal subcommittee. Somebody that's going to be able to put together your proposal for outside counsel and then to meet with outside counsel. And it's an extremely important function. So if you don't do it now, it needs to be done soon because you'll want to also start the fast track on that that proposal as well.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: I thought that's what the VRA

Committee was doing.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: For outside counsel?

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Correct.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Oh, okay. All right. I misunderstood what that function was but as long as it's on your radar and you're working on it, then that's fine.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I think we're talking -- yeah, anyway, yes.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yes. When you say outside counsel, you're -- Director Claypool, you're talking about the VRA consult -- VRA council?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: No. I'm talking about the Gibson, Dunn, or the Morrison, Forester that would represent you for litigation and for any potential litigation in front of the Supreme Court, that counsel.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Director Claypool, perhaps we can have a conversation Thursday and Friday about your understanding of what that would be?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: Certainly.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And if I may, just really quickly, one of the pieces that we learned in our, you know, in the VRA conversation with Mr. Antetta (ph.) from the 2010 Commission was that we may also want to start considering, rather than small subcommittees as we move

forward, having slightly larger subcommittees and actually having them as public meetings for transparency.

And he, I believe, my understanding, my impression of that conversation was that the legal subcommittee from 2010 was a larger subcommittee and did have public meetings separate or attached to the full meetings.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I believe it only had two members but it did sometimes have public meetings when it was discussing issues that were not litigation issues.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you. Okay, so I think we're ready to call this piece to a close. Is there any other comments? And perhaps just for the sake of ensuring transparency, I will go to public comment on the milestones. Commissioner -- Director Claypool.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: I just wanted to clarify. The last commission held open meetings for Admin. They had a subcommittee meeting. They did it for legal. They did it for, I think, three or four different subcommittees. And they would usually be in the mornings and in the afternoon would be the business meeting and then the evening would be a public meeting. So that would be a 13-hour affair. But they tailed it -- they didn't just do it for legal. They did it for many of the subcommittees.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And you can always hold a committee meeting during a regularly scheduled meeting. So if you have a regularly scheduled meeting, you could subdivide into -- I don't know how that would work with Zoom. But you could --

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: You could do breakout -- you could do breakout groups. But does that have to be agendized?

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: It does not have to be agendized but it would all -- all of them would have to be broadcast.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I was speaking to someone about that and they said, yes, we could do breakout rooms and this is where we need it -- where my question was. The question is we, can do breakout rooms, I don't know if each breakout room can have their own number so you can call in whichever breakout room you're interested in.

Because the reality -- or then we do three Zoom calls. But the reality is that if we were live, we would be breaking out into different rooms and the public would have to choose which room they wanted to go to. So it's the same concept, but the public -- so the public needs to be able to have a number to go to.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Well, sort of. The difference is, if it was a public meeting, when people

were actually here, you wouldn't have to worry about that the same as you do with the -- and I think there is a requirement that in -- under the emergency regulations, that each portion of it has to be broadcast. And I don't know if there are facilities -- you would need, Kristian, a separate broadcast for each of those.

MR. MANOFF: Yeah. Typically, we would. Probably not use the break-out room feature. We would use a completely separate Zoom meeting and probably hold some multiple Zoom meetings simultaneously, do multiple broadcasts with multiple caption teams and multiple ASL teams to provide the transparency and the ADA that the Commission has asked for.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: So it takes a little bit of planning.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Before we go down all that complexity, in Bagley-Keene, is, that would not be allowed to occur all at the same time or they have to be one after the other because --

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Yes, because under Bagley-Keene, you had members of the public who actually attended your meeting, and then they could pick which one they would go to. But because, if you're doing it only

remotely, you have to give that same opportunity for any member of the public to go to whichever meeting they want.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That one strikes me as that could come back to bite us in terms of -- because, you know, there's typically one person for these different groups and they -- they on zoom could not go, you know, it's essentially they'd have to pick one or the other. And I'm just concerned we could get caught with Bagley-Keene on that.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Well, no. But those portions of Bagley-Keene are suspended because of COVID. But it would be a problem if just one person wanted to attend all of them. Probably, we would have to get different people from the same organization to split up.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. My understanding is, in the -- in the 2010, they would have different rooms and each of the subcommittees would meet in different rooms. So individuals would have to choose which room they wanted to go to. So it's the same, but it's virtual. So even back then, no one could attend all the subcommittee meeting.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Correct.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you, that's helpful

to know. All right. Let's just -- we're coming to the end of our meeting agenda. Agenda item number 13, Discussion of meeting dates and future agenda items. I know that there was a proposed draft agenda, I believe, for the November 4th agenda. That was -- question? Commissioner Fernandez, yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I thought you were going to go to public comments. I would --

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Oh, I'm sorry, yes. Thank you. I did say that, yes. Sorry, thank you. It's getting towards the end of the day. Let's see, Katie, you're still looking very, very fresh.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you, Chair. So would you like me to go through the full instructions?

