

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION (CRC)

In the matter of:

CRC BUSINESS MEETING

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 22, 2020

9:31 a.m.

Transcription by:

eScribers, LLC



APPEARANCESCOMMISSIONERS

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

STAFF

Daniel Claypool, Executive Director
Alvaro E. Hernandez, Deputy Executive Director
Kary Marshall, Chief Counsel
Marian Johnston, CRC Staff Counsel
Fredy Ceja, Communications Director
Marcy Kaplan, Director of Outreach
Wanda Sheffield, Office Technician

TECHNICAL CONTRACTORS

Katy Manoff, Comment Moderator
Kristian Manoff, AV Technical Director/Comment Moderator

Also PresentPublic Comment

Lori Shellenberger, California Common Cause
Douglas Johnson, National Demographics Corporation
Kimberly Coles
Chris Chaffee, Redistricting Partners
Rosalind Gold, NALEO Educational Fund
Renee Westa-Lusk

INDEX

	<u>PAGE</u>
Call to Order and Roll Call	4
General Announcements	5
Public Comment	6
Executive Director's Report	10
Deputy Executive Director's Outreach Report	10
Line Drawer RFP Feedback	11
Public Comment	49
Chair Rotation Schedule	61
Public Comment	70
Data Management Update	74
Future Meeting Dates and Agenda Items Discussion	80
Closed Session	87
Public Comment	87
Adjournment	94

P R O C E E D I N G S

December 22, 2020

9:31 a.m.

CHAIR LE MONS: Good morning, Commissioners. Good morning, California. Welcome to the Citizens Redistricting Commission meeting on this Tuesday, December 22nd. I'd like to do our roll call. Wanda?

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Taylor?

VICE CHAIR TAYLOR: Present.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Toledo?

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Vazquez?

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Fernandez?



1 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Here.

2 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Fornaciari?

3 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

4 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Kennedy?

5 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

6 MS. SHEFFIELD: And Commissioner Le Mons?

7 CHAIR LE MONS: Here.

8 MS. SHEFFIELD: Thank you.

9 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Do we have a quorum?

10 MS. SHEFFIELD: Yes.

11 CHAIR LE MONS: Great. Thank you so much. So we're
12 going to move into our opening public comment. I'd like
13 to remind you that this public comment is open for any
14 topic that you'd like to talk about. We'd like to start
15 our meeting with hearing from the public.

16 We are going to have a pretty substantive
17 conversation regarding line drawing. So I ask if you
18 would reserve those comments, if you will, to after
19 agenda item 4. We will be talking about that and opening
20 the floor again for public comment at that time.

21 So we'll have our opening public comment, then we'll
22 move into general announcements and Commission updates.
23 Then we'll have our executive director's report, which we
24 will be hearing from our executive director, our deputy
25 executive director, and we will be having discussion on

1 the line drawer.

2 And then we will move into our interagency -- no,
3 I'm sorry, our interagency agreements, item number 5, is
4 actually going to be tabled for our future meeting. And
5 then we'll move into our data management.

6 Item number 6, we have a chair rotation schedule.
7 Item number 7, I'm going to move up the discussion about
8 future meeting items and agendas to just above closed
9 session. We will be going into a closed session today to
10 handle some personnel matters.

11 We will come back after that closed session, report
12 out. We will then have closing public comment, and
13 that'll be the conclusion of our business day today.

14 So at this time, I'd like to go to Peter. If you
15 could open the line for public comments.

16 MR. MANOFF: That'll be Katy will be taking care of
17 that for you today chair.

18 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay, Katy.

19 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Good morning. In order
20 to maximize transparency and public participation in our
21 process, the Commission will be taking public comment by
22 phone.

23 To call in, dial the telephone number provided on
24 the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted
25 to enter the meeting ID number, it is provided on the



1 livestream feed; 91092377762 for this week's meeting.

2 When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply
3 press the pound key. Once you have dialed in, you'll be
4 placed in a queue from which a moderator will begin
5 unmuting callers to submit their comment.

6 You will also hear an automatic message to press
7 star 9. Please do this to raise your hand indicating you
8 wish to comment.

9 When it is -- you will also -- sorry. When it is
10 your turn to speak, the moderator will unmute you and you
11 will hear an automatic message that says, "The host would
12 like you to talk", and to press star 6 to speak.

13 Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream
14 audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your
15 call.

16 Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when
17 it is your turn to speak. And again, please turn down
18 the livestream volume. The Commission is taking general
19 public comment at this time.

20 And we do have one person in the queue at this time.

21 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Please invite them in, Katy.

22 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: If you'll please state
23 and spell your name for the court reporter.

24 You are live, if you could state and spell your name
25 for the court reporter. There we go, if we could state

1 and spell your name for the court reporter.

2 MS. SHELLENBERGER: Yes. Good morning. This is
3 Lori, L-O-R-I, Shellenberger, S-H-E-L-L-E-N-B-E-R-G-E-R.
4 And I'm the redistricting consultant for Common Cause.
5 And good morning, everyone. Hopefully you're not hearing
6 my voice in your sleep at this point. I know I call in a
7 lot. I had two really quick comments.

8 The first is I won't go into the substance regarding
9 the line drawer RFP, but I did want to flag that I sent
10 an email on behalf of a few organizations who had
11 reviewed it over the weekend and discussed it yesterday
12 with some minor feedback.

13 And I just wanted to flag that and make sure it got
14 to the Commissioners. I emailed that last night, and I
15 will be on listening during your discussion and if it --
16 and as will, a few of the other folks who participate in
17 that discussion. And so if you have questions during
18 your discussion and you can flag for us, if you need us
19 to call in. Otherwise, I won't call in regarding the
20 substance. I think they're self-explanatory.

21 The second issue I just wanted to flag was a
22 logistical one and one was to thank staff for getting
23 emails out to the email list about upcoming meetings and
24 the posting of the draft RFP and the RFIs for counsel.

25 I also wondered if it might be possible, because I



1 am starting to get inquiries from folks about upcoming
2 meetings. And to the extent you can post the dates of
3 upcoming meetings on the website before everyone breaks
4 for the holidays, I think it would be helpful for folks
5 who are trying to plan for next year.

6 And those are my comments and just want to wish you
7 all happy holidays and thank you again for your
8 incredible service to the people of California.

9 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Ms. Shellenberger. And I
10 want to confirm, yes, we did receive the email and thank
11 you for those. Thanks to staff and thank you for your
12 participation. We appreciate it.

13 Katy, any additional callers in the queue?

14 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: No, Chair. That was it.

15 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. We'll wait a minute and give
16 people an opportunity and go from there.

17 (Pause)

18 CHAIR LE MONS: Katy, are there any callers in the
19 queue?

20 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: No.

21 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. With that, we're going to
22 move forward. I'd like to bring our attention to agenda
23 item number 3, general announcements from Commissioners
24 or updates, and from staff, any items of interest to
25 Commission.

1 Does anyone have any announcements or updates they'd
2 like to present? Commissioner Sinay?

3 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I would like to congratulate
4 Commissioner Fernandez on officially being retired.

5 CHAIR LE MONS: Congratulations, Commissioner
6 Fernandez. You look excited. I hear it's not all that's
7 cracked up to be. We'll wait for details.

8 Any other announcements? Okay. Seeing no hands for
9 further announcements or updates at this time, I'd like
10 to move to the executive director's report, agenda item
11 number four. Director Claypool.

12 MR. CLAYPOOL: Good morning, Commissioners, and
13 happy holidays. This will be a brief report by me, but
14 just on staffing, we continue to receive the interest in
15 the positions that we posted. And we will be reviewing
16 the two positions for budget and for an accounting
17 position next week.

18 And we will be running all of this up through our
19 finance and administration subcommittee. And also I will
20 have a budget report for you in our next meeting that
21 will encompass all of the expenditures through December.

22 Right now, I'd like to pass this over to Alvaro for
23 his report on outreach.

24 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, director. Good morning,
25 Commissioners. This is week 2 for me, and it feels like

1 I've been here much longer than that, unfortunately.

2 I've been working my way in getting information to
3 develop the strategic plan that I'll be running through
4 the different committees. Hopefully, I have something by
5 the next Commission meeting for you to take a look at.
6 Also in regards to the language services, there was a
7 question how long will it take? With the small business
8 contract for the language services, it will take anywhere
9 between three to four weeks to get that into place.

10 One of the things that has come up in regards to
11 that is what languages we will be looking at. So we'll
12 have to have a further discussion on that. Marcy Kaplan
13 shared that the census group had the California top
14 twelve languages that they focus on. So we'll have that
15 conversation at a later time. But I just wanted to put
16 it out there.

17 In regards to the grants recommendations, I'm
18 working on that as well, to put together the information
19 I've received from the subcommittee and as to the pros
20 and cons of either farming it out or doing it in-house,
21 and recommendations on what you should consider, at
22 least. That's the extent of my report. Director?

23 MR. CLAYPOOL: So the only other item that needs to
24 be discussed now is the line drawer -- coming up under my
25 report, is the line drawer RFP, we sent it out for the

1 public.

2 CHAIR LE MONS: Excuse me, I'm sorry to interrupt
3 you, Direct Claypool. I just want to give Commissioners
4 an opportunity to ask any questions before we dive into
5 this piece.

6 If they have any questions about what was shared so
7 far by either yourself or Deputy Executive Director
8 Hernandez. Commissioners, do you have any questions?

9 Okay, with that, please continue, Director Claypool.

10 MR. CLAYPOOL: So coming up under my report is the
11 line drawer RFP. We sent it out as you know, on Friday.
12 We've received public comment that should have been
13 distributed to all of you. And I'd just like to open it
14 up to the Commission for questions or edits or reviews of
15 that document.

16 CHAIR LE MONS: Have all the Commissioners had an
17 opportunity to review the email that Ms. Shellenberger
18 referenced? We did receive that. I see nods. Okay,
19 wonderful.

20 MR. CLAYPOOL: What we could do, Chair, is we could
21 go through that document very quickly just bullet by
22 bullet if that is something you'd like to do, or?

23 CHAIR LE MONS: I'd like the subcommittee to guide
24 the direction of this discussion. This has been
25 something they've shepherded from the beginning. So I'll

1 defer to them in terms of how they'd like to handle the
2 feedback and this discussion.

3 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you, Chair Le Mons.
4 Commissioner Andersen, feel free to jump in at any point.
5 You know, we've definitely taken our time putting this
6 together. It's been in progress for many weeks now and
7 we're very excited to have a draft to share with you all.
8 We welcome all of your feedback.

9 I did receive the email from Ms. Shellenberger last
10 night. I have kind of skimmed it, but I'll certainly
11 spend more time later today going through it in detail.
12 It looks like a number of great suggestions that have
13 been raised and areas where things need to be clarified.
14 So I certainly appreciate receiving all of that feedback
15 and very much open to additional feedback.

16 Is it helpful for the Commission for us to go
17 through the RFP? My sense is it's been posted, but you
18 know, I don't know if, Jane, if you have anything you
19 want to add to kind of this new draft.

20 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: The only thing I thought, if
21 we'd like, in Ms. Shellenberger's comments, there are a
22 few items which we may want to talk about as a
23 Commission. And there are a couple things we could just
24 sort of almost kind of walk through that and then
25 catch -- hit a few ideas just to confirm, this is what --

1 that this is indeed the Commission's ideas.

2 But other than that, unless if a Commissioner has
3 some particular items that they'd like to talk about
4 right away, I suggest we deal with those immediately. We
5 don't have to walk through the entire document if people
6 don't have many comments.

7 But we could indeed address Ms. Shellenberger's,
8 which as I said, a couple of them are items that we
9 probably want to bring to your attention anyway.

10 So with that, are there any questions from the
11 Commissioners specifically that we could address right
12 away?

13 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy. You're on
14 mute.

