

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION (CRC)

In the matter of:

CRC BUSINESS MEETING

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2021

9:30 a.m.

Transcription by:

eScribers, LLC



APPEARANCESCOMMISSIONERS

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

STAFF

Alvaro E. Hernandez, Executive Director
Marian Johnston, CRC Staff Counsel
Fredy Ceja, Communications Director
Wanda Sheffield, Office Technician

TECHNICAL CONTRACTORS

Kristian Manoff, AV Technical Director/Comment Moderator

PRESENTERS

Karin MacDonald, Q2 Data & Research, LLC
Andrew Drechsler, HaystaqDNA

Also PresentPublic Comment

Renee Westa-Lusk
Tho Vinh Banh, Disability Rights California
Unidentified Speaker

INDEX

INDEX

	<u>PAGE</u>
Call to Order and Roll Call	4
Public Comment	5
Chair's Report	12
Communications Director's Report	13
Line Drawer Presentation	16
Discussion on Line Drawer Presentation	106
Public Comment	122
Vote on Line Drawer Proposal	126
Adjournment	128

P R O C E E D I N G S

February 24, 2021 9:30 a.m.

CHAIR TOLEDO: Good morning, California. My name is Pedro Toledo, the rotating chair for the California Citizens Commission.

After public comments and roll call, we will -- I'll go over the agenda for the next couple of days during the Chair report.

With that, I'm going to turn it over to Ms. Sheffield who will be calling roll call.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Good morning. Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Good morning. 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 Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Kennedy.

1 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

2 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Le Mons.

3 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here.

4 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Sadhwani.

5 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.

6 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Sinay. I see you.

7 Commissioner Taylor.

8 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Present.

9 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Toledo.

10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Here.

11 MS. SHEFFIELD: Thank you.

12 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. Katy, please instruct the
13 public on how they can participate in public comment.

14 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. Good
15 morning.

16 CHAIR TOLEDO: Good morning.

17 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: In order to maximize
18 transparency and public participation in our process, the
19 Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone.

20 To call in, dial the telephone number provided on
21 the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted
22 to enter the meeting I.D. number provided on the
23 livestream feed, it is 93047167360 for this meeting.
24 When prompted to enter a participant I.D., simply press
25 the pound key.

1 Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a
2 queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press
3 star 9. This will raise your hand for the moderator.

4 When it is your turn to speak, you will hear a
5 message that says, "The host would like you to talk.
6 Press star 6 to speak."

7 If you would like to give your name, please state
8 and spell it for the record. You are not required to
9 provide your name to give public comment.

10 Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream
11 audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your
12 call.

13 Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when
14 it is your turn to speak, and again, please turn down the
15 livestream volume.

16 The Commission is taking general public comment at
17 this time.

18 And we do have someone in the queue, and again, if
19 you would like to comment and you are in the queue,
20 please press star 9 to raise your hand indicating you
21 would like to comment.

22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Please invite the caller to --

23 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: They're not raising their
24 hand at this time.

25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, they're not. Okay.

1 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yeah. So at this time we
2 do not have anybody with their hand raised wishing to
3 comment.

4 CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's give it a minute or two. While
5 we're waiting is there any Commissioner who has a general
6 announcement or any update?

7 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Chair, we do have someone
8 with their hand raised.

9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay, let's do that then.

10 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I'm sorry. Okay. Give
11 me one second. Your line is open.

12 MS. WESTA-LUSK: Yes, this is Renee Westa-Lusk. I'm
13 just having a question regarding the letter that was in
14 the share column of the handout by Shenkman & Hughes. Is
15 that going to be discussed at today's legal affairs
16 committee meeting report?

17 CHAIR TOLEDO: It will be discussed during the
18 meeting. It may not be today; it might be tomorrow.

19 MS. WESTA-LUSK: Oh, okay. I just wanted to --

20 CHAIR TOLEDO: It will be discussed, yes.

21 MS. WESTA-LUSK: I think it's real important. Thank
22 you.

23 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. We agree.

24 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And we do have another
25 caller. And your line is open.

1 MS. BANH: Hi, this is Tho Vinh Banh, spelled T-H-O,
2 V-I-N-H, B-A-N-H.

3 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

4 MS. BANH: Thank you so much. Good morning,
5 everyone. I want to first commend for the good materials
6 related to the Redistricting Basics. I actually like the
7 new stuff as well and appreciate the graphs. I hope you
8 don't mind. I'm going to be very real and maybe a little
9 raw.

10 So the materials, itself, I think spoke wonderfully
11 of inclusiveness, any and all voice for Californians, but
12 I fear a little bit that the language part, like not
13 having the meetings in different languages, may send a
14 very different and an opposite message.

15 You know, I don't sense this intentional, but in the
16 past it's often not those who speak English that have
17 been left out of things, but rather those who don't speak
18 English.

19 So if I may, indulge me, like if you folks are all
20 English speaking and I want you guys to come to a
21 meeting, and when you come to this meeting, the meeting
22 goes something like this, you know, (speaking
23 Vietnamese).

24 So if you came to a meeting and it was in
25 Vietnamese, and the materials were all in Vietnamese, but

1 you only speak English, I mean, there's multiple factors
2 for me to bring you to a meeting that didn't have
3 translation for you jeopardizes my relationship with you.

4 So I know that there's a lot of communities, Asian
5 Americans Advancing Justice, for example, MALDEF, for
6 example, NALEO and so forth, that want to help this body
7 bring people to the meetings, but if they use their
8 capital, their relationship capital, and their other
9 capital to bring forth folks to a meeting and the meeting
10 isn't translated, it jeopardizes their relationship with
11 that community, and it also sends a signal to the
12 communities that they're not entirely welcome, they're
13 not entirely invited.

14 So I can't imagine that would be the message and the
15 intentions of this body. You folks are very busy. You
16 folks have other things to do. The reason why you came
17 to this body is because you want to make sure citizens of
18 California and all Californians, regardless of status,
19 are well represented. So I just -- you know, I just want
20 folks to be thoughtful of that.

21 In terms of ways around it or ways that we could
22 potentially improve, I know there's going to be savings
23 related to not having to rent spaces, savings not having
24 to buy equipment related to hearing devices, savings not
25 having to hire multiple translations. I've done meetings

1 in Zoom where there have been, like, three other foreign
2 language lines, so once you get a language line, let's
3 say Spanish, which includes ten million people, so we've
4 got to have at least Spanish. For Spanish, if you hire a
5 Spanish interpreter, it could be five people that joined
6 a Zoom meeting or 500. It doesn't matter. They all
7 listen to that one line.

8 The savings that you get from having Zoom meetings
9 versus having in-person meetings where you have to have
10 500 equipments, so I think there's leverage that you can
11 use because of this way of being, the Zoom process that
12 may be maximized.

13 And I can share thoughts around that. I've had to
14 finagle with that. I've done trainings where it was
15 Spanish, Japanese, Chinese, and Vietnamese at the same
16 time, so I've learned -- a lot of mistakes along the way,
17 but have some knowledge around that as well.

18 So I hope that we -- I don't know. Here's the raw
19 and the real, I guess. You know, the North Star is our
20 guiding post, and I hope we create spaces where folks are
21 welcome, where folks are invited, and if we want folks to
22 fully participate, I mean, California at the very least,
23 we've got to include Spanish because that's ten million
24 people. We have twenty million people that speak
25 English, over ten million that speak Spanish. If all the

1 meetings are in English except for the comment part, it
2 does not send the vibe that you're welcome here. It
3 doesn't send the vibe that we want to hear your voice and
4 that you matter.

5 So I hope -- I know I'm starting the meeting quite
6 heavy. I apologize for that. You know, I hope that
7 we -- that cannot be our intentions, and I think as
8 Californians as a body, we can probably do better.

9 So I thank you for your indulgence. I thank you for
10 allowing me to be in this space, this date and this way,
11 and I hope you take that with wholeheartedness.

12 That's all. Thank you so much.

13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you for your comments. We are
14 committed to meaningfully engage all communities,
15 including the linguistic -- delivering our message in a
16 linguistically competent manner.

17 Any other comments in the queue -- commenters?

18 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: So if you would like to
19 make a comment, please press star 9 to raise your hand.
20 Other than that, Chair, there's one person in the queue
21 that has not raised their hand but they've been listening
22 the entire time. Everybody who has had their hand raised
23 has commented.

24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Katy. All right, with
25 that, we'll go to general announcements and Commissioner

1 updates. Does any Commissioner have an update or a
2 general announcement they want to make? Seeing none,
3 we'll go to the Chair report.

4 And I'm just going to go over the agenda for the
5 next couple of days. So at 10 o'clock we'll be going
6 over item 11, which includes the line drawer RFP
7 presentations, evaluation, and scoring. I anticipate
8 that we'll go to lunch at about 12:30, and at that time
9 we'll enter -- after we come back from lunch we'll enter
10 closed session. I don't anticipate coming back to public
11 session today. We'll likely be coming back tomorrow --
12 or we will be coming back tomorrow at 9:30 where we'll do
13 subcommittee reports, staff reports, legal affairs
14 committee, and item 12, data management.

15 We'll then hold a closed session on 9:30 on Friday
16 and return to the public session after that closed
17 session.

18 So it's about 9:43. We have time for just one short
19 staff report, so I'm going to ask Fredy to give the
20 communications report.

21 MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Toledo.

22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Do I have a -- oh, Marian.

23 MS. JOHNSTON: One point. You should report that no
24 action was taken during the last closed session.

25 CHAIR TOLEDO: We did report when we came back

1 last -- we came from -- to public session after the last
2 closed session, if I remember correctly.

3 MS. JOHNSTON: Did you come back into public session
4 after that? Excuse me, I didn't realize that.

5 CHAIR TOLEDO: If I'm -- so with that, let's go to
6 Fredy.

7 MR. CEJA: Thank you so much. Good morning,
8 everyone.

9 I just wanted to announce that the new website is
10 up. We have -- I'm been fixing content throughout the
11 weekend. I didn't realize, but transferring over the
12 agendas from the old website to the new one is going to
13 take me awhile. I was doing that yesterday. I managed
14 to get three meetings over because of all the content and
15 collateral materials, public comments that's attached to
16 each meeting, so that's going to take me maybe a week to
17 finish. So I'll be working intermittently throughout the
18 day doing that.

19 I did include a splash page on the new website, so
20 the first time you enter into the website it tells you
21 we're in transition. The 2010 content will be .CA.gov.
22 Click here to go there. The 2020 content is at the .org
23 site, click here to go there. And it gives you a picture
24 of both so that people can identify where they want to
25 go. So that is up.

1 I did want to share that we're continuing to do
2 media trainings. I know we had to reschedule some this
3 week. Apologies for that, but we had some unforeseen
4 circumstances. We will get right back to that,
5 rescheduling those so that Commissioners have the skills
6 that they need to get in front of the camera and talk to
7 reporters.

8 And I also included in this week the duties for the
9 communications team, just so that Commissioners know
10 who's responsible for what. The biggest change that I
11 added in there in the responsibilities, and I would pull
12 it up but my computer is acting up this morning so I
13 can't, is that Cecilia will be in charge of all social
14 media. I am going to be in charge of updating the
15 website just because I'm in front of my computer most of
16 the time and it's easy for me to just update things. And
17 she will be in charge of doing the media training in
18 addition to all the social media channels, and stations,
19 and monitoring to make sure that when we are mentioned
20 that that information gets to the executive director and
21 the chairs for the meetings immediately, and then we
22 strategize on how we want to respond, if we want to
23 respond.

24 I will continue to be in charge of reaching out to
25 do media pitching throughout California. So I'm



1 currently doing a media list for every zone. I have
2 completed two so far, and I'll share those with the zone
3 leaders as soon as I'm done with those, so that you can
4 do an initial hello, I'm the Commissioner, pretty similar
5 to what you're doing with the CVOs with the media, and
6 then I'll do the second follow-up to get stories and
7 picture stories and anything of that sort.

8 Then my other report would be the materials, but
9 that has a committee report pending, so we'll leave it at
10 that.

11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sinay.

12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Fredy, I was just wondering.
13 Does it make sense for you to make the first call to
14 media contacts and then introduce us versus the other way
15 around? I'm just -- until we get our media training
16 course and everything and our talking points I'm just
17 wondering if that makes more sense.

18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Fredy.

19 MR. CEJA: Yeah. I think, yeah, I can certainly do
20 that. I'll go about it that way. I'll make the first
21 round and I'll include or cc the zone leaders. There are
22 some Commissioners that have already reached out on their
23 own, so I'll leave it up to the discretion of each
24 Commissioner. So I'll say that I'll do the first round
25 and cc Commissioners unless you want to reach out first

1 or have already done so.

2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Any other questions for Director
3 Ceja?

4 Commissioner Yee.

5 COMMISSIONER YEE: I just want to say, Fredy, the
6 website looks great, and I know it was a long time
7 coming. The redirects look really good, too, and very
8 useable and very attractive, so good work on this.

9 MR. CEJA: Thank you.

10 CHAIR TOLEDO: I agree. The website is looking
11 -- coming along really well. With that, I did
12 actually -- I was mistaken previously. We did go back
13 into closed session last week, and so I want to make sure
14 that that gets captured and corrected in the record. And
15 we did not take action after -- during that session. So
16 thank you, Marian, I was a little bit confused in terms
17 of time line.

18 With that, we are going to be preparing for the line
19 drawer session. I'm going to turn it over to
20 Commissioner Andersen, who will give us a little overview
21 and prep us for the meeting, or the interview process.

22 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, thank you, Chair. Good
23 morning, everybody.

24 So I'm hoping that people notice that is on the
25 agenda this morning that they're interested in hearing

1 about what happens -- what are the results from our RFP
2 for a line drawing consultant.

3 And we did announcements. It is on our website. We
4 did the opening Monday morning, and we did receive one
5 proposal.

6 Now, this may seem a bit like a surprise. It should
7 not be. California is over forty million people. It is
8 big. This is a daunting task. I apologize. I had a
9 little camera issue this morning. It's a daunting task.
10 Many, many of the consultants who do this type of work
11 will have multiple contracts rather than doing one large
12 contract like the State of California. As you can
13 imagine, cities, counties all across the United States
14 have, you know, the need for redistricting, and so there
15 are multiple, multiple tasks that can be done, or you do
16 one large very arduous task, which is California.

17 So that said, we were very pleased to receive this
18 one proposal from a very qualified group. And they will
19 be doing a presentation shortly. And what they've been
20 asked to do is to give us a plan of what they envision is
21 how to redistrict our great, large state.

22 And so given -- they've been asked for many
23 different factors, given the pandemic issue, given our
24 diversity, both geographical and in terms of populous,
25 and actual -- the Voting Rights Act with California, and

1 all these considerations, public input, how do we do this
2 during this time, and how to engage with all the
3 Commissioners.

4 So that is what we'll be hearing shortly. Then
5 there will be a break after the presentation. We'll come
6 back after that for a question-and-answer session, after
7 which the Commission will then go into discussing the
8 entire proposal, and we will actually come to one
9 decision about what to do with this group.

10 So with that in mind, I will let them present
11 themselves when they do come on. I don't know -- I don't
12 see anybody on yet. I don't know if we've heard --
13 Kristian, have you been in touch with anyone this morning
14 about when they're coming in or anything like that?