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yes. If we can go through the full instructions, we'll also then give time for people to catch up on the livestream to start calling in.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We do have someone in the queue, so.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Oh, okay.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yeah, they called a little while ago, so.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Oh, okay.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the

Commissioners will be taking public comment during their meeting by phone. There will be opportunities to address the Commissioners regarding the items on the agenda. There will also be opportunities for the public to submit general comments about items not on the agenda. Please note that the Commission is not able to comment or discuss items not on the agenda. The Commission will advise the viewing audience when it is time to submit public comment. The Commissioners will then allow time for those who wish to comment, to dial in.

To call in on your phone, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed using your dial pad. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press the pound key. Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a queue from which a moderator will begin unmuting callers to submit their comment.

You will also hear an automatic message to press star nine to raise your hand indicating you wish to comment. When it is your turn to speak, the moderator will unmute you and you will hear an automatic message, the host would like you to talk, to press star six to speak. You will have two minutes to provide your comments.



Please make sure to mute your computer or live stream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your call. Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when it is your turn to speak, and please turn down the livestream volume. The Commissioners will take comment for every action item on the agenda. As you listen to the online video stream, the chair will call for public comments. This is your time to call in.

The process for making a comment will be the same each time, beginning by the telephone number provided on the livestream feed and following the steps stated above.

And we do have one caller in the queue. And if you will, press star six. If you will state and spell your name for the court reporter, please, and then state your comment.

MS. PONCE DE LEON: Good afternoon, Commissioners. This is Alejandra Ponce De Leon, A-L-E-J-A-N-D-R-A, P-O-N-C-E D-E L-E-O-N. I just wanted to call in and really appreciate just, again, all the conversations that you've been holding and thinking through, you know, thoughtfully in terms of the process that you're taking and in terms of the community outreach, but in also recognizing the challenges of the time constraints, the bureaucracy constraints that you're also facing. And so we just wanted to call and just uplift and appreciate the



time that you have been putting into place. The process that you've been taking to engage with a diversity of community organizations and partners to help you think through.

And we just want to uplift that, you know, that you still have time compared to the commission last time, you have more time to work through all of these details, think through and, you know, be able to consult with many partners in this process to develop the best strategy because at the end of the day, it's embodying one of our -- my director from our team here at Advancement Project and, you know, if you want to move fast, you go -- you go by yourself, but if you want to move farther, you go together.

The other thing that I wanted to uplift is that our partners from the network -- that we're all in this together. We have submitted the recommendations to all of you last night, early last evening, and so hopefully you'll have a chance. We did a lot of work in thinking through many components of community outreach and engagement. And so we hope that our recommendations are helpful in your thinking. And that, again, you know, we are here to -- to provide, you know, support and be able to answer any questions.

And if the information that we provided is something



that you would like to engage in one of your meetings, we're more than happy to be here for you and to be able to present and just be, you know, to think collectively with all of you in terms of the best the best community outreach plans and engagement. Thank you very much.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And that was the only person in our queue at this time.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Okay. Then let's go ahead and let's move on to agenda item number 13, discussion and meeting dates, and future agenda items. And I do believe there is a draft agenda for the November 4th. Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes. We asked for feedback or comments on that by noon so you get it up because it was due up today. And I got feedback from a number of commissioners. And so, I believe Raul has posted that. So I think at this point the -- would be gathering input for the following meeting, which Commissioner Kennedy is chairing on -- I'm not sure the date.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: I think it's November 16th through -- 16th, 17th, 18th, I think. The 16th through the 18th, I believe. Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Before we jump to that agenda,

I just wanted to share that Commissioner Fernandez and I were able to connect with the candidate for chief counsel. And we will be bringing that discussion in closed session next week.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. Excellent. Thank you very much for doing that. Okay. We'll go back to public comment. Last piece on items, not on the agenda. I don't know -- Katie, I think we have another opportunity to seek further comment. This would be on anything that's not on the agenda. Anyone who perhaps wanted to call in before but didn't have a chance to.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Okay. Are we doing? So we're doing full instruction -- the whole thing?