15 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I made the point last time
16 and it hasn't been reflected. And I just want to go on
17 record again and saying that in my mind, the footnote at
18 the bottom of page 1 and the text that it relates to need
19 to be flipped.

20 I mean, the Supreme Court of the State of California
21 in its ruling said that we have until the 15th of
22 December. Now, if you want to put a footnote saying that
23 the original constitutional deadline was the 15th of
24 August, that's fine, but the ruling of the Supreme Court
25 says the Commission is directed to approve and certify

1 the final statewide maps with the Secretary of State by
2 no later than December 15th 2021. That's pretty clear.
3 So I just really believe that we need to make that clear
4 in the RFP. Thanks.

5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That item did come up in Ms.
6 Shellenberger's comment, in terms of making sure that it
7 is indeed obvious to the line drawer that there is indeed
8 the possibility that you might -- this might -- work
9 might get delayed all the way through that date.

10 So a reworking of how exactly that's written to make
11 sure that encompasses that very real possibility, given
12 the time line of when the census data gets there, that is
13 certainly something we could just slightly rewrite. And
14 I think that was a good point. Ms. Shellenberger brings
15 it up when we have anticipated time for meetings to make
16 sure that that gets modified. That it's obvious that it
17 could go that late. So thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.
18 I think that is something that we should slightly modify.

19 CHAIR LE MONS: So I have a question for
20 Commissioner Kennedy. Commissioner Kennedy, do you feel
21 like what Commissioner Andersen has put forward is
22 representative of your perspective on this?

23 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: My objection is really to
24 that last sentence of item I(A)(3), where it says
25 "completed district maps and the accompanying reports

1 must be submitted to the California Secretary of State's
2 office no later than August 15".

3 You know, I think that needs to read no later than
4 December 15 2021. And then if you want to footnote and
5 say, this was based on the California Supreme Court
6 ruling extending the deadline from the original
7 constitutional deadline of August 15 and that, you know,
8 depending on when the Commission receives the data, the
9 Commission is encouraged to expedite the process. But I
10 think we need to reflect the Supreme Court ruling.

11 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. See, I think Commissioner
12 Kennedy is saying something a little bit different. I
13 just want to remind the Commissioners that we've had a
14 pretty robust discussion about the deadline and we as a
15 Commission have already agreed that August will be our
16 deadline.

17 So I do think that there should be some kind of
18 footnote that says that is the decision of the Commission
19 and if we want to reference the meeting in which we made
20 that decision, we should do that. And we can also add
21 the statement that the Supreme Court issued.

22 So it sounds like that could clear this up where we
23 have agreed as a Commission on a deadline date, which
24 should be reflected. The point about the potential
25 extension will also be necessary because it may get

1 extended, which we've also agreed in choosing the August
2 date that we were willing to extend based upon when we
3 get the data, and what the Supreme Court ruled.

4 So those three key pieces of information will be
5 included in the footnote. And then hopefully that
6 addresses all the concerns and respects the decision that
7 the Commission made previously in choosing the deadline
8 date. Commissioner Kennedy.

9 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, again, I go back to the
10 "must be submitted no later than August 15th". That is
11 the first thing that needs to be changed and the footnote
12 can be changed to reflect everything else that you've
13 mentioned. But I think the number one thing is to change
14 the body text.

15 CHAIR LE MONS: And you're saying that that should
16 be changed to December -- to the December date? Is that
17 what you're saying, Commissioner Kennedy?

18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Not necessarily.

19 CHAIR LE MONS: Or are you concerned about the word
20 "must" or are you concerned about the date?

21 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, it's the "must". If
22 we're going to say must, the must is December 15th. You
23 know, we can reference our decision.

24 CHAIR LE MONS: I understand.

25 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: We can reference our decision

1 to stick with the original time line and the fact that it
2 may be extended at the Commission's discretion. But the
3 Supreme Court ruling is clear in my mind.

4 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Commissioner Sadhwani, I know
5 you had your hand up.

6 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I would just say --
7 thank you, Commissioner Kennedy. I don't have a problem
8 removing the "must". I understand that this is most
9 certainly a point of contention for some, certainly as
10 well as the public.

11 My understanding from our previous conversations was
12 that we were, as a Commission utilizing August 15th as
13 our working deadline. And when we know if the census
14 data -- I mean, it's highly likely that the census data
15 will be late, but we don't know that for sure yet.

16 So as of right now, we have prepared this based on
17 that August 15th. I can -- I certainly understand, you
18 know, removing the word "must". But if you look down
19 later on page 15 of the document, you'll also see that we
20 have anticipated time frames including public hearings
21 and mid-July to early August being the preparation of
22 final maps for August 15th as our deadline.

23 There, we added an asterisk just reminding them that
24 this is, again, this is an anticipated time frame and
25 that it may change. So I don't have a problem removing

1 "must" but my understanding is that we already had this
2 conversation as a Commission that August 15th was our
3 working deadline. And that's what we were using.

4 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy.

5 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: So let's say, the Commission
6 intends to submit maps by August 15th, but I don't think
7 we can say "must" because we are not required to submit
8 them by August 15.

9 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And I'm fine removing
10 "must".

11 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Turner. Okay,
12 Commissioner Andersen.

13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I believe we have enough
14 information to rearrange a little bit like the original
15 deadline, the Commissioners' intent, and reference the
16 Supreme Court deadlines.

17 We just need to rearrange those two items and make
18 sure it's consistent all the way through, which evidently
19 one portion in the far end of the report, it's a little
20 vague.

21 So we need to -- that's what Ms. Shellenberger was
22 referring to. So I think I have enough information there
23 to make the slight modifications.

24 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Do Commissioners feel like we
25 need to have our counsel look at our closing -- whatever

1 language we come up with there, or not necessary?

2 Commissioner Andersen?

3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That's already -- anything
4 that we modify or change, it does go through our legal
5 counsel.

6 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.
7 Okay. So it sounds like this was one of the key points.
8 Going back to the plan, it sounds like Commissioner
9 Andersen recommended first asking Commissioners if they
10 had any specific things that they wanted to address.

11 We began with the one that Commissioner Kennedy
12 raised. I'm going to ask for additional comments or
13 concerns that Commissioners have, at which point we'll
14 turn it back over to Director Claypool to hit the
15 highlights of the public comment that we received in
16 writing, and Commissioner Andersen as well, who has
17 identified, there are key things that she feels the
18 Commissioners should weigh in on. So with that plan,
19 Commissioner Kennedy.

20 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I'm happy to defer, if
21 someone else has another issue.

22 CHAIR LE MONS: It's all yours, Commissioner
23 Kennedy.

24 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. Page 3 under
25 "Geographic Database for Redistricting". That first

1 paragraph, "Redistricting Database", I don't understand
2 the purpose of the first sentence. I mean, it seems to
3 me that the purpose of that paragraph is to say the 2020
4 census data used shall be that of the California
5 Statewide Database located at the University of
6 California Berkeley School of Law. So I would propose to
7 eliminate the first sentence under "Redistricting
8 Database".

9 CHAIR LE MONS: Does any members of the subcommittee
10 or staff have an explanation to Commissioner Kennedy on
11 his point?

12 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: We did discuss this and it
13 was not quite clear. I think we are looking for a little
14 bit more information about the certified population data.
15 I think that might be a particular title, and we did not
16 have an answer to that yet. I believe that's either, if
17 counsel could look into that one and or just do a quick
18 check with Ms. Mac Donald.

19 CHAIR LE MONS: Director Claypool?

20 MR. CLAYPOOL: And I would just ask our counsel,
21 didn't we use "certified 2020 U.S. census data", because
22 that is in fact what will come from the U.S. Census
23 Bureau, is a certified copy?

24 MS. JOHNSTON: Yes, that's correct. And the only
25 caveat of why we made it that the Commission can adjust

1 it is in case the data that is certified excludes
2 undocumented immigrants, in which case we believe that
3 under California law, those have to be added back in. So
4 it would not be actually using the certified. It would
5 be certified as modified.

6 CHAIR LE MONS: And Commissioner Kennedy, does that
7 handle your clarification?

8 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I guess I'm wondering if what
9 we're going to end up with, in any and every case, isn't
10 in fact the data from the Statewide Database. And if
11 that's the case, I'm not understanding why we need that
12 previous sentence. It seems to raise the possibility
13 that we might not use the data from the Statewide
14 Database. That first sentence seems to raise that
15 possibility.

16 CHAIR LE MONS: Director Claypool?

17 MR. CLAYPOOL: So it's my understanding that there
18 may be a clash -- and again, I'm going to defer to our
19 attorneys, but there may be a clash between the census
20 data as it's presented to the State of California and the
21 requirements of the State of California with regards to
22 the information that they can use. And I'd just ask
23 Kary, is that how you understand it, that there could be
24 a difference between the two?

25 MS. MARSHALL: Yes.

1 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen?

2 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, I'm still on mute.

3 Sorry, not on mute. Also the idea here is the rest of
4 the sentence is required because there's the population
5 data and we also need particular subgroups of it.

6 So now all of this data is at the Statewide
7 Database. That's where it's supposed to get it. But
8 what particular things we're looking for are the whole
9 piece of the data, and then the population subgroups.
10 And because there's a little bit of things you don't
11 necessarily have to use. Basically, we want to make sure
12 that they're using the part that's at the Statewide
13 Database that we want. So that was where we were talking
14 about the redistricting database. I mean, you --

15 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

16 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- we do say it again,
17 you're right, in terms of the next of "Data
18 Requirements".

19 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. So staff, you'll work with
20 counsel to consider Commissioner Kennedy's point and the
21 feedback that's been given, and explanation of that point
22 to make sure that it is clear for the intent of the
23 Commission? Thank you.

24 Commissioner Fernandez?

25 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just had a quick question

1 for Commissioner Sadhwani. You mentioned that you
2 reviewed the public comments from Ms. Shellenberger. Did
3 you say you were making changes based on that because I
4 had a couple questions that also were in that public
5 comment, so I didn't know if I needed to go through that
6 or if they're already being taken into consideration.

7 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I've only had a chance to
8 review that in brief. So we will -- I will take a closer
9 look at all of those. You are welcome to raise any or
10 highlight any key points, of course.

11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

12 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you, actually,
13 Commissioner Fernandez; that is some of the items that I
14 thought we should talk about because some of the items
15 she mentions here are our Commission items that we could
16 indeed -- that's up to the Commission to decide. So if
17 you want to bring any of those up now, please do.

18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. I just had a couple
19 of them. She talked about, or that item was on page 2,
20 when you talk about the page length, it was two to five
21 pages. And I also felt that that might be a little
22 restrictive. You might want to increase that.

23 And then the other one was -- I'm looking really
24 quick. Oh, on page 6, j, where you talk about "any
25 request for a written or verbal report must be responded

1 to within twenty-four hours". I thought that that might
2 be restrictive. I would want at least a reply and an
3 estimate as to when they can get that report, because it
4 really does depend on what kind of report we're
5 requesting.

6 I don't know if twenty-four hours would be possible
7 for some reports that we may need. And at this point, of
8 course, I don't know which reports we're going to need,
9 but just in case, especially if you need a whole new redo
10 of the explanations of the draft maps.

11 And just a minor thing, just throughout the whole
12 document, we reference COI sometimes as community of
13 interest, sometimes communities of interest, sometimes
14 it's COI, sometimes it's COIs, sometimes it's COI's, so
15 if we could just be consistent, that'd be great.

16 But thank you so much. I mean, just very good
17 document. I know you put a lot of time into it, so I
18 appreciate it. Thank you.

19 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.
20 Director Claypool?

21 MR. CLAYPOOL: Commissioner Fernandez, could you
22 tell me again the first point you made? I didn't get it.
23 I came in on 6, j, and twenty-four hours.