15 MR. MANOFF: Commissioner Andersen, Karin Mac Donald
16 reached out to me, and they have received their invites
17 and are expecting to log in at 10 o'clock, so about seven
18 minutes.

19 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. That's really all the
20 introduction I have. Commissioner Sadhwani, did you want
21 to say something and are there any questions before we
22 jump into this?

23 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. You know, I'll just
24 add on that this has been a process a long time in the
25 making, so we appreciate the support of the full

1 Commission throughout the many steps that we've had to go
2 through and the creation of the RFP, and you know,
3 sending out the RFP so that folks can see it and respond,
4 so we very much appreciate everyone's input thus far, and
5 we're looking forward to a great conversation today.

6 I think just to underscore what Commissioner
7 Andersen has already said, we asked in the RFP that
8 proposers submit to us a plan. That is not necessarily
9 the plan, but simply for them to bring their expertise to
10 bear on our process.

11 We will, of course, retain the responsibility of
12 finalizing an ultimate plan, but I do hope that you've
13 all had a chance to review it. There was a lot of
14 interesting ideas in there. It seemed as though the
15 proposers had been -- it sounded like they had been
16 paying careful attention to our deliberations, which was
17 less interesting to see, and so I look forward to a
18 fruitful discussion following their presentation.

19 Commissioner Andersen, do you want to mention
20 anything about some of the documents that have been
21 posted for Commissioners, evaluation criteria? You're on
22 mute.

23 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Yes. We're
24 basically -- originally this would have been -- if we had
25 multiple proposals this would still go to the same

1 procedure, and to make it -- we're actually -- this is --
2 our RFP was considered an RFP2, which is this is not a --
3 many contracts that go before the State, it's a cost
4 basis only. Clearly, this is -- the need and the
5 requirements for this position are not just something
6 automatic, particularly given our situation with COVID,
7 how it's changed. You know, look how we're meeting, just
8 for obvious reasons. So this required some different
9 ways of looking at things, different planning, different
10 actions, which is why we went with -- we really need
11 qualifications here. It's not the bottom dollar.

12 So as a result, there have been -- you still have to
13 compare a similar product, and to do that we did come up
14 with a rather elaborate scoring procedure. We still have
15 done the same evaluation, it's just we don't necessarily
16 need to talk of the numbers at all because really it's
17 all qualifications, and we're talking about, you know,
18 are they well qualified, are they qualified moderately,
19 that sort of thing.

20 And what we're -- the criteria that we have been
21 looking at and we ask the -- everyone to kind of consider
22 is the proposers -- the plan was actually -- should
23 actually be addressing, you know, the following issues.
24 Based on your experience, being the line drawer, and the
25 present pandemic and the challenges of redistricting

1 California, what approaches would you suggest the
2 Commission to consider in accomplishing the redistricting
3 and why?

4 And for each of these items we need to consider
5 their approach, their consideration of public input,
6 their consideration of all the RFP requirements, which
7 we're not going into right now, and their consideration
8 of Bagley-Keene.

9 The other item is we did actually say Commission may
10 decide to hold simultaneous four-to-six-hour remote
11 public input meetings in two to three different parts of
12 the state. Describe how you would approach these
13 meetings and manage the line drawing, keeping in mind the
14 RFP requirements for line drawing in public. Then based
15 on your experience, how would you recommend the
16 Commission approach VRA compliance during the line
17 drawing process?

18 And so important items that we're looking for as the
19 public as you're watching this, these are items that the
20 Commission should also be looking for is the plans, are
21 they -- the recognition of the importance of public
22 input. How important is that in the plan? Inclusivity
23 as in integration, is it important? How important is it?
24 What is the role of Commissioner versus the role of the
25 line drawer? Interaction with other consultants that we

1 are planning on hiring. The plan's recognition of the
2 importance of transparency in the line drawing process,
3 and their understanding of inclusion of many of the
4 different RFP requirements into the plan, which one issue
5 that we will talk about is the disclosure request,
6 because as contractors for the State usually don't have
7 to disclose all the requirements -- basically, anyone who
8 wants to work for the Commission must also disclose all
9 the requirements that we as Commissioners had to meet,
10 such as of the ten years before taking on this job, what
11 political parties are we involved with, the money we've
12 been given, all those criteria which are in the -- in our
13 Voters First Act.

14 So there will be -- there is a very large disclosure
15 portion in the RFP, and we will go over some of those
16 items today in our Q and answer session.

17 So those are basically the items that I was going to
18 discuss. Sara, any other things?

19 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No, I think you've covered
20 everything, and it looks like some of our guests have
21 arrived.

22 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Mr. Drechsler and Ms. Mac
23 Donald, are you there?

24 MR. DRECHSLER: We are.

25 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great. At this point we

1 might -- welcome, and we'd like to turn this over to you
2 for -- to introduce yourselves, and please continue with
3 your presentation.

4 MS. MAC DONALD: Yes. Good morning, Commissioners.
5 I just got a notification that my web camera is not
6 working, so I apologize. Luckily, all of you know what I
7 look like, and hopefully, I will be able to fix that
8 momentarily while my colleague Andrew starts with the
9 presentation.

10 I'm Karin Mac Donald with a different hat on today.
11 I am here as the owner of Q2 Data and Research and the
12 lead of this team that has provided this proposal to you,
13 and my colleague Andrew Drechsler who will be doing this
14 presentation with me. He is directing the PowerPoint.

15 So I will give you just a couple of introductory
16 points about Q2 Data and Research. We are, of course,
17 California based. We are in Oakland, California proudly,
18 and we're women owned and operated. There is one
19 exception that we have to the women-operated item and
20 that is Guang-Chen Li who is part of this proposal. And
21 you will hear a little bit about Guang-Chen who has
22 worked with us for quite some time also.

23 We are strictly nonpartisan, and we specialize in
24 working with independent redistricting commissions. In
25 fact, if you had a chance to look at our qualifications,



1 which I'm sure you probably have, you saw that our
2 redistricting experience with commissions goes back to
3 the redistricting commission in San Diego in 2001, which
4 was a very successful project. And really when I think
5 back of the independent redistricting commissions that
6 I've worked with since, San Diego was really the starting
7 point of a lot of the methodology that I have -- I and my
8 colleagues have used in every commission-based
9 redistricting afterwards. So it was a great project, and
10 it kind of set the tone for things that came afterwards.

11 When Proposition 11 was on the ballot, if you look
12 at the language of that commission, it actually included
13 a lot of the items that we started in the San Diego
14 process also so this has been a pretty long journey for
15 us.

16 And we love working with independent redistricting
17 commissions. I mean they -- a colleague of mine always
18 says that every commission is different, and I think that
19 is true. And we really embrace that uniqueness of
20 commissions, and we're all about collaboration, and you
21 know, designing a process with the commission that the
22 commission just can embrace and that really fits its
23 needs.

24 So with that, I will move things over to Andrew
25 while I try to fix my video camera here, and hopefully, I



1 will see you very soon. Thank you.

2 MR. DRECHSLER: Thank you very much, Karin. Thank
3 you, Commissioners, for giving us this opportunity to
4 present to you. My name is Andrew Drechsler. I'm
5 president of HaystaqDNA. HaystaqDNA is, you know, a big
6 data predictive analytics firm, so we do redistricting
7 work, and I'll talk about that in just a second, but
8 we -- as Commissioner Andersen was talking about, the
9 amount of work that has to do with recommissioning --
10 redistricting comes along usually once, once a decade.

11 So in the meantime, we are a big data firm where we
12 have a lot of different clients. If you looked at our
13 disclosures, we have some political clients. About a
14 third of our work is political. But we have a lot of
15 work in the healthcare industry. We've done a lot of
16 work in auto industry, entertainment, so we've worked in
17 a lot of different spaces and places over the last
18 decade.

19 And one of the things that we did a decade ago was
20 work for the Arizona Independent Commission. Our firm
21 was selected to do the work in Arizona. They had a
22 little bit of a smaller commission, with five
23 commissioners. But the work was still pretty big. We
24 traveled collectively. The commission and parts of our
25 team traveled nearly 30,000 miles around the state,



1 having -- participating in, you know, dozens of public
2 hearings and public meetings, getting input from numerous
3 different individuals around the state of Arizona.

4 So we understand the importance of the independent
5 commission, the importance of your job, and you know, we
6 were excited to have this opportunity to, you know,
7 present a team with Karin and Q2 to present the
8 Commission the team.

9 The other big thing we've been working on for the
10 last couple of years is the Redistricting Data Hub. The
11 Redistricting Data Hub, I think a good example is taking
12 what the Statewide -- California Statewide Database has
13 done for California, and what we're trying to do is do
14 that for the rest of the country.

15 When it comes to redistricting information, what
16 we're trying to do is democratize it so that individuals,
17 groups have access to data and that they are not spending
18 a lot of time pulling together the tremendous effort of
19 pulling together all the different data sets. So that is
20 something we've been working on for the last two years.
21 It is a completely nonpartisan effort. We're very proud
22 of that, and so when this opportunity came to submit a
23 proposal to the California Citizens Redistricting
24 Commission, we were excited to do that.

25 Together, our teams -- I think we have unmatched

1 experience with statewide redistricting commissions,
2 both, as Karin mentioned, in 2011 what her team did with
3 California and then our team did in Arizona. And that's
4 sort of -- we knew about each other back then, and had
5 admiration for each other, and understood sort of the
6 challenges of what goes through an independent
7 commissioner -- independent commission.

8 So we have experience in the line drawings and doing
9 this in public, you know, moving the lines with the
10 direction of the commission and not going off doing it in
11 secret, and you know, I think that sets us apart in terms
12 of making sure that we're listening to you. You guys are
13 our bosses. We are the technical consultants, and today
14 we have a plan for, you know, your request. We presented
15 you with a plan, a well thought-out plan, but of course,
16 as we will say multiple times, you guys, we're taking
17 your lead.

18 So besides the experts -- you know, being experts in
19 the redistricting software, we've had success with the
20 Voting Rights implementation, both clearly in California,
21 but also in Arizona. While Section 5 has been removed
22 from the -- is not a requirement for preclearance
23 anymore, Arizona did need to get precleared by the
24 Department of Justice in 2011, and we were excited to be
25 part of the team working closely with counsel and getting

1 the maps precleared for the first time in Arizona's
2 history -- on the first time in Arizona's history. So we
3 were excited that we, you know, were able to do maps and
4 that were in place and stayed in place for the entire
5 decade.

6 And I think we have a pretty comprehensive approach.
7 We wrote about this, about data security, monitoring, and
8 storage that we've added in an appendix. We wanted to --
9 we thought that was a very important part of it. You
10 know, we didn't squeeze it all in into that ten pages, so
11 did add that as an appendix. So we wanted to make sure
12 that that was part of what we had.

13 So you're different, and we feel like we are
14 different. You're both, as we mentioned, you're an
15 independent Commission. You have been doing this for
16 many months now and you sort of understand what it takes,
17 and I think one of the big things is transparency.

18 We, you know, filling out the documentation,
19 attachment D, where we all had to list our disclosures of
20 every client that we worked with for the past decade. We
21 understand that the disclosures that you as Commissioners
22 had to go through, so understand the process and
23 understand the importance of the transparency that we
24 come to as a team that what we're doing is understood,
25 and it's understood not only by the Commissioners, but

1 the public as well.

2 So that's why we think that it's -- we believe that
3 it's very important to be transparent through this entire
4 process. Our conversations, what we're doing with the
5 maps is, you know, directed by you, that it's in an open
6 deliberation and talked about in collaboration so that
7 there's an understanding of what's going on.

8 So that's what you have to do, and we feel like we
9 do that as well, both Q2 and Haystaq. We welcome the
10 transparency and feel that it's very important, and we
11 have a record, both in terms of working with statewide
12 independent Commissions and working -- collecting public
13 input, listening to what communities of interest are. So
14 that's something that we have done, and we feel like
15 we're highly qualified to be your partners on the mapping
16 process moving forward.

17 So the plan, the ten-page plan, we'll go into this a
18 little bit more -- per the request, we're going to talk
19 about this. So it is a ten-page plan that, again, is a
20 recommendation, as Commissioner Andersen pointed out.
21 It's not by all means what needs to happen. Clearly we
22 wanted to present you a plan, work closely with you to
23 make sure that there was comfort in what we were
24 suggesting, and we are open to listening to you and
25 making the appropriate suggestions.

1 So our plan includes regional line drawing. We're
2 going to see the regions broken out in the next slide,
3 but just basic big picture. We're going to have four
4 different mappers tackling each of the regions, each of
5 the four regions, and then we also have a mapper that is
6 going to help bring the four maps -- the four regions
7 together to make sure we're combining them in an
8 appropriate way. So that's what the process of the fifth
9 mapper is.

10 And when we -- I think this is a very important
11 point. When we talk about the regions that they're not
12 representing any proposed lines. I think that's an
13 important point that we needed a part -- as you know,
14 there's forty million people in the State of California.
15 How do you start tackling this and how do you do this
16 appropriately, and that's something that we gave a lot of
17 thought to and wanted to present it.

18 So at each meeting we're going to have at least one
19 line drawer and a senior consultant. We'll have back-end
20 support on the team who will be supporting us to, you
21 know, capture information, because there's going to be a
22 lot of public information and public input that are going
23 to be happening at these meetings. So we want to make
24 sure that they're going to -- that it's going to be --
25 that we have the appropriate team in place to capture

1 everything and then present -- you know, provide you with
2 comments, what we heard, to make sure that we're all on
3 the same page as we work on this together.

4 Furthermore, besides the line drawers, which will be
5 a very big part of the team, and the support staff that
6 will be working closely with the line drawers, we have
7 two people, two additional people. One person is
8 dedicated to managing data, security and information,
9 data transfer of very large files. As you know, a data
10 analytics firm we have a lot of experience with this, and
11 you know, as I mentioned, we have a couple healthcare
12 clients, so know the importance of making sure that the
13 data stays and is transferred in a secure way. That's
14 something that's extremely important to us. And then we
15 have another person on the team that will be working to
16 help with some of the administrative details as well.

17 So we have a pretty, you know, a robust team that we
18 feel like we can handle everything that is in front of
19 you and is in front of the Commission.

20 As I mentioned, we talked about this and we went
21 into further detail in our proposal. We have a box in
22 there sort of breaking down, and I can't stress enough
23 this is just a proposed plan of how we are suggesting to
24 break this down, and there's going to be some things that
25 make sense. Intuitively, I think you look at LA County

1 with nearly ten million people. I think having a mapper
2 focus on that alone I think is going to be very
3 important.

4 But then breaking up the rest of the state, we broke
5 it out into the outreach zones. Again, we feel like this
6 is a proposed plan and want to work closely with the
7 entire team to go through this to make sure that this
8 makes sense and how we're approaching this makes sense.

9 We listened in to some of the meetings. We haven't
10 been to every single second of the meetings, so
11 there's -- you know, working with the, you know, the
12 Commission as a whole, but subcommittees I think is going
13 to be very important to get feedback on how we approach
14 this.