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Might as well. Just in case. I don't want to --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Okay.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Because if it were me, I would be like, what was that again?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Right, yeah. No, definitely. Yes. Okay. So we will go through -- and this -- so this will be for general comments, just anything all around. Okay.

In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment during their meeting by phone.

There will be opportunities to address the commissioners regarding the items on the agenda. There will also be opportunities for the public to submit general comments about items that are on the agenda. That is now.

Please note that the Commission is not able to comment or discuss items not on the agenda. The Commission will advise the viewing audience when it is time to submit public comment. The commissioners will then allow time for those who wish to comment to dial in.

To call in on your phone, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed using your dial pad. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press the pound key. Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a queue from which a moderator will begin unmuting callers to submit their comment.

You will also hear an automatic message to press star nine to raise your hand indicating that you wish to comment. When it is your turn to speak the moderator will unmute you and you will hear an automatic message, the host would like you to talk and to press star six to speak. You will have two minutes to provide your comments.

Please make sure to mute your computer or live



stream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your call. Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert when it is your turn to speak, and please turn down the livestream volume. The commissioners will take comment for every action item on the agenda. As you listen to the online video stream, the chair will call for public comments. That is the time to call in.

The process for making a comment will be the same each time, beginning by the telephone number provided on the livestream feed and following the steps stated above.

And we do have someone in the queue. If you will press star six to unmute yourself. If will state and spell your name for the court reporter, please.

MR. WOODSON: Hi. My name is James Woodson, J-A-M-E-S W-O-O-D-S-O-N, and I'm calling to -- on behalf of the Black Census and Redistricting Hub, an alliance of 35 organizations across the state representing Black -- Red and Black serving organizations. Really just calling to echo my colleague, Alejandra, from Advancement Projects' comment and want to thank you all for the time that you're taking to think through these important pieces. And just, you know, again, highlight the importance of taking time to actually get this right. Right? And not just sort of move fast, you know, particularly when we're kind of thinking about community

and community residents.

You know, a lot of times in dealing with government officials and government entities, folks will feel like things are being done to them and not with them. And so I think, you know, the amount of time that you all spend on the front end developing those relationships and building that buy-in, I think the easier and the more efficiently you can move on the back end. So I just wanted to, again, just echo Alejandra's comments and again, thank you all for the work that you're doing. Thanks you so much.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you very much.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And that was the only person in our queue at this time.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm sorry. I guess I -- I guess we went -- so are we done with 13? So we just went through it really fast.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yes, because it didn't seem like there was any other additional agenda -- unless you have one that you want to bring up that we do?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No. I'm just hopeful maybe at the next meeting -- because we do have meetings planned out for November, December, and then maybe at the next meeting, we can start planning out January and

February. So if everybody can start looking at their calendars just so that we can say, you know, a few months ahead. And then that -- when the chairs and vice-chairs know when it's coming up.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: So perhaps for the sake of -- I know that -- I feel like we're all pretty tired.

Technically, we will have 22 minutes more. I'm wondering if we should at least look at January now, only because the next time, if we're already late and trying to plan out for another meeting -- I just -- I'm just trying to think about how we make things a little bit easier, so. Is that okay with everyone or -- okay. Thank you. So can we start looking at our January calendars then?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So our last -- maybe look at -- what's our last meeting -- December the 14 -- 14, 15th, and 16th. Is that right?

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I think it's the week before the Christmas holiday.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It is 14, 15, 16.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yes. Just out of curiosity, is there a desire to meet between Christmas and New Year's or are we going to let ourselves have a vacation? Okay -- Commissioner Vaquez -- all right, thank you. I just thought I'd ask. I just -- I didn't want to assume.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Commission Christmas party.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. How quickly after the New Year do you all have an appetite to meet?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: It may be nice to do a social in between those two weeks but I think we all will at that point will have earned a solid two weeks of no business. Especially once we have our staff on board. Yeah, two weeks.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: So perhaps, are you suggesting then that maybe that either the week before Christmas or the week between Christmas and New Year's, that we might do a social.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: We can plan that later but just thinking we -- it might be nice. And I'm open but then that's also not required if people are trying to plan for getting out of town or what have you.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So right after the New Year, that's the week of the 4th. Is there a desire to meet right after the New Year or would there be a preference to wait until the week of the 11th?
Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I have a preference to wait to the week of the 11th.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I think if we're following our cadence, the last week of meetings that we'll have in