24 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, it had to do with the
25 page length.

1 MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay.

2 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Is that the one?

3 MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay.

4 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: On page 2, it's the second
5 or third paragraph. It's just saying the page length of
6 the proposal.

7 MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay.

8 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It's actually the plan, and
9 that's a couple places in there, so we will pick that up.
10 Oh, however, if we do want to discuss that, because we
11 said two to five, the Commissioners want four to six, or
12 do they care?

13 CHAIR LE MONS: Does any Commissioner have a
14 recommendation?

15 Commissioner Kennedy, then Fernandez.

16 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: If you're going to give a
17 maximum, just give a single page -- number of pages
18 rather than range; and certainly maximum of two to five,
19 your maximum is five. So whatever it is. Whether it's
20 five or ten, go with whatever that absolute maximum is.

21 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fernandez, then
22 Commissioner Turner. Oh, Commissioner Fernandez passes.

23 Commissioner Turner, then Director Claypool.

24 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I think we heard that we
25 may not receive, we're not expecting to receive a lot of

1 submissions online drawers. So I'm wondering if there is
2 a need to restrict it and put a number there.

3 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen, then Director
4 Claypool.

5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: The reason why, it's to make
6 sure they realize that's not the proposal length, that's
7 only the approach plan or the plan length. It's just,
8 it's a small portion of the proposal. It's an important
9 part and it's what the -- basically the presentation is
10 based on, but it is not the proposal length. So that was
11 the idea why we put page numbers in there. So they'd
12 instantly go, oh, oh, I see. That is a portion of;
13 that's not the entire proposal.

14 CHAIR LE MONS: Director Claypool?

15 MR. CLAYPOOL: So Ms. Shellenberger's proposal was
16 to increase that to ten pages. And she makes a good
17 point. I don't think that we're going to have so many
18 line drawers that to extend it to ten pages is going to
19 be onerous in regards to going through that many
20 proposals. I would just think the Commission should
21 consider that as an absolute maximum and just make it ten
22 pages.

23 CHAIR LE MONS: Any objections, Commissioners?
24 Okay. Point resolved. Does other Commissioners have
25 items they want to lift up? Okay.

1 Director Claypool, from your assessment of the
2 document, you wanted to point to a few things. Would you
3 like to do that at this time?

4 MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes. So from the comments from Ms.
5 Shellenberger, I'd like to go to table 1 and key action
6 items. I'm not entirely certain where that is in the
7 document. It must be -- there it is.

8 Key action item, so we're looking at page 10. And
9 there has been the suggestion that we allow at least two
10 to four weeks between the posting of the RFP and the
11 deadline for submission.

12 So I think we need to consider the length of time
13 that we want to have this out and allow proposals to come
14 back. And I'll yield.

15 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen, did you have
16 a comment?

17 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I did. I tried to move it
18 up because as soon as this goes -- my idea was to try to
19 move this up as quickly as possible.

20 And as soon as it goes to Office of Legal Services,
21 I thought we could try to notify at that point all the
22 line drawers to say, hey, here's our draft, this is
23 what's out there, this is what we're trying to do.

24 So we could kind of give them the time frame and
25 once it comes out of legal, then they have, like, a two-

1 week, a shortened period.

2 So rather than making it wait and wait and wait,
3 because they already know here's the bulk of it. It'll
4 get cleaned up somewhat. But to give them that time
5 frame, again, just to move the whole thing forward, which
6 is why I tried to move it forward, that deadline, rather
7 than going four weeks afterwards.

8 CHAIR LE MONS: Is there a definitive recommendation
9 on the length of time change that's being offered?
10 Director Claypool?

11 MR. CLAYPOOL: So and as I discussed with the
12 subcommittee, typically this would go out for thirty
13 days, which is a long time. But as Commissioner Andersen
14 has explained, we're trying to bring this person aboard.
15 I would at least want to split that difference. I would
16 hope that we would go out for at least twenty-one days
17 with this. It is true what Commissioner Andersen said
18 that we can release our draft that's being inspected by
19 the Office of Legal Services, and I don't think -- I
20 don't think that there's going to be a great deal of
21 change between what we see here.

22 So they would be seeing part and parcel the primary
23 document, but it takes a while for people to pull
24 together this document and to consider all the different
25 pieces that go into it. And I think twenty-one days is

1 where the -- kind of the minimum place that I would
2 expect them to be comfortable.

3 CHAIR LE MONS: I see a lot of body language
4 affirmation from the Commissioners. Is anyone not
5 comfortable with twenty-one days?

6 Okay. Next point. Director Claypool?

7 MR. CLAYPOOL: I'm going through the notes I made.
8 Okay. Let me see. I think that from here, I would just
9 say that as we need to move back with the subcommittee
10 and Raul and myself and just consider the assignments of
11 the points for the proposal plans and so forth on the
12 merit of what was given to us.

13 I don't see anything else here that I would bring up
14 personally for consideration by the Commission.

15 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Commissioners, any add
16 feedback on this item?

17 Commissioner Fernandez.

18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm sorry. I just missed
19 it before when I talk -- page 6, when you talked about
20 professional and collaboration, I didn't know if you
21 wanted to refer to them adhering to the Commission's code
22 of conduct. What you put in there is fine, but you may
23 also want to refer to that.

24 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Looks like that'll be added.
25 Commissioner Kennedy.

1 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I just wanted to endorse Ms.
2 Shellenberger's point regarding the scoring table and
3 reducing the number of points assigned to presentation
4 and bumping up the points for substance. Thank you.

5 CHAIR LE MONS: Subcommittee, could you please speak
6 to that?

7 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Sara, did you want to
8 run with that? I'm trying to grab where it is.

9 CHAIR LE MONS: So while you're doing that, can --
10 oh, are you ready Commissioner Sadhwani?

11 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: What page Commissioner
12 Kennedy were you looking in?

13 CHAIR LE MONS: It's page 6.

14 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: 23.

15 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I have it's 29 of the line
16 drawing. I don't know how you got 26.

17 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: And I have 23. Anyway, under
18 evaluation criteria.

19 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fornaciari.

20 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I want to say I support it
21 too, so. And it's on 23, the chart's on 23 on my
22 document too.

23 CHAIR LE MONS: You guys are making me nervous. Are
24 you all looking at the same document?

25 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That's exactly what I'm

1 concerned about.

2 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. Are different from
3 what's posted on each page from the page of the document.

4 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, it says page 23 on
5 the document, not on the PDF itself.

6 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, thank you. Oh, so I'm
7 sorry, can you walk through the points, because we did go
8 back and forth on -- if everyone's looking at that, you
9 know, there's -- you can see how it is -- in the document
10 right now, it's "redistricting references". So that's
11 all, their references is twenty. Their experience is
12 fifteen. The proposer's, the plan and methodology is
13 fifteen, presentation is twenty.

14 I think I already told you the cost has to stay at
15 30; you can't go below that. And Ms. Shellenberger is
16 suggesting move the proposer's plan up to twenty-five and
17 make the presentation ten. So what do people think about
18 that?

19 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy.

20 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I would propose to bump those
21 two that are fifteen each of them up to twenty and take
22 those ten points that you used and reduce presentation to
23 ten.

24 CHAIR LE MONS: Commission Akutagawa.

25 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I just want to affirm that

1 I agree. I think she does bring up a good point in terms
2 of we don't want a lot of flash and not substance. And
3 so I think the renumbering of the priorities or the point
4 assignments, I think will ensure that we get a good
5 quality plan, not necessarily one that looks pretty.

6 CHAIR LE MONS: Any additional Commissioner feedback
7 on this point?

8 Commissioner Sadhwani.

9 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. I'm perfectly
10 fine making these adjustments. I'll say, I think
11 Commissioner Andersen, correct me if I'm wrong; when we
12 were talking about presentation, we also thought that
13 that allows us a little flexibility to make sure that we
14 identify someone that we all feel like we can work with,
15 right, through their presentation style.

16 I don't have any problem with the adjustments that
17 have been recommended either by Ms. Shellenberger or
18 Commissioner Kennedy. Either one would be perfectly fine
19 with me.

20 But I do just want to acknowledge and kind of point
21 to that at the end of the day, I think we want to make
22 sure that we can identify someone that we all feel we can
23 work with. This is someone who's going to be working
24 very closely with us. So I do want to make sure that we
25 can prioritize that, but I think that still can be the

1 case.

2 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay followed by
3 Commissioner Akutagawa.

4 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair. I guess my
5 only concern is then the high weight on cost. Because we
6 have talked that cost is part of the equation, but all
7 these other pieces are important.

8 And I think maybe is there another word we can use
9 for presentation, presentation and engagement, or
10 presentation and -- not charisma, but the whole
11 relationship piece. It may be presentation and
12 engagement, you know, how do they engage us in it? But
13 I'm just worried that cost is a lot of points based on
14 everything else.

15 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa.

16 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. First off, I
17 I'm going to say that I think if -- Commissioner
18 Sadhwani, if your intent was more about how we're going
19 to work with the person, and if also presentation was a
20 consideration, I would suggest that we make it split and
21 be explicit about what it is that you want.

22 And if relationship or ability to work well with the
23 Commission is a consideration, I think that should be
24 explicitly said, and also then given a separate set of
25 points versus just, you make a really nice presentation.

1 Like, it's pretty or something like that. And maybe I'm
2 just overly simplifying what you intended on that.

3 The other thing is, I think what Commissioner Sinay
4 said on the cost, perhaps for what you were thinking
5 about, Commissioner Sadhwani, perhaps the ability to work
6 well with the Commission could be a set of points that
7 you take from the cost.

8 I would recommend that we don't go below the 20
9 points that we put to the redistricting references and
10 the bump that we made to the plan and the qualifications.
11 I think, at least the cost from a fiscal responsibility,
12 we have to put that on par with some of these other
13 things, but perhaps we could take ten points from it and
14 put it towards I think part of what Commissioner Sadhwani
15 was looking for in terms of the person's ability to work
16 well with the team.

17 CHAIR LE MONS: According to Commissioner Andersen,
18 the cost is fixed. It cannot go below thirty --

19 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right.

20 CHAIR LE MONS: -- so we cannot subtract any points
21 from cost. Is that correct, Commissioner Andersen and
22 Sadhwani? Thank you. Director Claypool?

23 MR. CLAYPOOL: So I want to make sure that we're
24 talking about the same thing across the board.

25 So this presentation we're talking about is the

1 physical presentation that will be scored when the person
2 does the interview, correct?

3 So these are interview -- this is an interview
4 scoring for the presentation that we receive, not
5 necessarily the presentation of the documents themselves,
6 but the presentation when the person's in the interview.
7 So I just want to make sure we are all talking about
8 that.

9 CHAIR LE MONS: Does that clarification help
10 anyone's position on that?

11 Commissioner Fernandez.

12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I like the twenty percent
13 for the presentation, because I do want them to put some
14 effort in there and I do believe that it is important for
15 us to feel comfortable, and it goes a long way.

16 And in terms of the references, I know we're
17 allowing them to pick the references. So I always tend
18 to kind of not put as much weight on that because for the
19 most part, if I'm going to put a reference, I'm going to
20 put a reference that's going to give me a good reference.

21 So I would suggest maybe reducing that. I know that
22 goes contrary to Commissioner Akutagawa but I guess I've
23 just been on the hiring/interviewing side so often that
24 the references, they don't come into play as strongly as
25 you would hope they would only because they are being

1 selective in terms of who they're bringing forward.

2 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay, did you have a
3 question?

4 Commissioner Akutagawa.

5 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I would actually agree with
6 Commissioner Fernandez on the reference part and that
7 that could be a place where we could draw some additional
8 points for the others.