15 And then, finally, I just want to talk about the
16 team a little bit more. Karin introduced herself and she
17 is going to be the project leader, and I will be the
18 project manager working closely with the CRC staff to
19 make sure that we're in place when there's meetings,
20 making sure that the team, the appropriate team members,
21 are at the meetings and ready, prepared for the meetings,
22 working with the staff with any logistical.

23 You know, if we get to a point where we're in
24 person, where we're printing out maps and making sure
25 that those are available, or if there is a request for

1 maps on the website. I will be working with the, you
2 know, the staff to make sure that the needs are set and
3 making sure that everything that we're talking about in
4 the meetings and any, you know, proposed maps, draft
5 maps, that those are available to you. So that's
6 something.

7 Jaime is going to be the lead line drawer and
8 regional coordinator and she's going to be working
9 closely with the rest of the line drawers which will
10 include Tamina, Brad, Willie, and John. So together
11 that's the core mapping team. That doesn't mean that
12 those are the only mappers, but that's going to be the
13 core mapping team that we are going to have assigned to
14 this project and feel that each of the and all of their
15 resumes are in our proposal, so you can go look at their
16 experiences of what they have done over the last decade
17 and previously in terms of mapping. So you do have a
18 very experienced team here.

19 Three other people that we have on here, Adriana is
20 going to be working closely with the mapping -- the line
21 drawers, and she's -- there's going to be times where as
22 we get into meetings where there's a request to pull up a
23 map that would be part of the COI tool that we are, you
24 know, working with that the Commissioners may want to see
25 a little bit more in detail, that's something that

1 Adriana will be helping with and doing some of the
2 meeting support.

3 And then Sue as sort of a dual role, will be doing
4 some of the meeting support, but really helping us with
5 the administrative part of this contract. As mentioned,
6 this is a very large contract, a lot of moving pieces, so
7 we wanted to have Sue, who has experience in this, be
8 part of the team who is going to be bringing in her
9 expertise and making sure that all the T's are dotted,
10 T's are crossed and that we're fulfilling our part of the
11 contract.

12 Guang-Chen is our -- I don't have a line directly to
13 him to any one person. I think from a data security
14 standpoint he's going to be working with the entire team
15 to make sure that we're all aware of, you know, any data
16 transfers that will be going on, that they're done in a
17 safe and a secure way, that our personal machines are
18 protected, that we don't have any issues with that, and
19 we want to make sure that we're not compromised in any
20 way. So we take that, the data security and information
21 in a very serious manner, and we have a very qualified
22 individual who will be working with us on that.

23 I'm now going to turn it over to Karin who is going
24 to talk about, you know, the plan in a little bit more
25 detail.

1 MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you, Andrew. And my video is
2 now working, so hello, Commissioners. And I should also
3 tell you that was the first time that Andrew has ever
4 mispronounced my name. Go figure.

5 So good morning, again. I am going to walk a little
6 bit more through the plan that we have presented to you,
7 and I should tell you that plan was not always ten pages.
8 I think at some point it was sixteen pages, and then it
9 went to fourteen pages, and you know, we were limited to
10 ten pages, so there are quite a few things that -- there
11 are some other ideas that were floating around on this
12 team, and we're, of course, very happy to share them with
13 you, you know, as we move forward with this.

14 So I'm going to just take on some of the bigger
15 ideas while not, hopefully, boring you with repeating the
16 entire ten pages.

17 One big thing I think that's happened for all of us
18 is, of course, the census delay. And it's turned
19 something that we all planned for into really interesting
20 times. The census delay, however, may open possibilities
21 for more preen-up meetings because we have a little bit
22 more time now, and that may actually be a good thing,
23 especially looking at what happened, you know, if you're
24 comparing in 2011 there was not that much time, and you
25 know, while the line drawing time is essentially the

1 same, you do have more time to prepare and to go out into
2 the communities, and of course, you have other tools
3 available also. So this is a really interesting time
4 that we could all take full advantage of to get into the
5 communities and get a lot of input.

6 Another thing that really has changed over the last
7 many years is that we are now all, unfortunately, we're
8 all used to online meetings, but also the technology, of
9 course, of online meetings has changed dramatically. And
10 online meetings can save so much time on travel and
11 really increase the time that we can spend on meetings,
12 because you are not going to be sitting in cars going
13 from meeting to meeting, and neither are we.

14 And Andrew was talking about how many miles that
15 they covered in Arizona. I mean if you look at Arizona,
16 Arizona is, you know, so much smaller than California,
17 and you can imagine the kind of traveling that the
18 Commissioners and also the line drawing consultants did
19 the last time. It was a lot of being stuck in traffic
20 and just, you know, trying to get from A to B, and that,
21 of course, came at the cost of the time that we actually
22 had to have meetings with communities. So that is
23 something that has, you know, really changed and that we
24 can take advantage of. So you know, it's a time to make
25 lemonade, essentially.

1 Another idea that we had when we looked at how
2 meetings, you know, in our experience have worked with
3 independent redistricting Commissions is that it was
4 really -- it's really difficult and of course, everybody
5 who has ever gone to a city council meeting has tried to
6 present or give input on a particular item knows this,
7 you just don't know when you're going to be up. So you
8 know, you could be up at 8 o'clock, or you could be up at
9 10 o'clock, so you'd better bring a sandwich, as I always
10 say.

11 And I think that is something that we could really
12 improve on by perhaps creating an appointment system, and
13 again, these are ideas that we're having, and you know,
14 I'm not saying that we have all of the answers at all,
15 but it's something that we can perhaps collaborate on and
16 figure out whether, you know, we can create something
17 like that will work for you and that will work for the
18 public so that the public can plan in advance and kind of
19 just know, you know, that they're going to be home for
20 dinner because, you know, their slot is going to be the
21 first one in the meeting and so forth. Because, you
22 know, everybody had childcare needs and they need to be
23 at work the next day and so forth. So it just allows for
24 better planning for the public, and it also allows for
25 better public for you.

1 If we create this appointment system, we could
2 incorporate an advance request for interpretation
3 assistance so that people are lined up and we don't have
4 to sit in the meeting and go, okay, do we have an
5 interpreter available. You know, you're up now making
6 sure that that person knows that their services that are
7 required at that particular time.

8 So again, this is just all about better planning, a
9 more smooth process, and perhaps saving a little bit of
10 time on the logistics and just coming in, and you know,
11 having more time for the actual meat, so actually, I say
12 this as a vegetarian, so for actually the presentation
13 itself.

14 Next slide, please, Andrew. Thank you so much.

15 So another idea that comes along with this is that
16 we could perhaps ask people to pre-identify the geography
17 when they're coming in, and that could be something on
18 the meeting sign-up form or so. You know, what area
19 would you like to talk about, or perhaps even, you know,
20 did you submit something, because if you did submit
21 something, I mean we've talked, of course, about the COI
22 tool quite a bit. There is going to be a link on there
23 that people can -- that we can click on, that we can pull
24 up there their community of interest. And if people are
25 coming in and they want to talk to you about it, if

1 they're pre-identifying this is what they want to talk
2 about, or if they even just say, I want to talk about,
3 you know, the City of Oakland, or you know, the City of
4 Sacramento, then the mappers in the meeting can be
5 prepared for that and they can pull up the geography
6 already, and in particular, if it's geography that's a
7 lot smaller that may be a little bit harder to find. The
8 conversation is just a lot more efficient when we know in
9 advance what's required.

10 But as Andrew also said, we have a very
11 comprehensive team, and we thought about how to make
12 these meetings more efficient, and you know, having
13 mapping assistants, having the senior consultant there
14 and mapper and mapping assistant, all of this will turn
15 into just a smoother process and us being faster. And
16 faster on our end means that you can have a more
17 efficient conversation with the public.

18 A really big deal, of course, something that we all
19 need to keep in mind always, is that we need to mitigate
20 the digital divides. And one idea that we had was that
21 perhaps you might look into collaborating with the
22 outreach grant recipients to see if they might be up for
23 or able to assist with an appointment system, and also
24 with requests for assistance. You know, I think that
25 would, again, just on the front end make for a much

1 smoother entry point for people that may not be as used
2 to, you know, using a web forum and so forth.

3 And again, this is a collaboration that the
4 Commission could have with outreach grant recipients,
5 with the line drawers, really with the entire team. And
6 it goes to my last point, which is, you know, the five As
7 of technology access, availability, affordability,
8 awareness, abilities, and agency, you know, all of these
9 items need to be taken into consideration with every
10 piece of this conversation.

11 And to that point, reserving time for people that
12 don't have appointments, that's a really big deal, too.
13 You know, I've been looking with my neighbors into how
14 people can gain access, for example, to COVID
15 vaccinations right now, and if you've looked at it, you
16 know, most of the scheduling for the appointments is in
17 web form, and those web forms are really difficult. And
18 you know, a lot of my neighbors, I mean, some of you know
19 where I live, a lot of my neighbors don't have web access
20 to that point.

21 So there are barriers that sometimes we're not
22 obviously aware of as people that hang on computers and
23 stare at screens all day, and you know, I think it's a
24 good thing for everybody to just remind themselves every
25 day that, you know, we're -- there are people that are

1 not operating the way that we do. So of course you know
2 all of this, so anyway.

3 Next slide, please, and I'll get off my little soap
4 box here.

5 So option to participate, this is something that we
6 also discuss at length in the plan. We think it's a
7 really good thing, even if people -- if the COVID
8 restrictions are loosened, if perhaps COVID magically
9 goes away, that you continue to offer this remote meeting
10 participation. It was really difficult for people to get
11 to meetings last time. Some people were driving many,
12 many, many hours, and not everybody has that luxury.

13 So remote meeting participation, you know, figuring
14 out where people can access meetings also. Of course
15 we're going to have access sites and so forth, so there
16 is going to be some infrastructure there, again working
17 with outreach partners and so forth. I think this will
18 bring more people into the process, and so we think it's
19 a good thing to continue to offer that moving forward.
20 It definitely allows those that can't travel to
21 participate just in general, and you know, I think it's
22 just a good thing, in particular now that many people are
23 used to it. So it will bring more people into the
24 process for sure.

25 And then, also to continue to stream and post

1 videos, of course you're already doing this, but you
2 know, again, it's good to be mindful that there are a lot
3 of people that are working right now, for example, and
4 they may be watching this video later tonight because
5 they want to know what happened. And so that's a really
6 great practice that the Commission has already
7 implemented and we think it's a good thing moving forward
8 and of course, it aids in transparency and acceptability
9 also.

10 Next slide, please, Andrew. Thank you.

11 One really important thing I think is just conduct
12 some dry runs when we move into, you know, actual line
13 drawing and looking at -- you know, when you are moving
14 into line drawing and looking at maps to collaborate with
15 the video and streaming consultants.

16 We had a great working relationship in 2011 with the
17 videographers that were hired the last time that are
18 currently also streaming this particular meeting, and I
19 think that that was a very important one because
20 sometimes there are hiccups. Obviously, they are experts
21 in things that we're not, and it takes everybody to make
22 sure that this is a successful process. So we know that
23 people that are watching this online need to be able to
24 see the detailed maps, and you need to see the detailed
25 maps.

1 And so conducting some dry runs, really
2 collaborating with the video and streaming consultants is
3 important, and of course, we want to do this before the
4 public is, you know, subjected to us figuring out whether
5 we should be clicking this button or that button, because
6 there's nothing more aggravating than watching people
7 figuring out technical difficulties. And I apologize
8 again for my video not working earlier.

9 So there are multiple avenues that I think you are
10 already exploring, of course, to provide input, and we
11 just wanted to let you know we are with you. I think
12 this is great that you're thinking about these various
13 ways for, you know, input collection.

14 I think the bulk of the public testimony will
15 probably not be received in public hearings, if our
16 experience is any guide here. And you know, even if you
17 are doing what you're doing already, which is, you know,
18 having public hearings and opening things up and so
19 forth, but there are still a lot of people that feel that
20 mail and email are their most best-used options because
21 they may want to say more than what they can say in, you
22 know, two or three minutes. And you know, they may just
23 seem more comfortable with it, and that goes to my last
24 point here.

25 There are a lot of people that are not comfortable

1 speaking in public or able to speak in public, so you
2 know, making sure that there are many different options
3 available, you know, the sky is the limit pretty much, is
4 a really good process, and we're here to support you with
5 whatever you want to do.

6 Jaime, in particular, just pointed out that a really
7 good thing to do would be just to have a simple input
8 form that can be filled out online that will be really
9 simple to do and that we could do on your website. We
10 could help you with this, of course, and you know, just a
11 few items and a pretty quick run, something that could
12 also be printed perhaps that people can give to their
13 neighbor to fill out and then, you know, send your way.
14 That's a pretty good thing to do also. And again, I know
15 you have probably thought about this even more than we
16 have, and we're here to support you.

17 Then there's public map submissions, so we -- the
18 last time there were a couple of days where the
19 Commission, the last Commission, 2011 Commission, invited
20 various groups to present maps. And you, of course, have
21 heard the term unity map and unity mapping and so forth,
22 and that was one of the examples of the maps that were
23 presented.

24 There were two days to do this and I think because
25 there are just more options now, there's more

1 accessibility to online mapping tools and so forth, I
2 think there will be more maps. You're obviously going to
3 get a whole lot more COI maps because of the COI tool.
4 But you know, considering when and how to schedule
5 hearings for maps that are provided by the public I think
6 really, you know, deserves some time. You may need more
7 than just a couple of days because there may be more
8 people that are now in the process that are capable of
9 developing maybe statewide maps and want to just because
10 the technology is available. And you know, there's some
11 free -- there's going to be, obviously, some free
12 technology available also.

13 And one important point to consider is to create
14 some criteria for selecting presenters because you may
15 get a lot of people that want to present, and you know,
16 just figuring out, like, who should be presenting there
17 and that's really a pretty tricky conversation to have,
18 but I think it's good just to think about these criteria
19 in advance and then let people know, you know, who is
20 going to be invited to these and who should be
21 presenting.

22 Then, you know, figuring out the most appropriate
23 time for the public plan presentation, so when in the
24 schedule. I saw you have this really great Gantt chart,
25 and you know, took a look at that, and so figuring out

1 where this might fit into the Gantt chart will be a great
2 thing to do, also in advance so that people can plan
3 ahead.

4 And one other thing. I think there was an idea
5 presented that the CRC, that you should not be working on
6 any maps until you've seen some of the groups' maps. And
7 I think that that may not work with the time schedule,
8 and again, this is just my take on it, and you know,
9 Andrew's and my and our group's take on it. We think
10 there is definitely an opening there to start working on
11 visualizations, so on some hypotheticals, before you see
12 the group presentation. But also you know, being mindful
13 that some of the public plans in the group presentations
14 may actually provide you with some solutions or scenarios
15 that you haven't thought about, you know.

16 I mean this is a big state. There are a lot of
17 things that are happening here. There are -- you know,
18 there isn't just one perfect map, and that's something
19 that I usually tell people on the local level. You know,
20 sometimes people come into this process and think there
21 is one perfect map that is going to do the right thing
22 for absolutely everybody, and that's not true. There are
23 many, you know, good maps. There are many perfect maps.
24 There are many things that -- there are many maps that
25 will do something really great for some area and maybe

1 not so great things for another area, because things are
2 interconnected.