December starts on a Monday. Does that mean that we would then start our meeting in January on a Tuesday? And at that point should we be meeting -- planning for a meeting of perhaps three days? Okay. So January 12th, 13, 14. Or would you rather wait to a Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday? Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'd rather do Wednesday. I like it better when it's on one, one or the other weekend, just because that makes it easier for my clients. But I understand why Commissioner Vasquez states that that doesn't work for everybody. So I -- if it's two days, it doesn't bother me. But if it's three it's a little harder. So since I spoke up first, I would say 13 to 15th.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Actually, I was going opposite because it is a three-and-a-half-week break almost, and I would prefer that we do it sooner in case there's things that we need to push through, we need to approve any action items. So I was actually looking at 11, 12, and 13. I mean, that was my only reason. Because we do have this big block of -- which is great. So thank you very much for that.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I'm flexible with the dates.

January is so far away. But I think what I would just want to bring to folks' attention is that agendas do have to be finalized two weeks prior. So that would fall in that week between Christmas and New Year's. So someone will have to be working during that time.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Fernandes, is that you or do you have a comment?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, I did have a comment to that. You don't have to wait. You could actually do the agenda four weeks in advance.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: And then, Commissioner Turner, I saw your hand go up too. Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: It just went away.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So 11, 12, 13? Okay. I also want to just note for everybody that Monday, January 18th, is the Martin Luther King holiday as well, too. So just keep that in mind as we plan out our other meetings.

I know that there was also an intent or hope to have our line drawer hired by around that time. The COI tool is also going to be completed by that early January timeframe, so we'll, I think have a lot to be talking about. Is there a desire to meet the week after?
Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I was going to just ask for a reminder because I don't remember and I'm not flipping to

it quick enough in my notes. When we moved to three days per week, was the intent still to meet every week or every other week with three days? We talked about that, but I'm --

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I think it was, like, three days, two days, three days. And then we were going to take a break somewhere in between, like, every two weeks or every three weeks. Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I kind of remember that one because I'm the one that asked for it. It was it was more of to do the -- instead of, like, I think we're doing two, two, two was to do three, week off, three, week off, until we actually get to the point where we have to meet every week. But either way is fine.

Sometimes you want to maybe put the date out there in case you need it, and then if you don't need the two-day, you can just go to the following three-day, which is another option. You could go three, two; three, two; and then if you don't need the in-between, you cannot meet.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I'm -- I like that as an idea. But I also don't feel us necessarily ending meetings early. So when we're doing the three days, we're taking the three days and it's still three days and it's every week. So I think -- I really hope we either

schedule two days every week or three days every other week.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So then if we do that, then we would then next meet the week of the 25th. So taking Commissioner Sinay's request, do we then go the other end of the week, the 27th, 28th, 29th? That will mean that we'll have about a week and a half in between. Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I think I would like if we could at least try to do the middle again. I'm a lowly middle manager and it'd be nice if I could at least start a week and finish a business week. It's really challenging to have such long gaps between when I can focus on actual work. So perhaps if we start on Monday, then if we could do the 26th, 27th, 28.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Is everybody okay with that, 26 through the 28th in January? Commissioner Andersen, and I see a thumbs up from Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I know we want to do the three of three -- I'm just concerned that January we won't be getting our fees back. And, you know, in terms of getting our fees back, obviously, these won't necessarily be interviews, but we'll have to have closed session or something. And so I'm wondering, should we pencil in, you know, that let's go three but then two

days that next week and three just in case. Because we -- we'll sort of know November goes and before -- by the time December comes around, we might be able to delete it. But if we don't kind of block off a little bit of time now, then we'll obviously be putting ourselves in a bind, I'm concerned.

So I would propose 11, 12, 13 and then say two days somewhere the next week and then go the three.

COMMISSIONER: Okay. Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I like that idea but I'd amend to say one day and make us laser -- to make us laser-focused. I will say we do -- we do expand or contract to fit the time allowed, generally. So I think if we if we're putting on a day as a just in case, then that day is reserved for things that have to get done, closed session, things that have to get done. So maybe, you know, no committee updates sort of things. This is for stuff that has to happen in the next 48 hours.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: And if we're going to do that, I think it might be useful to schedule one of those that first week of January. And it can be later in the week. But I'm kind of like Commissioner Andersen. I'm concerned that if we leave too much time, our running between the -- what was it, the 16th of December -- 16th