9 I will caution however, in terms of, again, going
10 back to people who make a good presentation, whether it's
11 their presentation of their plan, I think we still need
12 to be focused on is the plan good? And then do they make
13 a good presentation about it? I think that given what
14 we're trying to do, my concern would be to ensure that
15 there's a strong plan in place, not a strong communicator
16 who can make something sound good, but not actually
17 deliver on what it is that we want.

18 So I think that that's kind of where I'm coming from
19 on it, but I would be comfortable if you wanted to keep
20 it the same, but I think we should try to make sure that
21 the qualifications and the quality of the plan is bumped
22 up to at least be equal weight.

23 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy, then
24 Commissioner Fernandez.

25 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: So then I would propose that

1 we modify it to be fifteen, twenty, twenty, fifteen. So
2 references fifteen, qualifications and experience twenty,
3 quality of plan and methodology twenty, presentation
4 fifteen, and leaving cost at thirty.

5 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fernandez, then
6 Commissioner Fornaciari.

7 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm just a little concerned
8 because Commissioner Kennedy is reading my thoughts. So
9 I'm just going to put that out. It's the second time I'm
10 going to just go ahead and agree with him, that's great.

11 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fornaciari.

12 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I just want to
13 clarify, is references, is that like, this team is great
14 references type of references or is it reference projects
15 that they've done in the past?

16 So in this case, a reference project would be an
17 example of something they've done in the past that is
18 equivalent or significant and how it came out and whether
19 there was a lawsuit and all that stuff, right? Is that
20 correct?

21 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen?

22 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: If we go back to page --
23 well, it's 14 on my document, so I guess the document
24 itself would be called 11, qualifications and experience.
25 It is as Commissioner Fornaciari just mentioned. It's,

1 you know, you have to show -- you have to have done this
2 kind of redistricting. You have to have -- we need a
3 list of all the projects in the last twenty years that
4 you've done this on. And we need to have certain things
5 identified in those projects; expert testimony in the
6 last twenty years, what those involved?

7 Then the actual reference projects are three
8 different projects with their information. And then
9 that's the -- essentially to show us how complex the jobs
10 are as well as the complexity, in which case we sort of
11 defined it as dealing with not just size. Size is a very
12 small component, actually. It's racial diversity; you
13 know, how much really hard VRA items have you had to deal
14 with, that sort of thing. And that's all in here.

15 So that is kind of a larger thing. The project
16 personnel, I'm not quite sure if that's under -- yeah, so
17 the redistricting references is a portion of the
18 qualifications and experience. Right, the references
19 itself, those we're talking about, are the three specific
20 big projects and how complex they are. So the complexity
21 issue is very important.

22 And then the other though -- yeah, so it is, that is
23 very important. And then the qualifications though is
24 very important because it says all the rest of
25 everything, it includes all the resumes. And the resumes

1 have to say for each person involved, what have you done
2 with the VRA, what have you done with the geography,
3 essentially, what redistricting work have you actually
4 done?

5 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that Commissioner
6 Andersen. Commissioner Fornaciari, does that change the
7 proposal on the table from your point of view? Are you
8 recommending an alternative point distribution?

9 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'm not. I just want to
10 make sure we were all clear on what that meant.

11 CHAIR LE MONS: Absolutely.

12 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So those folks who are
13 proposing point distributions might consider that, but I
14 don't have a specific proposal.

15 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Anyone who has made a point
16 distribution proposal, does this clarification alter what
17 we have on the table? Okay, anyone against the proposed
18 point proposal? Should we have some --

19 Commissioner Andersen.

20 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Could you just clarify
21 exactly what it is?

22 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy.

23 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: So the proposal is
24 redistricting references fifteen points, and particularly
25 if we're considering three references, it's harder to

1 divide twenty by three than it is fifteen by three.

2 Qualifications and experience of management and lead
3 staff, twenty points. Quality of proposer's plan and
4 methodology, twenty points. Presentation, fifteen
5 points. Cost, thirty points. Total, one hundred points.

6 CHAIR LE MONS: Again, I see a lot of body language
7 affirmation. I don't know if that's intentional or
8 involuntary, but thank you. Any opposition?

9 Okay. I think that was the final point, but we'll
10 ask again, are there additional points that any
11 Commissioners or staff want to raise with regard to
12 feedback or anything that you've observed in your own
13 reading and review of the document? If not, we will move
14 to public comment at this --

15 Ah, Commissioner Akutagawa.

16 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'm sorry. I'm not really
17 fully understanding her point about regarding
18 confidentiality. And I don't know if counsel can clarify
19 that, if there's something about that that I'm just not
20 understanding.

21 CHAIR LE MONS: Could you say it out loud, please?

22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sure. It's the bullet
23 point that says -- regarding confidentiality. I guess
24 it's III(D) and it says to -- it urges us to err on the
25 side of transparency and it seems like documents that are

1 incorrectly labeled as confidential, and that the
2 proposer will have the option to withdraw such documents
3 and have them removed from consideration if proposer
4 disagrees.

5 I'm not quite sure what they mean by that. And that
6 may be some kind of legal thing. I don't know.

7 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fornaciari.

8 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So if you read through the
9 statement of work, there's a section in there that talks
10 about confidentiality, and the proposer can claim
11 documents are confidential, and those won't be released.
12 The rest of the proposal will be released. I think what
13 she's saying here is if the Commission believes that
14 those documents should not be confidential, they can
15 disagree with the proposer and then the proposer would
16 have the option to either withdraw those documents or
17 allow them to be released publicly.

18 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

19 CHAIR LE MONS: So has this -- so are we going to
20 incorporate that and make that change? Is that what's
21 being recommended? Are you recommending that,
22 Commissioner Akutagawa?

23 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I would support the change.

24 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was just asking for
25 clarification. I'm not necessarily making a

1 recommendation.

2 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Turner.

3 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I was
4 going to say I do like that as a recommendation and
5 thanks to Commissioner Fornaciari, I never would've had
6 that understanding without the explanation. So I think
7 it's a good one with his explanation that he added in.

8 CHAIR LE MONS: Any dissenters on that? Okay. Any
9 additional points?

10 Commissioner Kennedy.

11 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: On the issue of multiple
12 simultaneous hearings, I'm one wondering if that's really
13 what we mean where people will be talking at two or three
14 or four locations at the same time, or are we talking
15 about a meeting where we will be listening to all of the
16 input coming from two, or three, or four locations?

17 And so I mean, I don't know that the actual physical
18 requirements of the contractor would be different, but
19 I'm just trying to understand if we are going to have to
20 choose between which of these simultaneous meetings we
21 participate in, or whether we will be able to hear the
22 input coming from all of them. And it's sequenced so
23 that we can do that. So if the subcommittee could help
24 me on that, I'd appreciate it. Thank you.

25 CHAIR LE MONS: Subcommittee or staff, do you have a

1 clarification on this point?

2 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: This is the point ii on page
3 12. Is that correct, Commissioner Kennedy?

4 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: It's mentioned several places
5 in the document.

6 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. Yeah. You know, this
7 was an -- and Dan, correct me if I'm wrong here, this was
8 some ideas that we had had about how we might do some
9 outreach. This is not locking us into anything. But
10 simply laying out some alternatives for how we might make
11 this approach during COVID, right? If we're not
12 physically present, could we be holding multiple meetings
13 at the same time? If so, how would a line drawer
14 approach that? So this is meant to be a part of their
15 plan to show us the kind of flexibility that they may or
16 may not have.

17 I know Dan has talked previously about, you know,
18 could we set up in multiple locations and in one evening
19 and do two hours here and two hours there, something like
20 that. So my sense of this is, show us what you got.
21 These are times that are very difficult, they're
22 challenging for all of us to figure out. And this
23 provides an opportunity for the line drawer to give us
24 some suggestions about how we might be able to handle
25 that.

1 But Commissioner Andersen or Dan, if either of you
2 want to jump into give further clarification. My
3 understanding Commissioner Kennedy is that's not holding
4 us to it, but simply laying out how would a professional
5 line drawer respond if we were to move in such a
6 direction?

7 CHAIR LE MONS: Director Claypool.

8 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah, Director Claypool?

9 CHAIR LE MONS: Do you have anything to add?

10 MR. CLAYPOOL: That is -- Commissioner Sadhwani, is
11 completely correct. That was our thanking behind it
12 completely.

13 CHAIR LE MONS: Is that sufficient, Commissioner
14 Kennedy? Thank you.

15 Commissioner Turner.

16 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. Looking at
17 the public comment, and I did not get an opportunity to
18 look at them real clear until this morning as well.

19 But Ms. Shellenberger, when she makes that
20 announcement, I'm wondering if it's one of just
21 agreement. She says regarding the simultaneous meetings
22 discussed, and she gives the 1B, 1H clarifying that it
23 would be two to three. And then she says, since you
24 include that detail in III.

25 So I wonder if there was something there, and I'm

1 trying to flip through and compare the two areas quick
2 enough to see if the point was is that there just was not
3 an agreement from one place in the proposal to somewhere
4 else.

5 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that, Commissioner
6 Turner. Any other --

7 Commissioner Fornaciari.

8 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So when I first read this,
9 I misread it, and I'm not sure if Ms. Shellenberger
10 misread it.

11 I think what it means is, we're going to hold
12 meetings at two to three locations simultaneously, right?
13 It doesn't mean two to three simultaneous meetings
14 because I thought we're going to hold these simultaneous
15 meetings and we're only going to have two or three of
16 them.

17 I think what it really means is we're going to have
18 some number, unknown number of simultaneous meetings, and
19 they'll be at two or three locations at a time. Am I
20 making any sense? No, sorry.

21 CHAIR LE MONS: Well, Ms. Shellenberger did say that
22 she was going to be listening into this conversation. So
23 if you are listening, Ms. Shellenberger, clarity, when we
24 go to public comment is welcome on that. Any other
25 comments?

1 Commissioner Andersen.

2 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That was the intent, as
3 Commissioner Fornaciari just said. The idea that,
4 particularly remotely, that possibly we might have to
5 have -- like, say we can just do a very small selection.

6 We could have a line drawer and a videographer in a
7 particular place. We might have a little bit, but not
8 all of us. But have us -- you know, that might be set up
9 in three different locations on a particular day.

10 We would all -- they wouldn't be happening all at
11 the same time, but the locations would be occurring. And
12 so a line drawer would have to staff three different
13 locations. Is that -- that's, I believe, what
14 Commissioner Fornaciari was saying. That was sort of the
15 intent there.

16 Again, as Commissioner Sadhwani said, it's to show
17 the flexibility and could they staff that many if need it
18 be.

19 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.
20 Commissioner Kennedy.

21 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I'll go back to a point that
22 I think I made once before in a meeting. Particularly
23 with an RFP, we want it to be impossible to be
24 misunderstood. And I don't think we're there yet.

25 It may be possible to understand, but it would be

1 much better if we could make it impossible to be
2 misunderstood.

3 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy, are you
4 referencing that point or the overall RFP?

5 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes. No, no, no. That
6 point.

7 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Okay. I understand that Mrs.
8 Shellenberger is in the queue, so at least as someone
9 reading it, we'll hear what her perspective is
10 momentarily.

11 Is there anyone else that would like to share
12 comment or uplift a point before we go to public comment?

13 Okay. Katy, could you read the instructions?

14 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair.

15 CHAIR LE MONS: Oh, I'm sorry. Oops.

16 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Oh.

17 CHAIR LE MONS: There's that fervor I was looking
18 for, Commissioner Fernandez. Let me go to Commissioner
19 Fernandez before we go to Katy. Thank you, Commissioner
20 Fornaciari.

21 Commissioner Fernandez you have the floor.

22 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you. Yeah, so
23 I'm going back to the simultaneous. The way it reads, it
24 can be interpreted two ways.

25 So I do agree with Commissioner Kennedy that instead

1 of saying, may decide to hold two to three simultaneous,
2 why don't we just say, may decide to hold simultaneous
3 meetings so that -- because the two to three could be is
4 it going to be on two to three different days, or is it
5 going to be two or three meetings on the same day?