3 And it's really difficult. My colleague Tamina
4 talks about redistricting like, you know, trying to
5 put -- trying to seat a wedding party, you know, were
6 Aunt Gertrude wants to sit here, but doesn't want to sit
7 next to Aunt Mabel and so forth. It's a difficult
8 process, and you know, taking advantage of public plans
9 and figuring, you know, just really looking at the
10 solutions or perhaps the ideas that are coming in with
11 public plans. It's a great thing to do before perhaps
12 you start creating your draft maps. But again, that
13 doesn't mean you can't do any work before.

14 And then there's another point about the submitted
15 community of interest maps and geography. It will be
16 really great that if the presenters, and I mentioned this
17 earlier, could pre-identify, you know, submitted
18 communities of interest and thus it doesn't go for, like,
19 group presentations of big maps perhaps as much as for,
20 like, the smaller presentations of communities of
21 interest.

22 So if, you know, the COIs could be pre-identified so
23 that the line drawers can quickly access them and pull
24 them out so that you can look at them in greater detail,
25 that again, goes to smoother process, and you know, that

1 also actually goes for the maps. If group presentations
2 are scheduled, the line drawers should presumably have
3 the maps in advance, so you know, if you want us to do
4 some work on them, if you want us to run some reports on
5 them or make sure that we have them available to show to
6 you, then we just have to figure out how to load them in
7 advance so that this can be a streamlined and quick
8 process.

9 Again, I'm thinking about shaving off time so that
10 you can have maximum time talking about the substance of
11 the presentation and you're not waiting for us to find a
12 map, you know, the line drawers to find a map or a
13 community of interest to be pulled up.

14 Next slide, please. Thank you so much, Andrew, for
15 doing this.

16 And so you've heard the term "collaboration".
17 Really it's a thread through our proposal and that is
18 because that's what we really believe in, and I think
19 collaborations are what make these projects successful.
20 And you know, a collaboration is, of course, what we're
21 doing with Haystaq. We, you know, work together on some
22 projects, and you know, related to data access and so
23 forth, and we realize that we're really good
24 collaborators. So collaborations really make the world
25 go around.

1 So data management, you have some data management
2 people right now on staff, and you know, we've
3 collaborated with them to bring them up to speed on
4 things, and we just see that going forward, of course,
5 with whoever you're going to bring on. And you know,
6 this is really an important one. And you've heard me
7 talk about just making sure that the files are available.
8 Some of these things will have to go hand in hand.

9 We think that probably what makes the most sense is
10 the line drawing team is responsible for the GIS data
11 portion, so anything that's, like, a GIS file and so
12 forth. And you know, you're going to get a lot of GIS
13 files I think from, again, the COI tools and the online
14 tools and the available GIS softwares that are there.
15 And we just need to be sure that there is this
16 streamlined process any GIS file that gets submitted to
17 you that comes into the data management team arrives with
18 us, and we're very happy and looking forward to working
19 with anybody you designate, obviously, to figure out how
20 that, you know, stream of communication works best.

21 Once we get the GIS files, you know, we'll be
22 working with you to figure out what we need to do with
23 these data. They, at the very least, need to be
24 processed and then probably integrated, because you're
25 going to want to see them in a greater scheme of things.

1 And then, you know, again we need to just assign
2 some responsibilities. You know that there will be some
3 PDFs that are coming in, so just static files, and again,
4 maybe the famous napkin will come in with a map. And you
5 know, we have to figure out what to do with that napkin,
6 and also with the PDFs.

7 And you know, what should go to the data management
8 team to make accessible. We think it would be a great
9 thing if the data management team could, you know, deal
10 with the PDFs that are submitted, since that's not
11 something we as line drawers would necessarily work with,
12 and that's something that needs to be digitized, you
13 know, that they can be made accessible to the Commission
14 and the public very quickly so that they can have the
15 same weight as other public input that comes in.

16 And then there's this idea of having a statewide COI
17 map, and I am not going to say that this was our idea. I
18 think pretty much everybody on your Commission has had
19 that idea. So we are aligned with your idea; let's
20 figure out how to best do that. I think it's a really
21 great idea to, you know, use something like a pin or so
22 to figure out where we have submitted COIs so that we can
23 figure out where there is a COI desert, you know, where
24 are there no COIs. So what now do we do in those areas?
25 You know, do we focus more meetings in those areas? Is

1 there going to be more of a push to work with partners in
2 those areas to get the word out?

3 You know, I think these maps, they are just a really
4 great visual tool for all kinds of different reasons, and
5 you know, figuring out how that might work best and how
6 to design something like that, we're, you know, looking
7 forward to working with you on that, and you know, seeing
8 what works for you and bringing, you know, our experience
9 to this.

10 So then also, again, developing protocols for
11 evaluating submitted district plans. This kind of goes
12 hand in hand really, I think with this idea of who
13 presents in the group meetings. I think there's a little
14 bit of overlap there. So you know, we need to -- we're
15 going to have to collaborate with the data management
16 team on a system to publish plans that are, you know,
17 consistent with other testimony to make sure nothing
18 falls between the cracks, and you know, just get guidance
19 from you on what you would like to see, figure out, you
20 know, what's possible and in what time frame and so
21 forth.

22 Next slide, please, Andrew. Thank you.

23 Again, Andrew has said this, and I just want to
24 reiterate this. We understand that the "we" in We Draw
25 The Lines is not us; it's you. You know, you are the

1 selected and the chosen ones, so we understand that. And
2 so on that note, you know, you direct us and we see our
3 role as being implementers. So we see you as providing
4 direction and then, you know, we will respond to that by
5 documenting that direction and then publicize the
6 direction.

7 Like, for example, we have an input meeting and it's
8 pretty clear that, you know, you all come to the decision
9 that, you know, a certain area should really not be split
10 because you've heard a lot of, you know, feedback on
11 that. We'll make sure we write that down and then we'll
12 make sure this get publicized on the map, whatever we
13 understand you to direct, you know, any direction that
14 you're giving to us.

15 And I think that's a really important one also to
16 make sure that we're all in the same page, that we don't
17 have miscommunications, and also that the public can
18 participate, because just imagine how upset you would be
19 if you're sitting there for, like, a week and you're
20 developing a map of your area only to find out later
21 that, you know, the CRC has given direction to, you know,
22 keep a particular jurisdiction whole and you have just
23 split it, and you just didn't know about it.

24 So I just think it's a good thing to do all around
25 to work with the public, and it's good for us as line

1 drawers to understand what the direction is, and you
2 know, for you to know that we really understood your
3 direction. So this goes, like, all over this, you know,
4 transparency and access idea.

5 For us, we can, you know, assess the possibilities
6 based on the direction you're giving. We can provide you
7 with some options.

8 Again, we were talking about visualizations earlier,
9 and this is an important thing. You know, as line
10 drawers -- line drawing is a tricky thing. It really is.
11 I mean even though California, you know, we have ranked
12 criteria, you know, those criteria are not easy. So you
13 know, you just have to think about all these different
14 things when you're putting something together, so for us
15 to, you know, just assess some of these possibilities and
16 bring them to you, give you some options and then, you
17 know, having you think about them and giving directions
18 about where you would like to go, you know, like any of
19 them, go back to the drawing table and what not. This is
20 kind of how we see our role of, you know, doing some
21 preliminary work that just based on efficiency, just for
22 efficiency purposes needs to be done.

23 And again, We Draw The Lines means you all make the
24 decisions and we don't make the decisions. You know, we
25 can give you suggestions, we'll collaborate with you, and

1 that's what we're dedicated to do.

2 Line drawing live and in public whenever possible, I
3 will tell you that there are very, very few consultants
4 that are comfortable with this. And that's what I liked
5 about Haystaq when we first started talking, and I think
6 that's what Haystaq liked about us, because we like this.
7 We think that this is a great thing to do, especially for
8 independent redistricting Commissions. This is where
9 transparency lies. This is the root of everything. This
10 is where, you know -- and I'm not saying that this is
11 easy. And it takes time, it takes longer, so you know,
12 just knowing that all of you are dedicated to this I
13 think, you know, the more live line drawing we can do,
14 the better.

15 And again, this little sub-bullet here goes to, you
16 know, working with multiple, you know, consultants that
17 you either already have on staff or will have on staff
18 like, you know, your streaming, and videographers, and so
19 forth, to make sure that this can be, you know, viewed
20 properly and people can participate.

21 Again, it's not always going to be possible. Not
22 all of this work can be done in public. I've outlined
23 already the work that may go into, you know, assessing
24 some possibilities and providing options, but you know,
25 again one more time, whatever is not done in public, you

1 know, we are of course committed to presenting every
2 option, everything that we've done to you. And I think
3 our software is set up to provide, you know, transparent
4 records and so forth.

5 So I think any work that would be done between
6 meetings, just again for efficiency reasons, might best
7 be done with subcommittees, and you're already mostly set
8 up for this, so this is just our idea of what could
9 happen, so obviously, you know, it's just an idea, and
10 you know, a technical subcommittee could perhaps work
11 with the line drawers to, you know, work with them on how
12 the work is being done and then report back to the full
13 Commission.

14 There's a legal one that's going to be a big one,
15 obviously, about where and how to implement the Federal
16 Voting Rights Act districts. And then regional one,
17 where perhaps Commissioners assigned to the outreach
18 zones may work with respective line drawers, because
19 obviously you're going to become experts on certain
20 areas, and we view the respective regional line drawers
21 as kind of fulfilling that role on the technical end
22 also.

23 And then continuity, that's just, like, the overall
24 process, administration and so forth; that's, I think,
25 also something that you already have in place. And you

1 know, some of your subcommittees may just be able to
2 pivot and take some of this work on.

3 After input hearings, this is also something that
4 I've touched on, you could provide some broad direction,
5 for example, to the line drawers, and then again, these
6 directions could be summarized and made publicly
7 available, and those directions can then be used to
8 create some visualizations and then be perhaps
9 incorporated in the draft maps if, you know, you agree
10 that these visualizations work for you, or we can use
11 these visualizations just as a starting off point, a
12 jumping off point to, you know, develop a map that may
13 work for you.

14 Some of these visualizations, I can tell you this
15 from experience, and I've worked with visualizations for
16 a long time, and some of them are probably not going to
17 make a lot of sense, and you know, you're going to hear
18 from the public about it, and that's part of it. You
19 know, you're going to put this out there and you figure
20 out what works. You figure out what works for you and
21 the public is going to let you know what works for them,
22 and then, you know, you come to some sort of an agreement
23 on where the lines go. So it's an interesting process
24 definitely.

25 And then, finally, training. I think training is

1 critical for everybody who is on the team to make sure
2 that we have, you know, good collaborations, good
3 communications like, for example, how is live line
4 drawing going to work? You know, getting a couple of the
5 line drawers in there and actually, you know, showing you
6 how this works, and having you ask questions. This is an
7 interesting training to have, and I think you all enjoy
8 it.

9 And the handoffs, the handoffs are really
10 interesting, and that's also something where you may be
11 interested and you may want to have a separate training
12 on that, or maybe we'll, you know, roll it into the first
13 line drawing training.

14 And then, finally, how are these visualizations
15 constructed and you know, really the sky's the limit on
16 this one, and we would ask you to, of course, just let us
17 know where you feel like you need training, and then
18 we'll design it and we'll present it to you.

19 This is going to be our last slide, I think. Yes.

20 And last, but definitely not least, this really by
21 some accounts should have probably been the first slide.
22 You know, it's the collaboration with the Federal Voting
23 Rights Act counsel, and I know you're looking at
24 applications now, and you know, obviously we'll work with
25 whoever you will choose. We've, you know, worked with

1 quite a few people in that field already, and you know,
2 Haystaq has worked with some of the people there, and
3 we've also worked with some of the people that have
4 applied, so there's not going to be many surprises for
5 us. And you know, I think determining an approach to
6 Federal Voting Rights Act assessment and implementation
7 really will rely on working with counsel.

8 And you know, counsel is going to drive this
9 process. Obviously they are going to be the expert on
10 it. But we have some assumptions, and those are that
11 we'll have a very close working relationship and that
12 this will be an iterative process.

13 And for example, the line drawers could identify
14 some areas of potential section 2 districts, Federal
15 Voting Rights Act district early in the process. I mean
16 we know we have the CVAP data, citizen voting-age
17 population data are out already, and you know, some of
18 this work can be frontloaded.

19 And then, you know, beginning with some large
20 pockets, figuring out where these areas may be, you know,
21 communicate those to counsel perhaps, wait for racially
22 polarized voting analysis and some direction, and then
23 figure out some general options. I mean I assume -- we
24 assume that, you know, counsel is going to talk to you
25 and then we will get direction from you on what to do,

1 and then we'll, you know, we'll kind of go back and forth
2 and figure out, you know, how to implement this.

3 In between, you know, all of that is we'll wait for
4 direction from you regarding the implementation. We'll
5 assess perhaps some more details options. Some of this
6 is real, like, fine-tuned work, and then, you know, work
7 with the subcommittee perhaps if you choose to go that
8 way and definitely counsel, and kind of go back and forth
9 a little bit, present some options to the Commission and
10 then, you know, districts are refined, perhaps tested and
11 then perhaps integrated into the larger map.

12 And one of the questions you may have to consider is
13 whether the Federal Voting Rights Act counsel is
14 responsible for guidance on the other criteria because
15 that's not the only criterion you have, of course.

16 Then our last slide is we thank you very, very much
17 for your time and for considering our proposal, and I
18 know I said "we" a lot, and I don't mean to be
19 presumptuous here, okay, just kind of slipped out that
20 way. And we wish you a happy redistricting, and we're
21 available for any questions you may have. Thank you so
22 much.

23 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Karin, and thank you,
24 Andrew for a great presentation.

25 We're going to take a fifteen-minute break, so we're

1 going to take a fifteen-minute break now and then come
2 back to questions and answer after that, so we'll be back
3 at 11:10 for questions and answers.

4 MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you.

5 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

6 MR. DRECHSLER: Thank you, Chair.

7 (Whereupon, a recess was held from 10:55 a.m.
8 until 11:10 a.m.)

9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Welcome back. With that, I will turn
10 it over to Commissioner Andersen who will be leading our
11 question-and-answer period.

12 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great. Thank you, Chair. So
13 at this point basically it's open to the Commissioners
14 for any questions that they'd like to propose to the
15 group.

16 And I would like to say thank you very much for a
17 wonderful presentation. It certainly well filled the
18 hour and it was well worth it. Thank you. Commissioner
19 Ahmad.

20 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, and thank you to Q2
21 as well as Haystaq, slipped my mind. Thank you, Karin
22 and Andrew for your wonderful presentation.

23 I was particularly interested in the proposed plan,
24 which I understand are just ideas at this point, the
25 aspect around data management, as I sit with Commissioner

1 Turner on the data management subcommittee, I just wanted
2 to gain some understanding on some additional ideas you
3 all might have in regards to that aspect as we move
4 forward.

5 So particularly, what role does the data manager on
6 the team that you had outlined, what does their role look
7 like, and then, additionally, how would you foresee a
8 data manager from our side on staff at CRC complementing
9 or supplementing the responsibilities of that line
10 drawer?