of December to the 11th of January is a long time when we may have things coming at us. So I think we would do well to have something scheduled that first week, even if it's a one day, you know, middle of the week, late in the week, whatever.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: I saw Commissioner Turner and then Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Commissioner Kennedy's comment took whatever it was straight out of my mind. I don't know what I was gonna say, okay.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. That's great. Mind melt right there. Okay. Commissioner Sinay then Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'll be honest, I'm going back and forth. I do like the one day, especially if we need it closed session and we stay focused both of the week of the 4th and the week of the 18th. I am thinking at some point we need to get work done. And we need -- once we have staff, us as commissioners are going to be working with staff on some things and then bringing it back. So I don't -- I would hate to think that we're taking two weeks completely off because, you know, there is a lot of work that needs to be done and maybe it's just Commissioner Vazquez and I.

But I think a lot of us are going to be working.

And I mean, our workflow may be different once staff comes in where we're preparing for the launch of things and so -- so I just want to put that out there. That life could be different for us in January as we're getting ready for a February and March getting out there.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I was kind of thinking along the same lines with Commissioner Sinay is, I don't see it as three weeks that we're doing nothing. I just see it as three weeks of one, the staff gets to catch up to us, and then two, we can actually have some conversation with staff to try to move forward on some of these. Because it's hard right now when you don't have staff to help you on some of these subcommittees to really have a true update for the next meeting because they're so frequent.

So and then the other question, or not question, comment I had was on RFPs. We, actually, when you create the RFP, you actually know what the date is in terms of when all of the bids are due back. So at that point, you can really -- you can schedule your time in terms of, okay, the bids are back now, we can start scoring them. So we'll know that in advance, too. So we can always plan that out. If it's going to coincide on a week that we don't have a meeting, then maybe we can work around

that, those timeframes.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: And normally those bids are opened by staff so it doesn't have to be an open meeting. But then they're presented to the commission during an open meeting.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: So okay. So Commissioner Turner next and then I have a comment.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I just wanted to -- on the single days that we're thinking, we're considering, is that something that would need to then, of course, well, I believe it would also need to be agendized. And how are we going to categorize that as -- because we're talking about them? That's just in case they -- something -- what would that look like from an agenda perspective?

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Was that for me?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes, Marian. Would there -- we heard the desire of the desire of the commissioners to also throw in a catch-all day, a single day, just in case something comes up. I'm wondering, that sounds like an okay idea, but I'm wondering how would we capture that and have it agendized in advance?

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: You could put in your standard agenda items but that wouldn't take into account if there was something specific that came up that was

new.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Right. And what we're talking this day -- we're considering it as a day in case something came up that we needed to have a meeting for. And we specifically said wouldn't be for our regular committee feedback and all of those other things. And so I don't know about, how that -- I think we would have to put something on as an agenda item, which means then we would need to cover that as an agenda item, which means it wouldn't necessarily serve as a catch-all day.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Commissioner Yee has a comment.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yes. I believe Commissioner Fernandez was right before Commissioner Yee. But it looked like they were trying to confer. And is there something that needs to be shared with us, either Marian or forget it?

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: There is a practice you could follow of noticing every day and then canceling those that you don't want to have meetings on. But you would have to notice every possible action item that might come up. And then if it doesn't come up, you don't have the meeting. Cancel the meeting.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: And that's what I thought we were

considering doing on the one day; that if it wasn't needed, it would be canceled. Or even on the other days that the meetings would be scheduled, it would be canceled if it wasn't needed.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: You can do that.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez, I believe you were next. And then Commissioner Yee. Okay, Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, I think we were specifically thinking that RFPs will be rolling in at some point there that we would need to consider. And -- but those are not considered in closed session.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Right. And you know the date they're coming in. So you can schedule those.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: I am thinking, though, that for the sake of all of our calendars that perhaps we do identify the potential dates. We don't have to agendize them or announce them formally just yet. And that as the RFPs -- we'll have a better idea when the RFPs will be coming in by December. And we can make a determination as to whether or not we'll need some of those meetings or not and formally agendize those. Is that true?

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Yes.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I'm just thinking about -- I think I just think about how much -- the more I can

block out, the less then I have to leave a meeting. So I'm just also thinking that it's probably the same for a lot of others. That if we know in advance we could try to make accommodations around it if we know the further out.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: We sort of have to plan the other way. If you know when you're going to issue your RFPs, then you can schedule when you know they're going to be coming in.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Well, let me just say --

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Then that triggers --

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Maybe we could have our committees who are working on those figure that timing out. But I also heard that there was a desire to at least hold on our calendars a day during the week of January 4th as a just in case. Can I suggest perhaps a Wednesday so that if any work needs to be done by staff, it could be taken care of on a Thursday or a Friday? And then it could be ready for us when we meet on the 11th? Would that be okay? All right.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: What day is that?