6 But if you just put simultaneous, take out the
7 number, we don't hold ourselves to how many times or days
8 we'll have simultaneous meetings, if that makes sense.

9 But anyway, yeah. So it probably needs to be maybe
10 rewritten just a little bit. Thanks.

11 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.
12 Katy.

13 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. In order to
14 maximize transparency and public participation in our
15 process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment
16 by phone.

17 To call in, dial the tell telephone number provided
18 on the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When
19 prompted to enter the meeting ID number, it is provided
20 on the livestream feed, 91092377762 for this week's
21 meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply
22 press the pound key.

23 Once you have dialed in, you'll be placed in a queue
24 from which a moderator will begin unmuting callers to
25 submit their comment. You will also hear an automatic

1 message that says press star 9. Please do this to raise
2 your hand indicating you wish to comment. When it is
3 your turn to speak, the moderator will unmute you and you
4 will hear automatic message that says "the host would
5 like you to talk" and press star 6 to speak.

6 Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream
7 audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your
8 call.

9 Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when
10 it is your turn to speak. And again, please turn down
11 the livestream volume.

12 The Commission is taking public comment on -- how do
13 we describe this?

14 CHAIR LE MONS: Item number 4.

15 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Item number 4. Perfect.
16 And we do have a very full queue at this time. We will
17 open it up.

18 If you'll please state and spell your name for the
19 court reporter please.

20 MS. SHELLENBERGER: Yes, this is Lori, L-O-R-I, last
21 name Shellenberger, S-H-E-L-L-E-N-B-E-R-G-E-R. I'm the
22 redistricting consultant with Common Cause. And thank
23 you for the robust discussion, and I should have said
24 this earlier, for all the work that went into this RFP,
25 which is in such a different form than it was previously

1 and looks really great.

2 And I just want to respond on the two to three
3 meetings question. And my understanding was the same as
4 Commissioner Fornaciari's and was that this meant you
5 would be having a few meetings at the same time. And
6 Commissioner Turner was correct, I was just trying to
7 ensure there would be consistency. I understand now from
8 your discussion that it could be read in a few different
9 ways. I do think it's important to put a number in there
10 in terms of how many meetings you would be having at the
11 same time, as opposed to how many times you might have
12 simultaneous meetings.

13 Because I think that a line drawer would want to
14 feel confident that they have the staff necessary to
15 staff that many meetings at the same time. So I think
16 the prior draft just said simultaneous meetings, and you
17 know, does that mean you might have meetings in ten
18 regions at the same time? And that would be a big lift
19 for a line drawer.

20 So knowing how many, what the expectation is of how
21 many you would conduct at the same time, I think would be
22 important to make sure they have the technicians they
23 need to staff that.

24 And then I wanted to make one other point. I know
25 I'm running to the end of my time. It is a clarifying

1 point that has to do with the date. And I appreciate
2 that you'll make the change to reflect that the date
3 could be extended, the deadline, for the final adoption
4 of maps could be extended to December 15th.

5 And I do want to make a clarifying point regarding
6 that comment and it doesn't have to do with the substance
7 of the proposal at this point, but to your decision to
8 have August 15th as your working deadline and have the
9 deadline be tied to the receipt of data.

10 And I just want to flag for you that I do believe
11 there are organizations that I've been facilitating who
12 have concerns about tying the date to release the data
13 because -- and certainly that date is in flux and my
14 colleague Rosalind Gold who leads work on that nationally
15 can speak more specifically to that.

16 But the second concern is just the conditions of
17 this pandemic and everything else that has been thrown at
18 organizations who are scrambling to respond over this
19 past year in the midst of a pandemic, and uplift
20 underrepresented communities, I think have concerns about
21 being able to facilitate and engage and educate the
22 community on redistricting in a time line as tight as
23 August 15th. And I would just urge you next year when
24 you reconvene to potentially revisit that discussion and
25 even invite some of those groups who would be doing unity

1 mapping and engaging communities in to gain a better
2 understanding of why that deadline may be really
3 difficult.

4 And then there was one other question that I had in
5 my email to you last night, which was a clarifying
6 question about the description of the data and the
7 reference to adjusted census data and was hoping that the
8 subcommittee could clarify what that was referencing.

9 And those are my comments. I can stay on if there
10 are any follow-up questions.

11 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani?

12 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. Just in terms of the
13 adjusted data, I need to go back to your email and see
14 exactly which portion you are referring to. But I
15 believe we had used that terminology regarding whether
16 or -- what we will do with the incarcerated population
17 data that we receive.

18 We have not had at discussion yet as a Commission.
19 I believe we will be having it soon. I have a sense of
20 where I think we'll go as a Commission, but we ultimately
21 haven't made that decision yet.

22 So that was what I believe we were referring to in
23 adjusted data. And I need to go back and look at the
24 specific subsection that you identified. But that was
25 where some of the use of the language of certified data

1 versus adjusted data had come from.

2 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen.

3 MS. SHELLENBERGER: Okay. Appreciate that.

4 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And also on that very same
5 point as I believe Ms. Johnston already said, that also
6 gives the flexibility should any immigrants be taken out
7 of the numbers we are given, that gives the flexibility
8 of putting them back in, because as you know, we have to
9 consider all people for our redistricting.

10 So it was on both points. And that's why the
11 "adjusted" is written in there.

12 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you Commissioner Andersen.

13 Katy, could we go to our next caller?

14 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes.

15 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Ms. Shellenberger.

16 Katy, are you there?

17 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes. If you'll please
18 state and spell your name for the court reporter. Sorry,
19 I was trying to get him to connect.

20 You're live; if you'll please state and spell your
21 name for the court reporter. Caller --

22 MR. JOHNSON: This is -- this is --

23 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: There you go.

24 MR. JOHNSON: -- Doug Johnson. Are you talking to
25 me?

1 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, I am.

2 MR. JOHNSON: Oh, okay.

3 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: If you could state and
4 spell your name for the court reporter.

5 MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. This is Douglas Johnson,
6 D-O-U-G-L-A-S, J-O-H-N-S-O-N. And good morning
7 Commissioners. I'm from National Demographics; we've
8 spoken before and good to talk to you again.

9 I just wanted to share a couple thoughts on this
10 proposal. One thing, as I mentioned before, I do
11 encourage the Commission to not make the proposal too
12 onerous because that will limit who bids.

13 Two thoughts on that; first of all, is kind of the
14 theoretical side to trying to spell out how many meetings
15 you're going to do simultaneously and things like that.
16 Playing what if games in the proposal is very hard and
17 takes a lot of work on our side.

18 And then secondly, a lot of provisions that may
19 sound straightforward are very onerous. For example, you
20 have the provision asking for a list and descriptions of
21 every project we've done for the last twenty years.

22 Well, our firm has done somewhere between 250 and
23 300 redistricting projects in the last twenty years. And
24 if we spend only two minutes per project putting that
25 summary together, that's between, I don't know, seven and

1 ten hours of work.

2 So I do want to encourage you to think about that
3 and make sure that you don't write an RFP that is so
4 onerous that the highly qualified firms that you might be
5 interested in just find it's not worth the effort to
6 apply.

7 So just a couple thoughts. Last, I would note
8 there's no information on how to share a thought in your
9 meetings on the agenda or in the website. There's
10 actually a circular reference. The website says, check
11 the minutes -- the agenda and the agenda says, check the
12 website, but neither one actually shares. I thought I'd
13 highlight that for you. The only way to find out is
14 actually video -- watch the meeting. So wanted to share
15 that with you, but thank you and I hope you take these
16 considerations into account.

17 Lastly, there's no provisions for an online mapping
18 tool. And as I talked about before, we'd note that when
19 the smallest school districts and small towns are
20 offering their residents online mapping tools to
21 participate in their process, it might be embarrassing if
22 the Commission for the State that hosts Silicon Valley
23 does not offer that to its residents.

24 So just wanted to remind you of that. Thank you
25 very much. Bye-bye.

1 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you Mr. Johnston. Next
2 caller, Katy?

3 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. If you'll
4 please state and spell your name for the court reporter.

5 MS. COLES: Yes, my name's Kimberly Coles.
6 K-I-M-B-E-R-L-E-Y, C-O-L-E-S.

7 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And the floor is yours.

8 MS. COLES: Oh, thank you. Thank you,
9 Commissioners, and good morning. I'd like to say a
10 couple of things quickly in my time. One is appreciate
11 Ms. Shellenberger for her email, none of which the public
12 has access to because it's not posted yet.

13 And so given the very extensive comments that Common
14 Cause is wonderfully making and I agree with, I would
15 love to be able to follow along. And so I believe this
16 has come up unfortunately numerous times and to encourage
17 that finally to be figured out.

18 I'd also like to talk about the time line and that's
19 Ms. Shellenberger's comment again. The impact of the
20 shortened time line and the working deadline of August
21 does seem to make sense in terms of the sort of democracy
22 of getting this done. But the impact on communities and
23 maybe of not getting the public comments and the
24 communities and all of that outreach done, is six months.

25 And so not to dismiss that with the desire to stick

1 with the original deadline, that the December has come
2 around for a reason. And the likely impact is not just
3 on the line drawer and getting those maps out, but on the
4 inability to get the data you need from California and
5 the people.

6 And then finally, and I know this is just a general
7 comment, for the last three or four meetings, you have
8 all discussed getting the 2021 calendar out. But it just
9 keeps up appearing on the agenda, is not happening.

10 And so for all of our planning and I think again,
11 several colleagues had mentioned this, it'd be really
12 nice to get at least the January, February schedule so
13 that we can all plan our time and you can plan as well.
14 Thank you very much.

15 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you Ms. Coles. Katy, could
16 you invite in the next caller please?

17 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. I'm trying.
18 They have to let themselves in. There we go. If you'll
19 state and spell your name for the court reporter.

20 MR. CHAFFEE: Hi, my name's Chris Chaffee,
21 C-H-R-I-S, C-H-A-F-F-E-E. I'm the CEO -- COO, excuse me,
22 of Redistricting Partners. I just want to say at the
23 start that we are not bidding on the line drawing RFP.
24 So this is not a comment from a potential proposal.

25 However, it is based on our experience doing this

1 work professionally and working on many proposals right
2 now, both in California and out of state. We have three
3 general comments on the RFP, both -- all on section II,
4 B(1) and (2) on page 8, related to the work of your next
5 demographer.

6 First, you want people to disclose the redistricting
7 work of both their companies and their employees working
8 on their various projects. This is about the people
9 involved in the work, not a brand name. To fix this in
10 sections 1 and 2 in the first sentence, after "proposer",
11 you'd need to insert phrase, or project personnel.

12 The second point is you really want to capture
13 redistricting work done for both decision makers and
14 outside organizations. In 2010 as you know, we did work
15 for Equality California, promoting the use of data to
16 identify LGBTQ communities as a community of interest.

17 If we were bidding on this, that's work you would
18 want disclosed. To fix this, in section 2 (sic) in the
19 first bullet at the end of the sentence insert the
20 phrase, and if different, who authorized the project,
21 i.e. nongovernmental organizations.

22 And the third point is you want to know if
23 incumbency was a criterion for one of the plans that the
24 proposer is submitting. Simply put, because it changes
25 the process. If it didn't exist, the Commission really

1 wouldn't exist. So to fix this and in section 1, in the
2 third bullet at the end, you'd want to insert, and
3 whether the maps considered incumbency.

4 So to summarize; one, experience is about the people
5 involved. Two, nongovernmental work should be disclosed.
6 And three, incumbency really impacts the relevancy of a
7 map if it's used as a criterion.