11 MS. MAC DONALD: Yes, thank you very much for that
12 question, Commissioner Ahmad. I think those are two
13 different roles, really. When we say data manager, data
14 security, it really is about internal data management for
15 us to make sure that we are all safe and secure, that our
16 files are properly backed up, you know, that we have
17 files available to us internally that we need.

18 So as you know, there's four -- actually five line
19 drawers that we're proposing to bring on, plus perhaps,
20 you know, some more mapping support, and depending on
21 what people are working on, there are the handoffs to
22 consider and so forth, so people may need to have access
23 to files at certain times, and we need to make sure that,
24 you know, these files are secure, that after every
25 meeting everything is properly backed up and so forth.

1 I think your data management team deals with much
2 more than that, perhaps. I don't know if your data
3 management team is also charged with providing overall
4 security, because that's kind of more a specialized IT
5 function, which is really what Guang-Chen is, you know,
6 an expert in. And of course, he also used to work at
7 Statewide Database, so he really understands, like, large
8 databases and large data sets and protocols and whatnot.

9 So I'm not entirely sure how you are really
10 envisioning that role for your data management team. We
11 know that we need to be able to interface with them. I
12 think their role is larger with respect to the file types
13 that they're working with because I think they're going
14 to have, you know, the public input that's not geographic
15 to deal with perhaps, you know, posting things, making
16 sure that things are available to you, the Commissioners,
17 when you need it. And we see our little piece as being
18 the geographic input piece.

19 Having said that, I think there's also a little bit
20 of collaboration there in terms of -- potential
21 collaboration, depending on, you know, who you bring on,
22 like who you want us to work with, if it, you know, goes
23 that way, but with making sure that files that are
24 submitted are indexed in a particular way that are
25 perhaps easily -- more easily accessible.

1 I think one of the things that this entire team
2 brings to the table is that we understand longitudinal
3 data sets and that's -- I know some of you have dealt
4 with longitudinal data. That's a totally different
5 ballpark than just getting one data set and having to
6 make sure that that works and is understandable and
7 properly indexed.

8 So you know, we may be able to interface with your
9 data managers, and you know, assist in naming conventions
10 and so forth. But I think that's basically the
11 difference, and I hope that answers your question.

12 Of course, it's also something that we could talk
13 about for a really long time, so --

14 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: No, definitely that does
15 provide some insight. As you all know if you've been
16 watching our meetings, we haven't full flushed out that
17 aspect, so we were really hoping to get insights from our
18 applicants for the line drawer position to see how we can
19 best make a very robust process overall.

20 And just one follow up question I had. I saw in the
21 proposal that the preferred tool is Caliper's Maptitude
22 for Redistricting. Is there any significant difference
23 between using that tool and the COI tool in terms of
24 drawing those lines, whether it comes from -- from public
25 testimony meetings? I personally don't know Maptitude

1 well enough to be able to identify any differences, so if
2 you could help me understand what the major differences
3 are, just so we're all on the same page, that would be
4 great.

5 MS. MAC DONALD: Of course. Thank you. Let me take
6 the COI tool aspect and then I'll hand it over to Andrew
7 to talk about the Caliper aspect.

8 The COI tool is really not a line drawing tool.
9 Like, I sometimes refer to it as a one-trick pony, and I
10 hope that doesn't sound dismissive because I think that's
11 actually the strength of the tool is that it does one
12 thing and it does it very simply, and it's super easy to
13 understand and use and all that. Line drawing software,
14 that's a totally different ballpark.

15 So essentially, the COI tool is really just to
16 define COIs and it's not for line drawing. For line
17 drawing you have to have data sets and all kinds of
18 stuff, and you actually have to put things together. For
19 the COI tool you're just, like, creating your community
20 of interest and you're sending it off to the Commission.

21 And I'll let Andrew talk about why, you know, and we
22 talked about this a lot, why we were thinking of using
23 Caliper's Maptitude for Redistricting software. And this
24 is internal, so this will be the line drawers using it.

25 Andrew, go ahead.

1 MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. One of the big reasons that
2 we use Maptitude or suggesting to use Maptitude is
3 because of the ability to take snapshots. In Arizona --
4 and that helps with the transparency aspect and sort of
5 ties into your initial question about our data security
6 person, is to make sure that we are backing up everything
7 at the end of the night, that any changes that are
8 made --

9 I think we had a total 40,000-plus different
10 snapshots of the maps in Arizona throughout the process,
11 something probably very similar that we will see in
12 California, if not many more, but that is -- that's one
13 of the reasons that we like Maptitude is because of the
14 ability to have the snapshots, have them available. If
15 there is a -- you know, ideally we're not going back and
16 looking at them, but if we need to go back in time to
17 say, all right, how do we decide on this -- this sort
18 of -- this line change or why did this line go here, we
19 have the ability to do that.

20 And then just one other thing that I think we want
21 to, you know, besides recording every change with
22 Maptitude, I think one other thing on the data security
23 is we take PII, personal identifiable information, very
24 seriously, and we would work with your data person to
25 make sure anything that's publicly submitted, that

1 people's names, phone numbers, addresses, are, you know,
2 retracted properly before that information gets out into
3 the public. So we take that extremely seriously.

4 MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah, and if I may add, my
5 copresenter Jaime just texted me that I should point out
6 that the COI tool also relies on an internet connection,
7 and in public meetings we may, if we're using Maptitude
8 for Redistricting actually the database may be on the
9 local computer, so you don't have to send the lines over
10 the web, which otherwise, you know, that little spinning
11 wheel, that can become quite hypnotic. It's a big state.

12 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Fornaciari.

13 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, thank you for the
14 proposal and your presentation. Really appreciate all
15 the hard work behind putting something like that
16 together.

17 I have two questions. The first question is do
18 either of your organizations have other line drawing jobs
19 going on right now, and if so, how would you guys manage
20 sort of kind of prioritizing the work in the case there
21 might be some conflicts or anything?

22 MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah, maybe I should take the first
23 stab at this, Andrew, if that's okay.

24 So we -- so Q2, we have a few contracts, some of
25 them in the works and a couple of them signed, and so the

1 only one really that kind of overlaps with this project
2 or would overlap with this project is a county where all
3 we're doing is helping them with training of a
4 commission, and so this is really just a few meetings and
5 kind of helping them sketch out the process. So this is
6 a county that has an advisory commission, and you know,
7 we're just helping with, you know, basically the
8 materials and it has a few meetings. I think it's a
9 total of seven meetings or so. And they have, like,
10 roughly the same deadlines that you have, whatever that
11 deadline may turn out to be.

12 And then we have a couple of other small
13 jurisdictions. One is a commission that we also worked
14 with the last time. They are not -- they don't have to
15 be ready for the primary. So all the other clients, they
16 have to be ready for the general election, so it doesn't
17 coincide with the work that's going to be done for this
18 particular Commission. So that's all we have at this
19 point going on. And I don't anticipate a whole lot more
20 happening.

21 MR. DRECHSLER: And I would second that, and the one
22 project, you know, full disclosure, that we did apply
23 to -- for Michigan, they have an independent commission
24 there as well, and Q2 and Haystaq teamed up to apply
25 there. And there's other members of the team that will

1 be -- that are currently not on the California project
2 that will be if we were to get the Michigan project, and
3 we are a finalist in Michigan, so a significant amount of
4 their time would be dedicated to Michigan.

5 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Yee.

6 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I had one more question.
7 Sorry.

8 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, I'm sorry. Go ahead.

9 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So you know, Andrew, your
10 firm does analytics. I know, Karin, you have a great
11 deal of experience with data. How do you guys envision
12 sort of helping us make sense of all this input we're
13 getting, and I mean, we'll be talking about hiring a data
14 analyst, but I'm just wondering what your thoughts are on
15 how your team, this team, would help us, you know, think
16 through the data, think through what it's telling us,
17 think through what we can glean out of the data to be
18 more effective in executing our job?

19 MR. DRECHSLER: I'll start and then, Karin, you can
20 jump in, but I think that's a great question, and you
21 know, we, Haystaq as a firm, deal with big data sets all
22 the time. And I think one big thing that I like to tell
23 clients is we help tell a story. So there's a lot of
24 data and there needs to be a story that needs to be told.
25 And we work with clients to make sure that they

1 understand what the data is.

2 In Arizona, what we did last time is we worked with
3 the commission staff to set up a system that categorized
4 every single piece of data that, you know, any comment
5 that came in, and worked with the commission staff to set
6 that up and implement that, and that was very important.

7 You know, we worked with the legal counsel as well
8 because they needed a lot of that information to preserve
9 and have ready in case there were any court cases, that
10 that information was available.

11 So that's one thing that I think we could work
12 closely with the CRC staff, and you know, we have that
13 ability to deal with large data sets. We deal with the
14 census data all the time. We have -- our firm has a
15 national photo file. We have a consumer file of 250
16 million Americans, so we're used to, you know, taking
17 large data sets and making that, you know, more
18 assessable and understandable to the client.

19 MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah, and just to add to that.
20 Thank you very much, Andrew. There's not much that I
21 have to add to that.

22 I think just making sure that the data are available
23 to you, I think whoever you bring in as the data manager.
24 Again, I see this as a collaboration. We'd be happy to
25 sit down with you and kind of go through what your

1 thoughts are currently and give you some feedback.
2 Because most data management firms or people that are
3 qualified to do data management, they haven't worked on
4 redistricting. I mean, that's generally the problem you
5 have when you're dealing with redistricting is that there
6 is very few people out there that have worked on it
7 because there's not that much opportunity to work on it,
8 right.

9 So there may be some overlap with datasets that they
10 have worked on in the past, but when we're talking about
11 communities of interest, and you know, there's input
12 coming left and right about these different topics, this
13 categorization, classifying of data, coding data, which,
14 of course, many of you are very familiar with because
15 you've also worked on data. Anybody who's done a data
16 research project on, you know, with qualitative data has
17 dealt with this. This is something we also did with the
18 last Commission. I think it can be much improved, and
19 we're very happy to figure out what needs to be done and
20 collaborate with you and whoever comes in to make that
21 work.

22 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Yee.

23 COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you. Thank you for this
24 presentation. Wow, I'm actually getting excited about
25 line drawing. I know it's still a little while off, but

1 very inspiring.

2 Two questions. The first question has to do with
3 data management. And this is something we've discussed
4 on the Commission ourselves, and it may become more
5 obvious once we're actually, you know, receiving public
6 input. So some public input will have GIS information
7 with it and others will not.

8 So as you're imagining it, the line drawer will have
9 a role in public input that has GIS information. But it
10 seems to me this creates two different paths for the
11 information. You know, you have COI tool submissions and
12 you have napkin or just narrative, just emails. And I'm
13 trying to figure out how do we treat them all -- how do
14 we get them all together, you know. And I guess that's
15 really the Commission's responsibility ultimately,
16 probably through its data management team to integrate
17 that and you know, give us everything that has to do with
18 Redding, you know, and that will have come from a lot of
19 different sources.

20 So I'm wondering from your point of view, the line
21 drawer staff, what's its particular role there in that
22 flow and how do you -- I mean, if you're -- let's say
23 you're predigesting 200 submissions about Redding and
24 characterizing it. Well, that's treating that data
25 differently than other submissions about Redding that did

1 not come through the COI tool, right. So I'm wondering
2 how you see that and what your thoughts are about how to
3 approach that. And then I have a completely different
4 question then.

5 MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. So if I may take a stab at
6 that. I think that is the -- that is such an important
7 topic because I think, you know, submitting input to the
8 CRC shouldn't be a popularity contest, you know, in a
9 perfect world. So I think we've all seen some people --
10 some neighborhoods in particular perhaps more, you know,
11 disadvantaged neighborhoods where perhaps one person is
12 able to put a submission together about where their
13 community of interest is and send it off, and that
14 Commission in whatever form -- that submission, I'm
15 sorry, in whatever form it comes in should, you know,
16 probably have the same weight as, you know, somebody who
17 was able to go on Twitter and say, hey, here's this map.
18 Everybody vote on it. And they have 8,000 followers, and
19 they all give them the thumbs up. You know, then the
20 question is for you, you know, how do I weigh these
21 things, you know, does one have more worth than the
22 other?

23 I think one of the answers to that question is that,
24 you know, you have to be attuned to that fact, you know,
25 that this may happen. I think we can help in taking some

1 of the information that you're, for example, getting in
2 written format where people talk about their community of
3 interest and they did not use the COI tool. I mean, we
4 have mapping support available. The technical term for
5 that internally is baby mappers. And this is the next
6 round of mappers that we're developing, you know. And
7 they can help with digitizing things from public input,
8 for example. So there are various ways by which we can
9 assist with that.

10 When we are talking about, for example, doing a pin
11 map of the entire area and you're seeing that you have a
12 lot of, you know, submissions from one particular area, a
13 lot of it is probably going to be the same. So you know,
14 you're going to have to weigh that information. I think
15 that's one of the really difficult things that
16 Commissioners have to do, right, is to weigh that
17 information, figure out what is the value of it, how does
18 it factor into the greater scheme of things, and then,
19 you know, compare that to other information that's come
20 in.

21 And you also see where there is perhaps not a lot of
22 information, and you can still take a look at that and
23 see, do I need to support that somehow? Do I need to do
24 more outreach? Do we need to go into this community? Do
25 we need to, you know, talk to our outreach partners and

1 so forth?

2 So I think it's in the collaboration. I think we
3 can help, again, with digitizing some of these things and
4 make them available to you. I think it's important that
5 you have the information available when you need it, and
6 we most certainly can help with that.

7 And Andrew, do you want to take a stab at it?

8 MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. And I think the key thing as
9 you were saying, Karin, is it's making sure that the
10 Commission prioritizes, you know, what you want. So if
11 you're hearing a bunch of comments and you're looking at
12 it and it's about a particular area, if you have 200
13 comments in Redding, and say, all right, could you take
14 these and do a map. That's something that we could work
15 with you, and it's driven by the Commission and what is
16 your prioritization. So you're right.

17 And the one good example, I think, is in Arizona
18 where we had a lot of people last time who came to public
19 hearings and they said, we want two maps -- or two
20 congressional districts on the border with Mexico.
21 There's other people who came and said, we want three
22 congressional districts. And the Commission looked at us
23 and they said could you map out these two scenarios?
24 Could you show us what these two look like? So I think
25 that's a really good example where it's driven by you.

1 We obviously would work with the data management staff
2 and help visualize what you guys -- what the Commission
3 is prioritizing.

4 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Go ahead, Commissioner Yee,
5 with question number 2.

6 COMMISSIONER YEE: Sorry. Question number 2. So
7 this is for Karin. So you're here with your Q2 hat, but
8 you also have a Statewide Database hat, and so I'm trying
9 to think as a member of the public how I would perceive
10 that, and I'm not thinking of conflict of interest so
11 much as, wow, that's quite a bit of role concentration in
12 a couple of people, you and Jaime and so on.

13 I'm just wondering what you would say to the public
14 in terms of having both those roles, which you also did
15 in 2011, and you know, I don't think there was any -- I'm
16 not aware of any criticism that came up about that. I'm
17 just wondering, once again, as you put yourself in both
18 these roles, how you wish to be perceived. Also
19 wondering, kind of a follow up to that, how things might
20 be different now that you're bringing Haystaq in, how
21 that compares to 2011.