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Wednesday, January 6th. Director Claypool.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL Yes. And to reiterate what Marian had said earlier. These, if -- when you're

thinking about your FRPs, think about the week -- the week after they come in or some period after they're supposed to come in on the deadline because your staff are going to open them up. They're going to notify the chair and the vice chair they're in. They're going to prepare them for scoring. And on -- whether you -- sometimes staff does the scoring, sometimes you may wish to do the scoring yourself.

But that all gets set up. And then when you come in, it's ready for you to simply process it and get it done. And then the other thing to, to agree with Commissioner Kennedy, that is a long period of time across January. And with us and not knowing what's going to happen with the census and everything else, to have a day where we can have action items for everything and then just get rid of it if we don't need it could be very important because we just don't know what's going to happen with the census. That's all.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: So I know that this wasn't the appetite, but it's been -- it's been -- is there a thought that we should consider perhaps meeting. Even if it's just one day formally for business, sometime -- I'm going to suggest the 20 -- maybe the 29th or even -- maybe the 29th or the 30th?

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: Of December or January.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: December. I'm not saying I want to but I would like to have time off, too. But I'm also very conscious of what there could be that we may need to be considering. Okay, so Director Claypool and then Commissioner Vazquez.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: I think that if you have that day on the first week of January, you're good. I think there's going to be very little that will occur between Christmas and New Year's. Having said that, however, you don't know. And -- but it's hard for me to imagine that anybody on state or federal level is going to do something in between Christmas to -- that would affect us so much that we would have regretted not having a meeting then. But I do think that if you have that meeting that you can dismiss in the first week of January, that's a real safe meeting to put in place.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: That was mostly going to be my point. I mean, if you take -- if you look at the 7th -- if you look at having a meeting on the 7th, we have until Christmas Eve to get our ducks in a row for that meeting on the 7th. So that to me seems safe.

COMMISSIONER JOHNSTON: I thought maybe was on the 6th.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Or the 6th but I was just

trying to backwards map or forward everything from Christmas Eve, so, yeah.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: And if for whatever reason, as things happen, if for whatever reason we do need to put something in, we'll know probably well in advance that if we need to put in an extra meeting, we can still have those 14 days advance notice to do so.

All right. Okay. So I have Wednesday, January 6th, January 11th through the 13th. January 26th through 28. Is there a desire to put in a one-day meeting the week of the 19th through the 22nd? Yes. I see Commissioner Andersen saying yes. Commissioner Sinay is, like, uh. Commissioner Yee says thumbs up. Okay. All right. I'm seeing thumbs up. Okay, thank you. Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: The 20th is Inauguration Day. I'm not sure any of us want to be distracted. 21st?

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: 21st is fine. I don't know. Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Can I ask for Tuesday?

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: The 19th?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm okay with that but the

meeting -- it just feels so quick when we do it that way. So if this is just a meeting in case we need a closed session or stuff like that, that's fine. But if there's going to be work that needs to get done, I'm looking forward to next month when we have weeks off where I can actually get some of the commission work done in between meetings. So I like the Thursday better than the Tuesday. But I am a minority.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thursday is fine. We can do the 21st.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. And I believe it is a -- supposed to be a, if we need to do work. Otherwise, I think we were going to try to just -- we were going to cancel it if it was not needed, I think, given everything that there's a lot of uncertainty. I think we just wanted to have this whole place in there. Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Quick question for Marian. Is there a timeframe in which we have to notice a cancelation or can we do that up until the start of the meeting?

MARIAN: You can do it to the start of the meeting.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay.

MARIAN: Yes, but you can add a problem since the meetings are virtual. If someone were traveling, then it

would be nice to give them more advanced notice.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Excellent. Thank you. Okay. We have our meetings in January. And it took us right to 4:30, all right. That is one less month of the meetings we have to schedule at another time.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well done, Chair.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right. All right. Yes, Commissioner Ahmad did say it right. She said we fill the time based on how many days we have, so. All right.

All right, so I believe we can adjourn. Okay. Thank you very much, everyone. Great work. Thank you. It's nice seeing you all again. See you next week.

(Whereupon, the CADGS-Citizens Redistricting Commission Business Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified transcriber and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

Lisa Hill

May 17, 2022

LISA HILL, CDLT-163