8 So thank you for your time and attention on this. I
9 can stay on if you have any other questions. Thanks.

10 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Mr. Chaffee. Katy, would
11 you invite the next caller in, please?

12 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: So we do have one other
13 person in the queue. However, they do not have their
14 hand raised. So if you would like to make a comment, if
15 you could press star 9 to raise your hand. If not, we
16 will move on.

17 Chair, they have not chose to raise their hand.

18 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Thank you very much for the
19 comments. We will now move out of public comment and
20 to -- let me check the time.

21 So we have ten minutes before our break.
22 Commissioner Yee, would that be an adequate budget amount
23 of time for you to address the chair rotation?

24 COMMISSIONER YEE: It could be. It just depends on
25 the amount of discussion that gets generated.

1 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Well, why don't we begin it
2 and if we aren't able to complete it, we'll finish it
3 after lunch -- excuse me, after the break. So
4 Commissioner Yee, take it away. We're moving to number 7
5 on the agenda, which is the chair rotation schedule. And
6 then we will come back to number 6 if we complete 7 after
7 the break.

8 Commissioner Yee.

9 COMMISSIONER YEE: Very good. So as you'll recall,
10 Commissioner Toledo and I initially drafted the current
11 chair rotation policy, which has a strict rotation of our
12 political categories and then our alphabetical order.

13 Some of the coming and going from the pool of
14 Commissioners who are choosing to stay in the rotation
15 create a situation where we may be down to, it looks like
16 we're down to three Democrat Commissioners in the
17 rotation. So this creates a situation where we just have
18 some of the Commissioners rotating in a lot more than
19 others, and it just seems to be something worth
20 revisiting because it gets to a point where it is just
21 not very equitable.

22 So I came up with some various options we can
23 consider and you can see in the handout that I prepared,
24 playing around with this. Option A is what's currently
25 policy and you'll see, for instance, that Commissioner

1 Turner who would be next after currently, Commissioner Le
2 Mons, and then Commissioner Taylor, and then Commissioner
3 Turner would be next. And then Commissioner Turner comes
4 back again because there are only three Democrat
5 Commissioners in the rotation. And so it goes.

6 The other issue is that it just happens that the
7 policy we came up with maybe we should have played it out
8 because as it happens, it's seems to generate just by
9 happenstance, a lot of unmixed gender pairs of chair and
10 vice chair. In fact, eight of nine so far which is
11 just -- we seem to specialize in low probability outcomes
12 in this Commission. And some Commissioners have voiced a
13 desire to have more mixed pairs. So that's the current
14 rotation.

15 Option B that I propose, emphasizes mixing genders
16 as a priority. In none of these, do we have
17 Commissioners serving with the same political affiliation
18 Commissioner. So that's always mixed to some degree.
19 And then option B also tries to have Commissioners serve
20 sort of in the order so far, so that -- except that
21 Commissioner Kennedy comes up quickly again because he's
22 the only Democrat guy, actually.

23 So you'll notice that with option B, however,
24 political affiliations are not equitable. So since in
25 the rotation, you have three Democrats, four

1 nonaffiliated, five Republicans in that rotation, that's
2 the ratio you get. So you have a Republican Commissioner
3 chairing five-thirds as many as you have a Democrat one.
4 So those are no longer even in that proposal.

5 Okay. Working along, option C, this is if we try to
6 equal out workload. So this option looks at who served
7 so far and tries to continue on putting up the three of
8 us who have not served so far early and spreading
9 everyone out as equally as possible, not considering
10 gender.

11 So that proposal, again, the political ratio is not
12 even, and you end up with a lot of unmixed gender pairs.
13 But it does even out the workload, if that's the most
14 important thing to you.

15 Okay, then option D, we go back to a strict
16 political rotation. So all three categories are strictly
17 even, and then I tried to -- and then I strictly
18 alternate gender. So political affiliation are even, you
19 have mixed pairs at all times. The cost is that some
20 Commissioners end up serving a lot more than others.

21 So for instance, you'll notice that Commissioner
22 Fornaciari doesn't actually show up until a long time
23 from now, because there's five Republicans and you have
24 to spread them out. And Commissioner Kennedy will have
25 served three times before Commissioner Fornaciari comes

1 back. So that's the cost of that rotation.

2 Note that in none of these rotations, do I consider
3 geography or race. So we're not prioritizing that in any
4 of these rotations.

5 I do have a preference. I don't know if I should
6 float it or recommend it or just wait to let this
7 comment.

8 CHAIR LE MONS: Totally up to you to you,
9 Commissioner Yee. Would you like to share, or?

10 COMMISSIONER YEE: If I had my druthers, I would go
11 with option B. So in thinking about it, as I think about
12 how the 2010 Commission was routinely lauded for having a
13 rotating chair, nobody went on to say, and the rotation
14 was perfectly equal; isn't that great?

15 Of course, more equality is better than less
16 equality, but it's just the fact that it was rotated.
17 That seems to be the chief credit. And in option B, we
18 still do have always a mixed pair politically. You never
19 have two Commissioners of the same affiliation status.

20 So I think that's relatively less important. We do
21 still rotate. We still do have all three affiliation
22 statuses rotating. They're not perfectly even, but
23 they're sort of even, as even as can be. And then we do
24 address fully the gender mixing concern, which I think
25 actually would be a nice change.

1 In option B, you do have two same gender pairs
2 coming up; Fernandez and Ahmad, and then if it rotates
3 around again, you'll see the last one there is Taylor and
4 then it rotates back to Toledo. So Toledo would be two
5 guys. But otherwise, we're all mixed pairs.

6 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Turner.

7 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes, absolutely. I wanted to
8 support Commissioner Yee's option B. Thank him for all
9 of the work in detail that he put into this. And I am
10 heavily in favor of option B.

11 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Any other Commissioners
12 have --

13 Commissioner Kennedy.

14 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I certainly appreciate the
15 work and I hope Commissioner Yee has enjoyed the work.
16 I'm still to this day, not fully convinced that rotating
17 is something that was -- certainly not contemplated by
18 the original drafters. And I'm not fully convinced that
19 it is compliant with the regulations as they're currently
20 drafted.

21 Would I object strenuously to any of these? No.
22 But you know, I do have my doubts as to whether rotating
23 was really the intention of the regulation as drafted.

24 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.
25 Any other comments?

1 Okay. We're going to break for -- break. We're
2 going to go to break for fifteen minutes. Feel free to
3 ponder the list before us. We will return back to this
4 agenda item when we come back from break at 11:15 and go
5 from there. Enjoy your break.

6 (Whereupon, a recess was held)

7 CHAIR LE MONS: Welcome back from break. We're at
8 agenda item number 6 -- hang on; I'm sorry -- 7 that's
9 being led by Commissioner Yee. So where we left off just
10 before the break is there was a recommendation of option
11 B and we were having a little bit of discussion there.

12 So I'd like to pick up the discussion and continue.
13 Our goal here is to choose one of the options so we can
14 move forward.

15 Commissioner Fernandez.

16 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just wanted to ask
17 Commissioner Yee if this was -- I hope my assumption's
18 right; that we would start this rotation after Chair Le
19 Mons. And if so, my recommendation -- I mean, I don't
20 mind it, but I would recommend that maybe we move Taylor
21 and move him up since he's the Vice Chair and then that
22 way he can be the chair and it can be Taylor and Toledo,
23 and then go that way.

24 And I was looking at that also because both of them
25 have not chaired so far. And I know that Commissioner

1 Yee and Sadhwani also hasn't chaired so far, so I didn't
2 want to take that away from them either. So I'm just
3 trying to even it out.

4 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Yee?

5 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, good point. Actually, I
6 assumed that Commissioner Taylor would chair next since
7 he's current Vice Chair. And then the rotation goes on
8 from there.

9 If I may, a couple other quick points, one is
10 that -- so a substitution rule, which we need, because if
11 somebody has to step off temporarily, then how do you
12 know who's next?

13 The rule I'm suggesting is that basically, we keep
14 the gender and political affiliation order. And if
15 somebody has to step off temporarily, then that spot is
16 filled with somebody of the same flavor.

17 So if I had to step off, then another Republican guy
18 would take my spot in the rotation. That works except
19 for Democrat guys because there's only one. So we have
20 to keep Commissioner Kennedy healthy and strong so that
21 there will not be a situation where he needs to be a
22 substitute cause there's no other Democrat guy in the
23 rotation.

24 Another thing -- oh, just apologies to Commissioner
25 Andersen. I misspelled her name once here. Hopefully, I

1 didn't misspell anyone else's. If I did, my apologies.

2 Also we need to think about, okay. So I've been
3 applying myself to this because Commissioner Toledo and I
4 picked it up the first time around, but I think it needs
5 to land in one of the subcommittees actually, rather than
6 just as my kind of private project.

7 I mean, it's okay if that makes -- actually, it's
8 okay. But maybe I should go to finance administration, I
9 don't know. And I think we're keeping our already
10 agreed-upon understanding that chairs will conduct two
11 full meetings, and then some of these single-day meetings
12 are just getting added on to whatever meeting followed or
13 proceeded.

14 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Toledo?

15 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: This looks like good work. I
16 had a question about option three. It says at the bottom
17 that there's three Democrats, but I count four in that
18 rotation.

19 COMMISSIONER YEE: I can see --

20 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I count four Democrats listed
21 there, but in the bottom, it says there's only three
22 Democrats.

23 COMMISSIONER YEE: In option C, that is?

24 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No, in option B.

25 COMMISSIONER YEE: B.

1 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And actually, all of them, I
2 think option B and C assumes only three Democrats, but
3 there's four Democrats, I think, listed whose names are
4 on that list.

5 COMMISSIONER YEE: Let's see. We have Sadhwani,
6 Turner, and Kennedy, right? So I should have mentioned,
7 I did touch base with several Commissioners who would be
8 most affected by some of these options. And so for
9 instance, maybe we should hear from Commissioner Vazquez
10 about her decisions.

11 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.

12 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Vazquez?

13 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Thanks, Commissioner Yee.
14 I've elected to pull myself out of the rotation just
15 given my health and trying to navigate everything. I'd
16 much rather commit my energy towards subcommittee work,
17 especially outreach with Commissioner Turner and my zone
18 rather than also trying to add additional pieces to my
19 plate. So that's just best for me. And I think it's
20 also a way for me to better serve the Commission.

21 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner
22 Vazquez.

23 COMMISSIONER YEE: So I think that leaves three
24 Democrats. Am I missing somebody? I think.

25 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No, I think I was miscounting.

1 COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. All good.

2 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

3 COMMISSIONER YEE: I'll send you these later. You
4 can play with them too.

5 CHAIR LE MONS: Are there any more comments to
6 option B as the recommendation or does any Commissioners
7 want to offer an alternative option?

8 If not, we'll move to a vote. Well, we'll go to
9 public comment, of course, and then we'll come back and
10 vote on option B if someone puts the motion forward.

11 So Commissioner Fernandez, then Commissioner
12 Sadhwani.

13 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I would move to accept
14 option B starting with Commissioner Taylor as the Chair,
15 and then moving in the rotation.

16 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I would second.

17 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. If there's no additional
18 comments, I'd like to go to public comment and come back
19 for a vote.

20 Katy, could you read the instructions please?

21 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. In order to
22 maximize transparency and public participation in our
23 process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment
24 by phone.

25 To call in, dial the telephone number provided on

1 the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted
2 to enter the meeting ID number, it is provided on the
3 livestream feed, 91092377762. When prompted to enter a
4 participant ID, simply press the pound key.

5 Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a
6 queue from which a moderator will begin unmuting callers
7 to submit their comment. You will also hear an automatic
8 message to press star 9. Please do this to raise your
9 hand indicating you wish to comment. When it is your
10 turn to speak, the moderator will unmute you and you will
11 hear an automatic message that says "The host would like
12 you to talk", and to press star 6 to speak.