22 MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you for that question. Yeah,
23 it is a little bit of a juggling process. I think one
24 way that I -- that I differentiate is that I'm always
25 very clear what my role is at any particular time. Am I

1 here as Statewide Database or am I here as, you know,
2 your consultant.

3 The interesting thing about Statewide Database is
4 that as soon as the data are released, our workload drops
5 dramatically. So we're super busy, you know, right now,
6 maybe a little bit more busy because of all the things
7 that have been happening with census, of course, you
8 know. But our workload will be dropping dramatically at
9 that point.

10 I should also tell you that I currently have, I
11 think 57, days of vacation that I have to take at UC and
12 clearly, nobody is going anywhere. Holiday markets in
13 Europe are not going to be happening, and I'm very happy
14 to spend my vacation with all of you. So I would like to
15 say that.

16 It's not unusual for you know, academics, people
17 that work at UC to also, you know, do consulting work,
18 you know, and I know you've had some people, of course,
19 on other consulting roles present to you and it's the
20 same for them as it is to us.

21 I think I have a unique skill set that is, you know,
22 was kind of partially developed because of Statewide
23 Database, but really a lot of it has to do with my own
24 academic work. My "obsession" with communities of
25 interest came out of my academic work. I've been

1 working, you know, working on communities of interest
2 since 1997. You know, that was work that I did when I
3 was in PhD program. I wrote my master's on it and so
4 forth, so that has very little to do with Statewide
5 Database because it really, like, informs other pieces of
6 redistricting work.

7 In terms of a conflict of interest, you know, I have
8 looked at it, others have looked into it. There really
9 is no conflict of interest because the Statewide Database
10 is a publicly available data set. Whatever I know, you
11 know, everybody knows. I don't have access to any data
12 that you don't have access to, you know, or the general
13 public has access to. And yeah, I think it's a busy
14 time, but you know, as academics I think we understand
15 how busy we can all be when we're on projects, you know.

16 So I would actually say now that you've got me
17 thinking it, I think my, you know, my academic work and
18 my redistricting work has really benefitted the Statewide
19 Database, and the way that we make the data available.

20 In particular, if you're looking at the map stuff,
21 and I'm now going a little bit off on a tangent, but you
22 know, now cities and counties have to use the Statewide
23 Database for line drawing, for example, and you know, the
24 fact that I've actually worked with cities and counties
25 and I understand who may be accessing these data and how

1 they're looking at these data is informing the way that
2 we're going to be presenting the data at Statewide
3 Database.

4 So I think that, you know, the information that I've
5 gathered and the work that I've done as a consultant, or
6 as an academic, or you know, pro bono, much pro bono, has
7 really benefitted that project. So I hope I've answered
8 your question, Commissioner Yee.

9 COMMISSIONER YEE: It does, and maybe some thoughts
10 on bringing Haystaq in this time around.

11 MS. MAC DONALD: Oh, yeah, Haystaq. So yeah, this
12 was an interesting one too. I mean, this is a big
13 project that you all have in mind, you know, and we
14 don't -- we didn't have the capabilities of doing it by
15 ourselves, but we also thought we would benefit from
16 bringing some partners on that perhaps have other
17 experience, you know.

18 I mean, Jaime and I were basically -- Jaime, Tamina,
19 and I, we talk to each other and figure things out. So
20 sometimes it's good when you talk -- that you talk to
21 somebody else to figure things out because, you know,
22 there's some perspectives that we haven't looked at,
23 perhaps technological solutions that we haven't looked
24 at. And you know, in walks, you know, Andrew and his
25 team with this fantastic idea of basically replicating

1 the Statewide Database on a national level.

2 And you know, kind of -- for me it was, of course,
3 love at first sight because Statewide Database is like
4 my, you know, my everything, as you know. And you know,
5 being able to work with people that I had already heard a
6 lot about, you know, I heard of their work in Arizona. I
7 knew that they had done a good job. They basically used
8 the same methodologies that we have used in California in
9 terms of, you know, transparency and so forth.

10 And having access to more seasoned line drawers, to
11 Andrew's, you know, expertise, to having a company that
12 knows a lot about big data, and you know, data analytics
13 in the way that we in our little niche perhaps don't know
14 about, you know, it just seemed like a real asset.

15 And you know, looking at the fact that they have
16 done transparent work and they're moving -- they have
17 their redistricting hats on in a completely nonpartisan
18 way. That just makes sense to me.

19 So you know, we were working well together on the
20 Redistricting Data Hub. I was working with one of the
21 Haystaq people at the MGGG Voting Rights Conference two
22 years ago, the voting rights project where I was
23 teaching. And you know, so there was a lot of overlap
24 there already, and there just seemed to be a synergy.

25 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

1 Commissioner Toledo, did you have a --

2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you. It's actually concerning
3 just Haystaq and just questions about -- about
4 impartiality and conflict of interest specifically. I
5 did see your disclosure regarding Congressman Ro Khanna,
6 South Bay Congress member. I'm just curious as to -- I
7 did read your statement, and I'm curious as to the
8 perception -- the Commission, as you know, has the
9 requirement to be impartial and to do its work in an
10 impartial manner. Given that your firm has worked with
11 many political candidates -- does work with many
12 political candidates, many of them on the Democratic
13 side, how have you and how would you ensure impartiality
14 in all of the work that you do and ensure that there's no
15 conflict of interest as it's applying in the statutes?

16 MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah, that's a great question, and I
17 think what we have done in the past in terms of -- and
18 that was the same question that we faced in Arizona when
19 we went and did the project there in 2011, and I think
20 that is why we are so big on transparency. The software
21 we choose, you know, has the ability to take snapshots
22 with every single line change.

23 We are committing that while we were working on this
24 project that we don't do any California -- the team
25 that's working on this project doesn't do any California

1 political work because we want to make sure that we don't
2 want to even present -- it may be unrelated, but we want
3 to be able to show that we are not, you know, showing any
4 favoritism or any, you know, favors to any political
5 candidates.

6 And that's something that we think, you know -- and
7 the big thing is we're not off mapping in a dark room at
8 night. We're doing this in the public, and we're taking
9 direction from each of you, the fourteen of you, you're
10 our bosses and you're the ones who are telling us where
11 to put the lines, where to move the lines.

12 So that's something that we are fully committed to,
13 full transparency, and you know, by doing it in the past,
14 having a track record of this, I think is very important.
15 And when it comes to redistricting, you know, the fact
16 that we've been brought in to help set up with the
17 equivalent is the Statewide Database on a national level
18 as a nonpartisan, you know, organization, that's
19 something that was very important and one of the reasons
20 that we were chosen for that is that we could, you know,
21 when it comes to redistricting it's we have a nonpartisan
22 hat completely on.

23 CHAIR TOLEDO: Follow-up to that. So when we signed
24 on to be on the Commission we had to give a ten year --
25 had to commit to not to run for office for ten years, not

1 to be appointed to office because of the perception, the
2 possible perception about impartiality and conflicts of
3 interest. I'm just curious. I didn't see this in the
4 documents. Are you also committing to not working with
5 politicians or elected officials who potentially might be
6 -- where districts might be redrawn through this process
7 over the next ten years, or just during the line drawing
8 process?

9 MR. DRECHSLER: We had talked about it just during
10 the line drawing process. Part of it is, you know, being
11 a, you know, a firm that, you know, does redistricting
12 every once a decade when state commissions come together.
13 If we could do redistricting all the time, I think
14 there's a lot of members on our team that we would only
15 do that, and part of this, you know, being a relatively
16 small business as well, like, there's times where we
17 can't, you know, there's times where, you know, it's a
18 business decision where we choose clients.

19 So that's something that we were fully committed to
20 doing throughout -- you know, and we understand that
21 there's litigation that often happens, and so we are
22 committed to making sure nobody on our team does
23 political work in California for that, and I really hope
24 it doesn't go for ten years for your sakes.

25 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

1 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Are there --
2 because I do have several conflict of issues (sic) items
3 to address. Are there other questions by the
4 Commissioners that aren't just the conflict of issue
5 (sic) items at this point?

6 Commissioner Akutagawa and Commissioner Kennedy.

7 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: It's not conflict of
8 interest. Did you want to ask yours first?

9 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: No, actually. Please go ahead
10 with anything that isn't, then we'll sum up with that.

11 Thank you.

12 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay, thank you. So Karin,
13 thank you very much and Andrew, thank you. I do
14 appreciate your presentation and also your proposal.

15 I actually have two questions. There's one that has
16 a subset and then the other one is a completely separate
17 question.

18 I'm just kind of curious, because you mentioned that
19 in 2010, I guess the last CRC was challenged in
20 organizing the deluge of the written public comments, and
21 we had heard this as well, too. I am just kind of
22 curious. What happened? I mean did you -- you know, was
23 that data not used? And how is that going to be -- and I
24 think this is kind of a different take on what
25 Commissioner Yee had also asked, but I think I'm asking

1 this mostly also because we've been talking a lot about
2 language access as well, too, and we're going to be
3 translating, you know, public input, whether it's written
4 or submitted through, obviously, the COI tool.

5 We're going to be encouraging as broad and as wide
6 of submissions that we can receive, you know, through
7 different means. I think this Commission has made that
8 kind of commitment that we want to (audio interference)
9 that, and it's reflected also in your proposal as well,
10 too.

11 But I think about when translations also occur, too,
12 you know, there's some words that just don't translate
13 easily from one language to another, and I'm kind of
14 curious as to how that's going to complicate what you're
15 going to be doing in terms of really, I guess, I think
16 the words that you used was categorization and coding,
17 you know, the data, like, so that it's going to be usable
18 for us in a way that Andrew has said, it tells a story
19 that we can then use for, you know, for the line drawing.
20 So I'd be interested to hear how you would address that.
21 Is that even on the radar screen at this point right now?

22 MS. MAC DONALD: Thanks for those questions. I'll
23 start with the second one. I think that we would need to
24 work with you and also with the translators, obviously,
25 and probably also with the public to make sure that, you

1 know, kind of terminology issues are resolved properly.
2 I totally agree with you. I've run into this in the
3 past. I mean, there could definitely be some tricky
4 situations, and you know, I'm not going to sit here and
5 tell you that I have the answers to all of those, but I
6 think that's something that we all have to work on. It's
7 not going to just affect our work; it's going to affect
8 your work also. The timeliness of these translations is
9 going to be a factor. Like, who do you bring on?

10 You know that what's happening with the COI tool is
11 that it's going to community review, and you know, when
12 you look at translation companies and figure out who you
13 want to bring on, you're going to be looking also at
14 some, you know, translation companies that offer
15 community review, which takes longer. So some people
16 offer it, some people don't offer it. You know, some
17 people don't offer all of the languages, so this is going
18 to be an interesting one, and again, this will be
19 something where we need to work together.

20 And I agree with you also that it can affect
21 categorization. I mean, I am not proposing that we, you
22 know, categorize everything. I would say, you know, some
23 broader categories that we worked out with the specific
24 subcommittee perhaps and then, you know, bring to the
25 full Commission to see how the full Commission thinks

1 about it, whatever is most useful for you, and then, you
2 know, just have these data a little bit better available.

3 So going to what happened in 2011 was, you know,
4 it's just redistricting, here we go. Everybody always
5 seems to be getting thrown some sort of a curve ball, and
6 you know, in 2011 there was no time, there was no money,
7 there was just -- I mean, it was just -- and it was the
8 first Commission, so essentially, everything was
9 literally inventing the wheel.

10 So you know, that Commission hadn't really thought
11 about the fact that they might get this much input. In
12 fact, I still remember the first meeting that -- the
13 first input meeting that that Commission had. We were
14 sitting there and we were all worried that we would
15 travel all the way to the meeting location and nobody
16 might show up. I mean, we have no idea whether there was
17 any interest, you know. And then all of a sudden it was
18 a lot of interest, and then, you know, we have to deal
19 with the exact opposite concern, which was like, oh my
20 goodness, now what do we do with all of this input,
21 right.

22 So a lot of these things were developed as a
23 response to what we were seeing on the ground. And I
24 mean, I would say that that's what you also want in a
25 redistricting consultant is somebody who can basically

1 pivot with you, depending on what happens, if they can
2 come up with a solution.

3 Because I still remember Guang-Chen, who is on this
4 project, he put a COI database together on the fly,
5 essentially, or just a database that could log input.
6 And the Commissioners did have access to it, so the input
7 was, you know, was considered. But it was perhaps not as
8 pretty as if we had been able to, you know, frontload it.
9 And it didn't have all of the input in it.

10 So there were different ways of -- there were
11 different streams of input that were in different
12 locations. And again, there wasn't a dedicated data
13 management team. We had no money. You know, we had no
14 time. So you know, we basically strung it together. And
15 I'm pretty confident that all of the input was considered
16 by the Commissioners, but a lot of it also required for
17 you know, the consulting team to remind the Commissioners
18 or to point out to the Commissioners that perhaps there
19 was a piece of input that they either didn't have time to
20 read, or you know, that just came in, or that had been
21 submitted a long time ago and you know that they perhaps
22 wanted to take into consideration.

23 So you know, again, it was an all-hands-on-deck kind
24 of situation and yeah, I think you have some time. You
25 have a better infrastructure, you will have a bigger

1 team, and there's a lot of know-how on this Commission,
2 so I think putting everybody's heads together and coming
3 up with something good is really going to benefit this
4 process.

5 I hope that answers your question, Commissioner
6 Akutagawa.

7 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, it did. Thank you
8 very much, and I appreciate that, that's helpful to know,
9 and I think it's something that we're also quite
10 conscious about in terms of the reasons why we're
11 considering the data management system that we're looking
12 at and also the data analysis.

13 I have one more question, if I can ask. I was also
14 quite interested in understanding your suggestions around
15 the regional teams, you know, kind of similar to the zone
16 methodology that we've taken so that we ensure that the
17 entire state will have someone to turn to.

18 I am kind of curious as to what -- can you explain a
19 little bit more what you have in mind, because I was
20 reading some of the other areas where Commissioners are
21 going to be (audio interference) your team, if this is
22 successful, in terms of whether it's the finance and
23 administration, whether it's the -- you know, what's
24 currently the line drawer RFP subcommittee which could
25 then morph into, you know, them doing something related

1 to it. I'm going to perhaps think that there may be
2 other subcommittees that'll get pulled in, including the
3 zone team.

4 So can you explain a little bit more what you see
5 around, you know, like even the zone or the regional
6 liaisons that the zone teams will have in terms of
7 working with your zone or regional teams?

8 MS. MAC DONALD: Yes. Thank you. Thank you very
9 much for that question. You know, it's a little bit --
10 it's a unique approach, but it's an approach that, you
11 know, we've at least tested, and it works.

12 So California is an incredibly large place, and it
13 is -- you know, if the last input process is any -- you
14 know, gives us any suggestion or any indication about how
15 much input we're going to get this time, it's going to be
16 so much more just because, you know, you're out there,
17 you're promoting, we have different tools and so forth.
18 You know all of this.