13 Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream
14 audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your
15 call.

16 Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when
17 it is your turn to speak. And again, please turn down
18 the livestream volume.

19 The Commission is taking public comment at this time
20 on item --

21 CHAIR LE MONS: Number 7.

22 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: 7. I had it. Thank you
23 though. I was proud of myself. We do have one person in
24 the queue.

25 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you so much, Katy. You can

1 invite the caller in, please.

2 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Please state and spell
3 your name for the Commission -- or court reporter.

4 MS. GOLD: Yes. Rosalind Gold, R-O-S-A-L-I-N-D, and
5 the last name is Gold, G-O-L-D. And I just wanted to ask
6 permission to make a very short comment that is not
7 germane to the issue being discussed right this moment,
8 but is germane to the previous discussion on the scope of
9 work for the line drawer, if I may beg that indulgence?

10 CHAIR LE MONS: What I'd like to do, caller -- Ms.
11 Gold, is to invite you, right after lunch, we'll have
12 open general comment and you can comment on anything on
13 the agenda at that time.

14 MS. GOLD: I will be happy to call back then. Thank
15 you so much.

16 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

17 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And Ms. Gold was our only
18 person in queue at this time.

19 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. So could we do our roll call
20 for vote please?

21 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Sadhwani?

22 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

23 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Sinay?

24 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

25 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Taylor?

1 VICE CHAIR TAYLOR: Yes.

2 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Toledo?

3 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

4 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Turner?

5 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

6 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Vazquez?

7 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.

8 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Yee?

9 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

10 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Ahmad?

11 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.

12 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Akutagawa?

13 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

14 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Andersen?

15 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

16 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Fernandez?

17 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

18 MS. SHEFFIELD: Is that a yes?

19 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

20 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Fornaciari?

21 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.

22 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Kennedy?

23 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Abstain.

24 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Le Mons?

25 CHAIR LE MONS: Yes.

1 MS. SHEFFIELD: Okay. Motion passes.

2 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

3 MS. SHEFFIELD: You're welcome.

4 COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, everyone.

5 Chair, you're muted.

6 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. I'd like to move to item
7 number 6; data management, Commissioners Ahmad and
8 Turner.

9 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. Commissioner
10 Turner and I would like to provide an update in regards
11 to data management and where we are at.

12 So last week, we met with USDR and Karin Mac Donald
13 to go over the different responsibilities of the line
14 drawer and then specific needs from a data management
15 standpoint that the line drawer had. USDR was able to
16 engage in a discovery sprint in which they asked a whole
17 bunch of different questions related to what our process
18 is, what our vision is, what lessons learned. Karin had
19 to share with them.

20 We are in the middle of that process so we will have
21 more to report on that at our next meeting. We also will
22 be getting assistance from USDR in drafting the job
23 descriptions for a data analyst or management type role
24 from a technical standpoint. They have substantive
25 experience in doing this and providing this service for

1 other agencies. So we will be taking advantage of that
2 opportunity as well.

3 In terms of next steps for our data analyst or
4 manager, we are really exploring the idea of an
5 interagency agreement. This avenue would expedite the
6 time in which we can bring someone on board for that
7 role. This interagency agreement will also take
8 advantage of the talent that we have in California at
9 academic institutions, and potentially provide us with an
10 additional avenue to connect with students from across
11 California given that academic tie as well.

12 So we are in the process of getting that information
13 together with staff, and we will have more to report in
14 January. Commissioner Turner, is there anything else
15 that I missed?

16 COMMISSIONER TURNER: No, you did a beautiful job.
17 I think it was very clear and we'll see now if there are
18 any questions.

19 CHAIR LE MONS: Any questions Commissioners?
20 Commissioner Sinay.

21 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Are we not revealing who the
22 interagency agreement may be with?

23 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: We don't know who the
24 interagency agreement will be with at this point. We are
25 still in the early phases of drafting that from what I

1 understand from staff. And Dan, you can correct me if
2 I'm wrong; that process will work relatively faster than
3 a traditional RFP process. Dan?

4 MR. CLAYPOOL: The only thing I would say to all the
5 Commissioners, including you, Commissioner Sinay, is if
6 you know of someone with these types of talents and
7 skills, please reach out to them once we put this
8 together.

9 CHAIR LE MONS: Any addition?
10 Commissioner Sadhwani.

11 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So just for clarity; this
12 will be released like an RFP? My understanding of an
13 interagency agreement is that it's specifically with an
14 entity or an individual at an entity.

15 Are we still -- it sounds like we're still seeking
16 such an entity here in California or at a state-based
17 entity. My understanding, for example, in 2010, Matt
18 Barreto had an interagency agreement, but he was not in
19 California at that point in time, he was at the
20 University of Washington.

21 So this could be at a state-based higher education
22 institution outside of California as well. So this is
23 going to be released and people are going to respond? Or
24 I guess just a little bit more clarity about how this is
25 going to be managed in terms of identifying this

1 individual.

2 CHAIR LE MONS: Direct Claypool.

3 MR. CLAYPOOL: So this is where we can go back to an
4 RFI and basically put out a request for information from
5 individuals who might be interested in entering into this
6 type of agreement with us.

7 So we can use an RFI as a vehicle to search or we
8 can identify it. And Mr. Barreto is a good case in
9 point; he was with the University of Washington last
10 time, but we also can use individuals who have a
11 cooperative agreement with California and California
12 institutions.

13 So we're not necessarily restricted to California
14 talent, although we would always like to place this with
15 Californians as much as possible. But that's the process
16 that we're looking at.

17 We're going to produce an RFI document. We're going
18 to float through all of our vendors and all of the people
19 that are on our list. And we're going to look for
20 somebody who has the talent to pull this forward for the
21 subcommittee.

22 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that, Director
23 Claypool. Any other questions for the subcommittee?

24 Commissioner Yee.

25 COMMISSIONER YEE: Thanks. I'm not sure this is the

1 time to ask, but about scope of work, it wasn't entirely
2 clear to me that we ever landed on the question of
3 whether the data management contractor was responsible
4 for the COI tool input in any way. You know, we
5 discussed that. In my mind, I'm not positive we landed,
6 but I might be mistaken.

7 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Turner.

8 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Thank you. And thank
9 you, Chair. In the discussions that we're having
10 currently with USDR, when we receive their prototype back
11 of the process, that will be included as well.

12 And we also noted that in the line drawer RFI that
13 we just went over, that there is also an opportunity
14 there for the Commission to direct that individual to own
15 a piece of that as well.

16 And we're going to -- so once we get the prototype
17 back, we'll have a clearer kind of picture and path for
18 you that will just say who's going to own COI and how all
19 of that will work.

20 We do know that USDR and our conversation has talked
21 with both Karin and Jamie to kind of shore up some of
22 those details. So probably for part of January is when
23 we'll have a clearer picture. We have all of the right
24 players on the table now and in discussion with each
25 other. And so now we're really looking forward to

1 getting definitive answer for us as a Commission.

2 COMMISSIONER YEE: Very good. Thanks.

3 CHAIR LE MONS: Any additional questions? Okay. So
4 we'll expect to hear more from the subcommittee at a
5 subsequent meeting and we look forward. Thank you so
6 much for all the hard work that you all are doing.

7 I love that word "discovery sprint". That sounded
8 kind of sexy, actually. So as we move forward, I did
9 want to -- speaking of COI tool, I wanted to clarify a
10 comment made by one of our callers earlier, Mr. Johnson,
11 who suggested that there wasn't a tool or mechanism for
12 the public to be able to submit maps.

13 So we want to just do a shoutout to the Statewide
14 Database and the wonderful work that them and their
15 partners are doing develop the very thing that Mr.
16 Johnson suggested wasn't happening. We do have that, and
17 will have that for the citizens of California.

18 Commissioner Andersen.

19 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'm sorry; to clarify on
20 that. He was actually talking not about the COI tool.
21 He was talking about a redistricting tool when he was
22 talking about the maps. And that is something that the
23 Statewide Database and the -- you know, that is still
24 being worked on, but the COI tool was the first portion
25 that they were working on.

1 The COI tool is only for communities of interest.
2 The redistricting tool which is what Doug Johnson was
3 talking about; he wasn't talking about just communities
4 of interest mapping. He was talking about which is
5 our -- we talk about mapping, mapping, mapping, we get
6 them all mixed up.

7 He was talking about redistricting mapping. So
8 basically, the average person can go out there and say, I
9 think you should draw them all like this. That's what he
10 was talking about. And that is -- Michael Wagaman was
11 talking to us about that. But again, that is gone -- the
12 sequencing of the work on that is after the COI tool is
13 out, then they were going to start working on that
14 particular item.

15 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen for
16 that clarification; I stand corrected. With that, we
17 will move on to item number 10, which is discussion of
18 future meeting dates and agenda items.

19 So I'm not sure which Commissioner has been keeping
20 track. I know that there has been at least one or two
21 Commissioners who've been keeping track of the dates that
22 we have scheduled so far. And I think we are scheduled
23 into early February at this point. So if we could pick
24 up from there and potentially go out to the end of
25 February or the beginning of March in terms of picking

1 dates, and then we'll continue to use our Google docs
2 tool and the developments of our progress to indicate our
3 agenda items and grow those agendas accordingly.

4 Commissioner Sinay, did you have your hand up? I'm
5 sorry.

6 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes. Sorry, I was trying to
7 unmute. My notes say that we had gone all the way
8 through February on our selection. I can put them --

9 CHAIR LE MONS: Oh, okay.

10 COMMISSIONER SINAY: If you'd like, I can share them
11 verbally so everybody knows what I have and we can see if
12 I was correct or not.

13 CHAIR LE MONS: Sure.

14 COMMISSIONER SINAY: January 6th is a tentative
15 meeting if needed. January 11th through the 13th.
16 January 21st is a tentative meeting if we need it.
17 January 26th through the 28th, February 8th through the
18 9th, February 16 through the 17th, and February 24th
19 through the 25th.

20 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay, fantastic. So I think one of
21 the callers -- I don't think we have this posted anywhere
22 yet; is that correct?

23 Yeah. Okay. So I think with our rotation and our
24 dates now that we solidified our new rotation, we can tie
25 those to the meeting dates that we have out to the 25th.

1 Do Commissioners want to go out further than the 25th or
2 wait until we convene after the the first of the year and
3 see where we are in terms of extending the chosen dates?

4 Commissioner Sinay?

5 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I guess one of the reasons I
6 think we stopped, but also one of the reasons I'm not
7 sure how to extend it past February, is I'm not sure what
8 our world looks like, what our work looks like after
9 February. And we were waiting for the outreach plan to
10 kind of have a better feel of that.

11 CHAIR LE MONS: Awesome.

12 Commissioner Sadhwani?

13 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Same. I kind of wonder to
14 what extent we need to continue to have these kinds of
15 business meetings, if we're also going out into the
16 community and beginning to collect either COI information
17 or doing the public outreach and education meetings. I
18 think we need further clarity on that before we commit to
19 these meetings.

20 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. So with that, I think we can
21 satisfy helping the people slate -- helping the public
22 start to slate their schedule through the end of February
23 by simply posting our current projected meeting dates.

24 And Commissioner Yee, do you want to add the new
25 rotation schedule? Do you want to tie it to those dates

1 or would you like to keep that separate?

2 COMMISSIONER YEE: I'd be happy to put it all in one
3 document. That would be useful. Also I should mention
4 that February 18th -- we're projecting that we will have
5 our new legal affairs committee formed in January and on
6 the 18th, there'll will be an additional public meeting
7 day for the Legal Affairs Committee to do any final
8 interviews and discussion to select our VRA and
9 litigation counsel.

10 So that's February 18th. But I'll go ahead and
11 merge the two; the calendar and the rotation.

12 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Commissioner Andersen.