19 So having a mapper who becomes an expert on a
20 section of the state is going to give you more quality, I
21 think, in putting the maps together. I think assuming
22 that a mapper can become an expert on, you know, the
23 input and the kinds of concerns that are perhaps in some
24 of the areas of the state, like I'll just grab a couple
25 of points out of my hat from last time.

1 We were talking about watersheds. We were talking
2 about, you know, small counties working together on, you
3 know, perhaps certain agricultural issues. We were
4 talking about coastal access, you know, issues that are
5 very predominant around the coast and what's happening
6 there. There were so many different facets that affected
7 the different regions, and being able to go to one
8 regional expert, "regional line drawer", and asking them
9 for advice and having them be able to jump basically from
10 plan, to plan, to plan where they can -- by which I mean
11 from Assembly, to Senate, to Congress and so forth.

12 It can happen many different ways, because they
13 already know what you did in the Assembly, so if you, for
14 example, said in the Assembly, oh, we're going to try to
15 split X area because of these particular considerations,
16 but we don't want to do that in another plan, they can
17 remind you of that. They can tell you whether it's
18 possible. They will have mapped it on a smaller unit of
19 analysis and on a larger unit of analysis. So that's
20 essentially the idea.

21 As Andrew said when we were looking at this map,
22 this is not set in stone. I think it makes a lot of
23 sense to have one person assigned to LA because Los
24 Angeles is like its own country, really, in many
25 different ways. It is super large, and it has pretty

1 much every concern you could possibly consider. And you
2 know, there are a lot of opportunities, a lot of
3 challenges there, and having one person just focus on
4 that, it's going to take all of their time to become an
5 expert on it, and then also remember, there will be a
6 Voting Rights counsel who will work with the mappers and
7 with you, obviously, and you know, not everybody needs to
8 be in the same room for the conversation about Los
9 Angeles.

10 So it's as much about knowledge as it is about
11 efficiently deploying this team and making sure that
12 somebody is available as a contact point for the
13 Commissioners that perhaps are working in that region.

14 And you know, we try to speak to your outreach zones
15 because it seems like you've organized yourselves around
16 those. And I agree with you, you know, looking at some
17 of these subcommittees, figuring out who needs to be and
18 should be in the room, and you know, maybe modifying this
19 a little bit is a really good idea, and obviously we're
20 open to that.

21 And I hope that answers your question.

22 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. I'm just seeing
23 where our time is getting shorter here.

24 Commissioner Kennedy, I know you have some
25 questions, and then I might ask a few more and wrap this

1 up.

2 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I only have one question, and
3 this is something that I had put out on the table for
4 discussion several months ago during the Commission
5 meeting.

6 I just wanted to get your thoughts on possible
7 value. We're talking about how to make best use of our
8 time, particularly before the census data reach us. We
9 know that once the census data reach us, the whole pace
10 and focus, everything will shift. But before the data
11 reach us, do you see value and how would you see best
12 making use of soliciting public comment on the existing
13 2010 cycle districts? We're not asking them anything
14 about the future districts that we're going to draw. We
15 would essentially ask them what was your reaction? How
16 do you feel about, what changes do you think should have
17 been made to the work product of the 2010 Commission? Is
18 that worthwhile? Could it be worthwhile to us?

19 MS. MAC DONALD: That's a really good one. Yeah.
20 So let's talk about the congressional maps. Let's start
21 with that.

22 We are going to know in April whether we're even
23 going to have to have the same, you know, number of
24 districts. And so that particular map may go into a
25 totally different category with respect to this

1 conversation because, you know, we just don't know.

2 I think sometimes people really like to -- a lot of
3 people like to focus on something, comment on something
4 that's already in place, right. So if you already have a
5 map and you ask people what works and what doesn't work,
6 that could potentially work. I have not personally tried
7 that out. I think we need to consider that we have
8 population changes that may not make it possible to
9 respond to those comments. So you may run the danger of
10 kind of inadvertently suggesting that you'll be able to,
11 you know, "fix" a particular problem in a district that
12 you may not be able to do once you see the data, because
13 the districts have to change.

14 So you know, on some level it could be a good idea
15 because you have something that people can comment on.
16 On the other hand, it could backfire on you because you
17 may be creating expectations that you can't meet. And
18 also the question is, you know, how much will you rely on
19 those and can you rely on those districts, you know.

20 Again, there is some Voting Rights concerns probably
21 that may not have been there the last time. So it's
22 something I think you have to carefully think through.

23 But going to the first part of your question, which
24 is how to utilize that period of time, perhaps that month
25 before the Statewide Database out, I mean, you will have

1 the PL94 data, and I think that you may want to have a
2 conversation about starting with the unadjusted data and
3 using the unadjusted data to do some visualizations.
4 Because you can make some assumptions, presumably, about
5 which areas are going to be affected by the prisoner
6 reallocation most tremendously, because, remember, the
7 big areas that are affected are the ones where the
8 inmates are removed from, right, and then I'm thinking of
9 it as a sprinkling of people throughout the State of
10 California, with, of course, some communities being more
11 affected than others, but the biggest effect is going to
12 be on the area that gives us those populations.

13 So I think you could make some reasonable
14 assumptions and perhaps get a starting point that people
15 can actually comment on using visualizations and then,
16 you know, not drawing, obviously, because you don't have
17 the adjusted and the official data, but that could give
18 you a head start on some of the conversations and then
19 people do have something to focus on where they can give
20 you feedback. It's just an idea.

21 Does that answer your question, Commissioner
22 Kennedy?

23 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you.

24 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Sadhwani.

25 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, thank you, and thank

1 you to both of you for your presentation and your
2 proposal. I enjoyed reading them and hearing more about
3 the details of it.

4 I wanted to go back and ask you both a little bit
5 more about the application that you mentioned to the
6 Michigan commission and get a better sense of if you were
7 to get that contract, how you would split your time
8 between California and Michigan and what that would look
9 like as well as thinking more about -- certainly there
10 aren't exact conflicts of interest between California and
11 Michigan. Are there appearances of conflict, however?
12 Are there appearances of conflict to the role of
13 independent commissions at the same firm is ultimately
14 doing redistricting for many of the independent
15 commissions?

16 MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah, I'll start with that. That's
17 a good question. And I think in terms of -- I think the
18 biggest conflict is going to have to do with timing of
19 meetings and public meetings and public hearings, and
20 that's why we have additional individuals on the team who
21 are not working on California and only working in the
22 State of Michigan. So we want to make sure that they're
23 separate there and that we're not stressed out.

24 I mean there is the time zone advantages where, you
25 know, Michigan is two hours ahead, so that there's

1 meetings that overlap. There will be some advantages
2 that we could take place there.

3 But I think largely how we were planning to sort of
4 staff the -- if we were to get Michigan, and again, we're
5 not in there, so if we were to get Michigan and
6 California I think that's something that we have
7 discussed a number of times.

8 And I think the other thing is there's not a lot of
9 redistricting firms out there because this happens only
10 once every ten years, big statewide redistricting in
11 terms of the congressional and the State seats. So I
12 want to make sure that when we're committing to
13 California, we're committing to California, and that's
14 something that we'll work closely with the staff to make
15 sure that we're hitting deadlines.

16 And part of my job as the product manager is to be
17 working with the staff, and you know, the appointed
18 people, the appointed Commissioners, to make sure our
19 project plan is rolling out smoothly, address any, you
20 know, hiccups that may come up. We don't anticipate any,
21 but we want to make sure that we have open lines of
22 communication that we're continuously addressing the
23 needs for in the event of both states, that we're
24 addressing the needs for both states, but we're fully
25 committed to -- and making sure we're not stretched too

1 thin, and we have plans in place to bring on additional
2 people if they're needed.

3 MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you, Andrew, for that, and I
4 would like to add to that that, you know, all these
5 applications come out pretty much at the same time, and
6 you know, we knew that our team was pretty uniquely
7 qualified to work with an independent commission. But
8 you know, we don't take anything for granted. We may
9 feel we're really qualified. We don't know what
10 everybody is looking for. So yeah, so obviously, we, you
11 know, didn't just put all of our eggs in one basket, and
12 we applied to another state. We, you know, talked about
13 it in advance, and you know, Q2 will be taking the lead
14 on California if we -- you know, if you decide to hire
15 us, and Haystaq will be taking the lead on Michigan if,
16 you know, if it turns out that way.

17 And so we just want to make sure that you understand
18 that you really do have our full -- you know, you've got
19 us if you want us. We're here for you, and again, as
20 Andrew said, we all have a larger team. We did not put
21 the entire teams that we have available internally onto
22 this project. We pulled the people that we thought would
23 work the best, and so you know, we put it together that
24 way for a reason. It's very -- we're looking at this
25 very strategically, who can handle X, who has the

1 qualifications for X. And you know, Michigan is a very
2 tiny little state compared to California. It's really a
3 totally different ballpark, you know. You're looking
4 at -- you know, LA, of course, is large, but Michigan in
5 terms of population, it's like the population of LA.

6 So it's a different ballpark, but I just -- you
7 know, I want to assure you that you have our full
8 attention.

9 MR. DRECHSLER: And just one additional thing, and I
10 think we put this in our proposal, that we understand
11 this isn't a 9 to 5 job. We understand that there's
12 going to be meetings that go very late into the night,
13 start very early in the morning, and you know, we
14 committed in the proposal to, you know, as the project
15 manager to, you know, be available to you seven days a
16 week, because there's going to be questions that come up
17 on the weekend about something. So we just want to make
18 sure that we're available to you during those times, both
19 on times and off times that we're addressing your needs.

20 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. That's very
21 helpful. And if I may just ask a little bit more pointed
22 of a question regarding disclosure, and I think this will
23 begin to weave into some of the questions Commissioner
24 Andersen might have prepared for you also.

25 Of course your firms do do other work. You have

1 completed, to the best of my ability, I can tell, a
2 lengthy disclosure form for the RFP that, of course, is a
3 disclosure of those projects you've had in the past. As
4 we move forward over the next year or beyond, as may be,
5 is it something that we can ask of you, to continue to
6 disclose any projects that you might take on and clients
7 that you might take on during this time period for the
8 purposes of full transparency?

9 MR. DRECHSLER: Speaking for Haystaq, a hundred
10 percent yes.

11 MS. MAC DONALD: Yes, absolutely. For us,
12 obviously, yes.

13 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Very good. Thank you.
14 Commissioner Andersen.

15 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah, that does dovetail
16 exactly into -- essentially there are two items, and the
17 good news is I have only a very few questions because
18 most of the Commissioners have picked everything up. So
19 mine are very specific and very pointed, and it does deal
20 with the disclosure.

21 And specifically, there are two sections in the
22 proposal itself which deal with disclosure, one of which
23 is -- there are two different attachments to the
24 proposal. One is your confidentiality and nondisclosure
25 statements, and it definitely says in there that

1 you're -- basically the nondisclosure statement
2 essentially says, you know, everything that you're doing
3 belongs to the Commission and you acknowledge that.

4 We actually do need that form to be filled out by
5 not just the president of the company but actually all
6 the project personnel, and I'm sure that was sort of an
7 oversight on your part.

8 And also the project personnel as they get added
9 need to actually be able to sign that form. Go ahead.

10 MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. I was just going to say that
11 was an oversight. Attachment -- I believe it was
12 attachment H, and we are -- today we were pointed to
13 that, and we are gathering for each of -- not only the
14 current staff, but we will do that for anybody that we
15 add on as well to disclose that.

16 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great. And those are lead
17 positions, obviously.

18 MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah.

19 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Great. And the other item is,
20 and it's called Attachment D, and this is the full
21 disclosure. It's actually conflict of interest. I take
22 that back. And it does have to, just from the public's
23 perspective, most of the public is aware that we have as
24 Commissioners this ten-year history of anything we've
25 done ten years before. We also have five and ten years

1 in the future. And so what we have done in this
2 disclosure is ask you to disclose any and all connections
3 in your previous ten years, which you've actually all
4 been very diligent about, thank you very much. It
5 appears everything is there, hence Commissioner Toledo's
6 question about the Ro Khanna issue.

7 There is one other person which I definitely have to
8 bring up because it would be a bit remiss not to, and it
9 is your John O'Neil who has done great work on the
10 Arizona districting and has done marvelous things in the
11 Princeton work, which I won't get into. However, the
12 last four years he was actually an elected member of the
13 LA County Democratic Party and a delegate -- was actually
14 was elected as a delegate to the State Democratic Party
15 Central Committee.

16 So do we have -- that's something that I'm glad you
17 disclosed, and I really appreciate that because it was
18 exactly what you're required to do. It is up to the
19 Commission to decide, you know, whether that -- what we
20 do with that information. I just want to bring that
21 forward, and I'd like you to be able to comment on what
22 role you thought Mr. O'Neil is doing and how, you know,
23 what he -- you know, how could he remain independent. I
24 sort of ask you to comment on that, please.

25 MR. DRECHSLER: Yes. And so John O'Neil is going to

1 be a member of the mapping team, and the role that we
2 specifically had envisioned for him is to help merge the
3 maps together. When we talked about the zones, the
4 different zones, as those maps come together we wanted to
5 make sure that we, you know, had somebody who was going
6 to be able to bring those maps together.

7 Furthermore, John O'Neil is somebody who is the
8 director of the Redistricting Data Hub, so the last two
9 years he's been in that role, and you know, carrying out
10 that nonpartisan role very diligently, so I would
11 comment, just note that as well, but wanted to make sure
12 that, you know, he is somebody who understands
13 redistricting, also in his track record as he's done work
14 in Florida, and he -- you know, and this was a project
15 that, you know, he's responsible for the maps that the
16 Supreme Court -- the Florida Supreme Court chose and the
17 State of Florida for both the congressional maps and for
18 the State Senate maps, and you know, that the Supreme
19 Court -- the Florida Supreme Court, chose those maps
20 because John O'Neil did those maps in a nonpartisan way.

21 So when it comes to, you know, his ability when it
22 comes to redistricting, he has a proven track record of
23 being nonpartisan and would continue that on this team as
24 well.

25 MS. MAC DONALD: And if could perhaps add to this,

1 Andrew, about the role that that particular -- that John
2 would have. We just figured, you know, it's COVID, and
3 we better just look for somebody who, you know, add
4 somebody to the team who could be an emergency mapper,
5 if, you know, something happens, if somebody got sick or
6 so. So essentially it spoke to the continuity of the
7 project, so he's kind of -- I mean, like a floater, so to
8 speak, should something happen to somebody which we,
9 obviously, don't expect, but you know, it was just built
10 in that way.

11 And as Andrew said, the handoff, so the person that
12 does the handoffs actually doesn't map. This is a person
13 who kind of works and perhaps comes in as a collaborator
14 between the two people -- like the LA person and the
15 person that maps the coastline or so where there is a
16 handoff, and assists them in negotiating how those two
17 maps are put together.

18 We just thought having, you know, another person
19 helping out with that, with that particular technical
20 piece would be a good thing to do. We didn't have that
21 last time. The people -- you know, the mappers last time
22 had to figure it out themselves, but we also know that it
23 would be smoother if somebody else were there who has a
24 lot of mapping expertise who could help them with that.