13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I was actually writing that
14 down now, and if we wanted to go over that. Because
15 there is a question about the two-day meetings, are we
16 talking about full meetings and were our two-day meetings
17 full meetings or not?

18 So that does affect February obviously. So if we
19 wanted to kind of talk about the two, three-day item,
20 then -- and anyone can put it together. But I think --
21 did we decide two days was the full meeting or was it
22 three? I think Commissioner Akutagawa was involved in
23 two-day meetings and might have some input on that.

24 CHAIR LE MONS: Does anyone have any comments on
25 that?

1 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, if I can just comment
2 on what Commissioner Andersen said. I'll just -- for
3 clarification, I chaired two meetings because they were
4 two two-day meetings and I think the rule was one three-
5 day.

6 CHAIR LE MONS: If I recall, I'll just jump in here.
7 I thought it was just a series of meetings. They might
8 be a two-day meeting or a three-day meeting. I don't
9 think one was considered a full meeting if it was three
10 days versus two days. Commissioner Yee?

11 COMMISSIONER YEE: I believe the original rule was
12 one meeting or three days. Then we amended it to be two
13 meetings. I recommend that a two-meeting day count as a
14 meeting because it involves a whole separate agenda and
15 that's kind of the biggest work is assembling the agenda,
16 right, so.

17 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa.

18 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And I just want to add
19 further on top of that; I did find that having the two
20 consecutive meetings did make agenda planning a little
21 bit easier, and then working with Commissioner Fornaciari
22 on the agenda and then having him also do two, I think
23 enabled us to think further out and get kind of ahead of
24 the agenda because of posting requirements.

25 And so I think it was at that time that we made the

1 recommendation that each chair, chair at least two
2 meetings. And so that's where we ended up and I think
3 that's why you were chairing quite a few meetings now.

4 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Any other comments or
5 feedback on that?

6 Commissioner Andersen.

7 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So with that understanding,
8 I could say who has each of those meetings, if that would
9 help people right now, just for --

10 CHAIR LE MONS: I think Commissioner Yee is going to
11 post it. We know that the next Chair is Commissioner
12 Taylor, and then it'll be posted and people can check the
13 list and see when they come in, if that's okay with
14 everybody.

15 Okay. Any objections to Commissioner Yee combining
16 the schedule with the rotation and putting that forward
17 to our staff to post?

18 Commissioner Yee.

19 COMMISSIONER YEE: Just to mention that Commissioner
20 Le Mons, Chair Le Mons generously picked up this meeting,
21 a one-day meeting adding it to his total. And so I'll
22 just continue for optional meetings to assign those to
23 either the proceeding or the following set, just
24 depending on how the order is going.

25 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Okay. If there's no

1 additional comments on that --

2 Commissioner Taylor.

3 VICE CHAIR TAYLOR: Yes, and I guess maybe for
4 clarification, as we had discussed and presented before,
5 Commissioner Le Mons will have the January 6th optional
6 meeting, and I will have the January 21st optional
7 meeting as division of labor.

8 CHAIR LE MONS: Yes. Okay. Any other comments,
9 questions, concerns, thoughts on this item? Okay. Thank
10 you, everyone.

11 So what we need to do now is go into our closed
12 session. Yes, 11:43. And we have until 12:45. Is that
13 correct, or 12:30, Kristian? Time check for me.

14 MR. MANOFF: That's correct, Chair.

15 CHAIR LE MONS: Which one? I'm sorry. 12:30 or
16 12:45?

17 MR. MANOFF: 12:45.

18 CHAIR LE MONS: 12:45. Okay. So why don't we move
19 into our closed session? So the public, we'll be going
20 into closed session to address the personnel matters.

21 I'm not sure exactly how long that'll take. We've
22 budgeted 45 minutes to an hour. Then we will be
23 returning. That'll put us right at lunch.

24 So we would come back after lunch and take final
25 public comment in the event that we don't have time to do

1 it before we break for lunch. And at that time, you'll
2 be able to comment on anything that we've addressed in
3 the agenda today, as well as we'll report out where
4 appropriate, any decisions or actions taken in closed
5 session.

6 So with that, we will leave this meeting and go into
7 our closed session link, and then come back. We will
8 come back just before lunch either way, to let the public
9 know where we are. That way we can stay on top of time
10 and the public can be aware. Okay. Alright, everyone.
11 Thank you.

12 (Whereupon, a Closed Session was held)

13 CHAIR LE MONS: Welcome back, Commissioners.
14 Welcome back, California. Thank you, California, for
15 your patience. We are going to go right into public
16 comment to close the day and I'll turn to Katy to read
17 the announcements and this will be general public
18 comment, and you are welcome to comment on any of our
19 agenda items for today, or anything else for that matter.
20 So Katy, could you read the instructions please?

21 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. In order to
22 maximize transparency and public participation in our
23 process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment
24 by phone.

25 To call in, dial the telephone number provided on

1 the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted
2 to enter the meeting ID number, it is provided on the
3 livestream feed, 91092377762. When prompted to enter a
4 participant ID, simply press the pound key.

5 Once you have dialed in, you'll be placed in a queue
6 from which a moderator will begin unmuting colors to
7 submit their comment. You'll also hear an automatic
8 message to press star 9. Please do this to raise your
9 hand indicating you wish to comment.

10 When it is your turn to speak, the moderator will
11 unmute you and you'll hear an automatic message that
12 says, "The host would like you to talk". Press star 6 to
13 speak.

14 Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream
15 audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your
16 call. Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for
17 when it is your turn to speak, and again, please turn
18 down the livestream volume.

19 The Commission is taking general public comment at
20 this time. We do not have anybody in the queue.

21 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. So we'll give it a minute or
22 two -- two minutes -- to give people a chance to sign in
23 with the delay. Can we, while we're waiting, can Marcy,
24 supervisor, introduce her to the Commission and say a few
25 beautiful words about her, please?

1 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Just so you know
2 Commissioner -- real quick, Marcy, I don't mean to
3 interrupt. We do have someone in the queue, so the
4 please talk and then we'll go there.

5 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Real quick.

6 MR. HERNANDEZ: All right. So let me go ahead and
7 introduce Marcy. She comes to us with a wealth of
8 knowledge from having participated in the census a few
9 months ago. So let me introduce to you, Marcy Kaplan.
10 Marcy?

11 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Welcome, Marcy. And
12 we'll hear more from you in our next meeting, but we were
13 remiss not to introduce you earlier. Katy, could you
14 invite our first caller in please?

15 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. If you'll
16 please state and spell your name for the court reporter.

17 MS. WESTA-LUSK: Yes. Renee Westa-Lusk. First name
18 is spelled R-E-N-E-E. Last name is W-E-S-T-A, hyphen,
19 L-U-S-K.

20 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Please share your
21 comment.

22 MS. WESTA-LUSK: I just have some questions
23 regarding mainly today's agenda items that came up under
24 the item 4, the RFP line drawing services on page 12
25 about that there would be more than one hearing being

1 held at the same time in different parts of the state.

2 I wanted to know why do you have to hold more than
3 one hearing at a time in different parts of the state.

4 Is it because you might have to have more than one
5 hearing in each region at the same time?

6 And I wanted to know how many Commissioners will be
7 listening or attending the virtual hearings, if you have
8 more than one hearing going on at the same time. Because
9 in the past, in the 2011 hearings, all the Commissioners
10 from all the hearings either attended or saw online, all
11 the nurse were there, all fourteen at each of the
12 hearings.

13 And then my second question has to do, if you could
14 please explain the outreach zones and what the teams are
15 supposed to do for outreach?

16 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani, would you
17 like to address the first question?

18 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. Thanks so much Ms.
19 Westa-Lusk for calling in and for your comment. We did
20 actually discuss the simultaneous hearings a little bit
21 earlier in the meeting, so I'm not going to go into too
22 great of detail.

23 But the idea here is not that we are most that we
24 are definitely holding such meetings, but that it is a
25 possibility based on many of our discussions. And so the

1 idea here is that we would want to know how a potential
2 line drawer would staff meetings if we chose to do them
3 that way.

4 So it is not saying that that's how meetings will be
5 held, but simply that we want to make sure that we
6 have -- that we can identify a line drawer who could be
7 flexible and nimble and be able to accommodate different
8 kinds of meetings should we choose to go in that
9 direction.

10 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

11 Commissioner Sinay, would you address the zones real
12 quickly please, understanding that we're going to get
13 into that more fully in a subsequent meeting?

14 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes. The zones, we discussed
15 them briefly at the last meeting, and in a future
16 meeting, we will actually vote on them and we'll have a
17 better understanding of our roles.

18 The idea was to really look at the whole State of
19 California and how could we break it down so that each of
20 us could get -- go in a little deeper in the different
21 zones and start making some of the relationships we need
22 for the outreach piece.

23 When we hear from -- when we receive the outreach
24 proposal and we discuss the outreach -- not proposal,
25 sorry -- the outreach plan from staff, that will give us

1 more guidance on what our next steps are.

2 But currently, the outreach teams are just --
3 they're just a place to do -- it's just outreach zones.
4 They are not anything to do with the mapping or where
5 we'll be having hearings or any of the above. It's just
6 a way to organize ourselves.

7 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that, Commissioner
8 Sinay and thank you, Ms. Lusk for your questions and your
9 call. Katy are the additional callers in the queue?

10 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: No, Chair. That was it.

11 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Well, that brings us to the
12 end of our meeting. And if there are no closing
13 comments, concerns, I want to wish everyone happy
14 holidays, Merry Christmas, and all of that good stuff.
15 It's been an absolute pleasure being the Chair. And if
16 you have anything that you want to put forward for the
17 January 6th meeting, please be sure to go and post that
18 in the Google doc today.

19 And then I will let you know. It looks like we
20 probably will have that meeting, but you'll get a
21 confirmation letting you know because we'll need to post
22 by tomorrow. Is that correct, Director Claypool, or is
23 it by midnight tonight?

24 MR. CLAYPOOL: Let me work backwards on that, Chair.

25 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. So either by midnight tonight

1 or by tomorrow.

2 So Commissioner Sinay.

3 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Because it was a maybe meeting,
4 anything that we thought of like the zones, we put it in
5 the 11th. Should we just also put it in the 6th just so
6 or will we just look at the 11th and move it up?

7 CHAIR LE MONS: Yeah, I'm going to look at the 11th.
8 So if it's pressing, like if we have some -- like today
9 where there was some things we really needed to handle
10 and likewise, if there's some things we have to handle on
11 the 6th, then we'll flesh out the agenda for one-day
12 meeting and then pick and choose.

13 So if you have something on there that you have
14 posted for the 11th through 13th that you want to handle
15 earlier, like say, please, please consider this, make a
16 note there. But we do have the zones on there as a
17 consideration.

18 Like for example, with the chair rotation today,
19 that was one of those things that if we could get to it,
20 we would, if not we push it. So we are going to handle
21 the zones the same way. Director Claypool?

22 MR. CLAYPOOL: So it would be, by my calculation,
23 midnight tomorrow.

24 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay, perfect.

25 MR. CLAYPOOL: Midnight Wednesday.

1 CHAIR LE MONS: So if everyone could just go by
2 there tonight at some point, and if you have something
3 pressing, remember this would be a meeting added; if not,
4 it'll happen on our January 11th meeting.

5 So in any event, we won't see each other till next
6 year. So happy New Year. And I look forward to seeing
7 you all in 2021.


8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Happy New Year, everyone.

9 CHAIR LE MONS: And with that, I guess I have to
10 officially say the meeting is adjourned. The meeting is
11 adjourned.

12 (Whereupon, the Business Meeting adjourned at
13 4:42 p.m.)
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, of the videoconference recording of the proceedings provided by the California Citizens Redistricting Commission.



TRACI FINE, CDLT-169

June 13, 2022
DATE