25 So I think at that point when John would kick in,

1 that would be the point when, you know, your guidance and
2 your districts were already on a map, and it's just
3 making sure that things match; it's kind of like a
4 puzzle, right. So we have these four puzzle pieces and
5 then integrating them with each other and then
6 communicating to all of you where there may be issues.
7 So that's just about the technical piece.

8 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. I wanted
9 to give you a chance -- certainly the credentials are
10 very good, and I just wanted to give you a chance to
11 explain the issues involved and the credentials. So I
12 really appreciate that.

13 It's a wonderful presentation. You certainly
14 covered all our bases; I believe answered all our
15 questions. Unless I see another -- oh, Commissioner
16 Sinay.

17 COMMISSIONER SINAY: This might be a quick and basic
18 question, but what is a handoff? Just to better
19 understand that.

20 MS. MAC DONALD: I apologize to Commissioner Sinay.
21 Thank you for asking that question.

22 Yeah, the handoff is basically how you go from one
23 region that you've mapped to the other region that
24 somebody else has mapped. So it's essentially
25 integrating, and I call it, like, a handoff, you know.

1 So essentially, I'm now done with LA, with this
2 particular very tricky district, and it reaches into
3 somebody else's region, and you know, making sure that
4 that works. So that's the handoff, kind of like a
5 handshake. And I apologize for the completely made-up
6 techy term.

7 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: All right. At this point, I
8 think we're done. We might thank you very much and
9 excuse you, and the Commission might continue on with our
10 discussions.

11 MR. DRECHSLER: Thank you very much for the
12 opportunity to present, and we would be very excited if
13 we were to work with you, each of you. This is an
14 incredible project and understand what you guys are going
15 through, so would love to be part of the team.

16 MS. MAC DONALD: Yes, ditto to all of that. Thank
17 you so much for your time, and for talking to us, and for
18 considering our proposal.

19 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you both very much.

20 MR. DRECHSLER: Good-bye.

21 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: So Chair, I can turn this over
22 to you, or at this point do we want to -- it's now 12:15.
23 I guess we can go to 12:45 before we require a break.

24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Let's have some discussion now and
25 then -- so let's have some discussion around the

1 proposal.

2 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. So at this point what
3 we'd like to do is any overall comments and I think in
4 your mind you probably already -- the criteria we've been
5 looking for ultimately out of this is for the
6 presentation is are they qualified, not qualified, highly
7 qualified, that sort of a ranking kind of, ultimately,
8 and then Commissioner Sadhwani and I will give you our
9 recommendations. We'll discuss a little bit about the
10 entire proposal itself, and put the whole package
11 together and give -- you know, make a recommendation.

12 So at this point, do you want to just -- let's sort
13 of just discuss about the presentation and the plan
14 itself. Any questions or comments?

15 Sara, you went on mute.

16 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sorry. I said or reactions,
17 reactions to the --

18 CHAIR TOLEDO: Linda -- Commissioner Akutagawa, and
19 then Commissioner Fernandez after that.

20 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I guess just reactions and
21 just in terms of the plan itself. I mean, I did like
22 reading through what they proposed. I thought that they
23 had some great ideas.

24 I will also say that, you know, I guess maybe one of
25 the advantages of having someone like Karin who's also

1 involved in it is that they've been listening to our
2 conversations, our discussions as a Commission, and I
3 feel like some of the things that we've been grappling
4 with they tried to also address in terms of proposing
5 perhaps may not necessarily just a solution but just some
6 ideas in which some of the things that we're raising as
7 areas in which we want to focus on was reflected, and I
8 was really happy to see that in the proposal.

9 And so yeah, I would just say I just really
10 appreciated the things that they put down on paper for
11 what they would help to do so that we could accomplish
12 our goals.

13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

14 Commissioner Fernandez and then Commissioner Taylor.

15 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, I agree with
16 Commissioner Akutagawa. I believe they're qualified. It
17 is an advantage because they've been involved already,
18 and I guess I'm just wondering, normally, and maybe this
19 is just part of this process, but normally when we come
20 forward as a subcommittee we'll say what our
21 recommendation is and then we discuss it at that point.
22 So I'm just wondering why you don't have -- you didn't
23 give us your recommendation first and then we can discuss
24 it. So yeah, I don't have any concerns in terms of their
25 qualifications.

1 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: If I might jump in.
2 Commissioner Sadhwani, did you want to answer that
3 because -- we did discuss that, because yes, that's
4 usually what we would do. We didn't want to prejudice
5 the Commission one way or another, so we wanted you to
6 have a look, see what you think, and at this point, I
7 mean, we could just take a straw poll about, you know,
8 qualified.

9 Also it's a little different in that we have the one
10 proposal. Normally we would be adjourning, you know,
11 we'd consider, we'd be writing down, you know, okay, what
12 do we think of this presentation, qualified, well
13 qualified, you know, the different types of essentially
14 ratings, and then we would break and we'd have the next
15 proposal, next presentation. And at which point then
16 we'd collect those and Commissioner Sadhwani and I would
17 say, now, because in the RFP there are many components of
18 this, and we have essentially a rating for the rest of
19 the components of the RFP, which we could discuss. So
20 that's the reason why we're doing it in a staggered step.

21 CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's go to Commissioner Taylor,
22 hear from him, and then do a straw poll, and at that
23 point we'll entertain a motion from the -- a motion or a
24 recommendation from the committee.

25 Commissioner Taylor.

1 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you, Chair. I thought
2 as a reaction to the presentation that they spoke to
3 being collaborative and especially agile to be able to
4 suit our needs, and I think that's an extremely important
5 component when we talk about the relationship between
6 data management, data analysis, and interpretation.
7 Thank you.

8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.

9 In terms of -- let's do a straw poll first just to
10 see where people are and then we can continue on with the
11 conversation.

12 Everyone who believes this proposal meets the
13 qualifications -- I don't remember the exact language you
14 wanted to use, Commissioner Andersen. I believe it's
15 meets the expectations.

16 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, actually, it really is.
17 The cutoff line is qualified, and anything above that,
18 you know, does anyone think that they're not qualified?

19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Or vice versa. Does everybody
20 believe that they are qualified? Let's start with that.
21 Does everybody believe that they are qualified? Raise
22 your hand if you do.

23 I'm not saying one Commissioner raise his hand.
24 Does anybody think that this proposal -- this proposer is
25 not qualified, raise their hand? So no one. It looks

1 like we have consensus that the proposal is qualified at
2 this point.

3 Commissioner Fernandez, Commissioner Ahmad, and
4 Commissioner Sinay, and then we'll entertain a motion if
5 there is one on the floor.

6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, I was just saying
7 that I thought they were qualified, but I can submit a
8 motion if you want. That's fine. I was just saying,
9 yes, they're qualified.

10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Okay. Commissioner Ahmad.

11 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. I did raise
12 my hand and I agree that they are qualified to complete
13 the task at hand. I am curious to understand though,
14 does qualified also mean minimal conflict of interest as
15 well, considering the discussions that we've had with the
16 proposers themselves?

17 My other question is actually related to process.
18 So are we actually voting to potentially hire this
19 applicant today, or are we just trying to get on the same
20 page in terms of whether they are qualified or not?

21 CHAIR TOLEDO: My understanding there is a potential
22 for up or down vote on this applicant today -- for today.

23 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay. And then in that, I
24 think I need more clarity in terms of what does the
25 negotiation process look like in terms of the plan

1 itself, and who is taking that on on our team, and what
2 that time line looks like as well.

3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Good question. Commissioner Sadhwani
4 and Andersen, do you want to tackle that question?

5 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, a couple of thoughts.
6 So in terms of process, and Commissioner Andersen, feel
7 free to jump in here, one of the key steps -- had we
8 received multiple proposals one of the key steps -- first
9 steps, would have been to identify whether those
10 proposers are qualified or not qualified. And so that's
11 really the piece that we're doing at this point in time.
12 From there, we can -- we can then discuss, do we actually
13 want to hire them. My understanding is that we can vote
14 today as to our intent to hire and intent to develop a
15 contract with them, in which case then we would go forth
16 in advancing that contract.

17 As far as I'm concerned, the plan should not be a
18 part of that contract for the most part. The number of
19 meetings, perhaps, the finances, which have not been
20 revealed at this point in time, are all of the components
21 that we would still have yet to -- to determine. I see
22 Commissioner Andersen shaking her head, so do you have
23 something different than that?

24 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. Let's see, yeah. Okay,
25 there we go. The cost portion has been released. It

1 was -- as part of the contract, as part of the way this
2 works, as soon as we begin talking about the proposers,
3 the cost portion is posted.

4 So essentially what we would be doing today is
5 saying, yes, we do, indeed, think this is qualified.
6 Even if we were at the end of all the different
7 presentations we would be talking about -- if someone we
8 saw not qualified at all we would dismiss that proposal
9 from the group. But then we would be discussing the
10 entire proposal and at one point then voting on the
11 different people.

12 So what we're doing this time is essentially the
13 motion would be, since we have one proposal, we would
14 like to propose that we intend to award the contract to
15 this particular group. And at that point -- and that
16 would be a full up or down vote.

17 We need to discuss it, and as part of those are,
18 indeed, what exactly do we want for essentially the
19 nondisclosure portions, you know, do we say, yes, that
20 will work, no, that won't. These are portions that we
21 would then add and discuss in terms of can we go forward
22 with the contract.

23 In terms of numbers of meetings, that sort of thing,
24 that is written in the RFP. There's a minimum, and then
25 they have to give costs for additional meetings. So that

1 is to be determined by us. That's not a make or break on
2 the contract.

3 So hopefully, that did answer a few questions.

4 CHAIR TOLEDO: I have a question, and then after
5 that, Commissioner Fornaciari and then Commissioner
6 Sadhwani. And my question is does the subcommittee
7 envision itself being -- if we were to motion and move
8 forward with an intent to award, would the subcommittee
9 be the entity that would be negotiating the terms of the
10 contract? Would your committee be taking on the lead?

11 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes.

12 CHAIR TOLEDO: In the negotiating of terms, working
13 with staff on finalizing the contracting process.

14 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: There's -- actually there's
15 very little -- from the Commission in terms of we say a
16 particular -- essentially, you know, when I mentioned
17 this item H, you have to fill out, item D, if we say we
18 actually did add in, and they've already publicly said
19 yes. The issue is, yes, we have to know everything about
20 what they're doing up until the ten years. Can they work
21 on other projects during? Right now they must disclose
22 anything that they may be contemplating. If we wanted to
23 put an additional, no, you can't be working on anything
24 while you're working with us. That item would then -- we
25 would take that idea but legal would actually work on

1 this because ultimately the contract gets -- we can put
2 these little parts in and we can say with the proposer,
3 yes, we would agree to that. Then legal, actually --
4 legal being I think it's OSL actually comes up with this
5 is the final contract, bingo, yes, and they sign it.

6 So we're more of a -- we are the people who work
7 with the proposer and hand it to legal, if that helps.

8 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you for the clarification.

9 Commissioner Fornaciari.

10 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I think Commissioner Sinay
11 was ahead of me, and I was just going to answer -- try to
12 answer Commissioner Ahmad's question.

13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sinay, and then we'll go
14 back to Commissioner Fornaciari.

15 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. So I completely blanked
16 out on my question again. Go ahead.

17 CHAIR TOLEDO: We'll come back to you.

18 Commissioner Fornaciari.

19 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So Commissioner Ahmad, you
20 asked about the plan and how are we going to manage the
21 plan. And I was going -- I'm going to propose later in
22 this meeting to revisit a suggestion by Commissioner
23 Sadhwani that we put together a larger subcommittee that
24 would meet in public that would be some combination of
25 the outreach committee, the line drawing committee, the

1 language access committee, probably the data management
2 committee. You know, we have to figure out how we manage
3 it in a way that we don't get a quorum for this. But you
4 know, just like the legal subcommittee gets together, we
5 get representatives of each of the committees that are,
6 you know -- that have, you know, interest in the plan and
7 work with our outreach team, work with the line drawing
8 organization that we bring in, and develop a plan for our
9 public input and line drawing meetings. So I mean,
10 that's what I was going to propose.

11 I mean, it's up to the Commission how we go forward
12 with it. But I thought, you know, it would be a
13 collaborative effort with the line drawers and our
14 outreach committee -- I mean, our outreach staff and the
15 various subcommittees.

16 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you.

17 Commissioner Sadhwani and then Commissioner
18 Andersen.

19 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh, I was actually just
20 going to respond to Commissioner Ahmad's question about
21 disclosure. And at this point in time the RFP merely
22 asked for a disclosure of conflicts of interest, and that
23 didn't preclude people from applying or being qualified
24 if they had potential conflicts of interest, simply that
25 they had to be disclosed.

1 I think there was -- in many of the conversations
2 that Commissioner Andersen and I had with individuals who
3 are engaged in redistricting, there's a clear sense --
4 they said it multiple times today. It only happens once
5 every ten years, so in the meantime they have to do
6 something. So most firms are going to have some kind of
7 conflict of interest potentially. We didn't want that to
8 stop people from applying, which is why we opted for
9 disclosure. That's certainly something we can discuss
10 further as we move into the contracting phase.

11 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Andersen.

12 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I just want to say, yes, the
13 plan -- working on the plan is something -- this was
14 their idea. And we've already had a bunch of discussions
15 in through our meetings back and forth of, that's not
16 exactly what we're thinking. And oh, that really is --
17 back and forth, and this -- even just on the discussion
18 of time lines, this is another idea that -- so what we're
19 looking for here is, is this a group that we go, we could
20 work with these guys. These guys are interested. It
21 isn't like, this is what we want to do, period. This is
22 take it or leave it. Do we feel that they have
23 flexibility, that this a group we could work with,
24 because we know amongst the whole Commission in terms of
25 things that would work?

1 I know the outreach plan has many issues, is like,
2 that's not quite how we're saying it, and a little bit --
3 we have more input for the plan that we want to use. And
4 I believe that would be a further discussion of what do
5 we want to do with the time frame, like Commissioner
6 Kennedy brought up.

7 These are all items that we will discuss in the next
8 portion of one of our meetings, and actually set up time
9 of once we kind of know our window, you know, when is
10 that, is it February 15th, is it not, that part, we
11 actually work on what do we want to do in this extra
12 period of time. But that's not a discussion we need to
13 have now, but the idea -- my intent on all of that was
14 it's a full Commission, not just a few of the
15 subcommittees, because I think everyone has ideas, and
16 then we can break those portions into our subcommittees.

17 But I don't want us to work -- I don't want us to
18 focus on what is our plan right now. This is, do we
19 like. This is an idea that has never been completely
20 formulated as much as it has been right now. And I love
21 that we're all trying to jump in on it, because that's
22 exactly what we want to do. And let's do that. I think
23 we've allotted some time in some of our meetings coming
24 up that we can actually specifically do just that. So I
25 would like us to move forward.

1 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen. At
2 this time is there a motion on the floor for an intent to
3 award? Commissioner Andersen.

4 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I move that we -- that we
5 -- I move that we go ahead and vote to -- that we approve
6 the Haystaq/Q2 team with the intent to award the
7 contract.

8 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Second.

9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Discussion? Commissioner Sinay.

10 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think one of my big concerns
11 is if they get the contract in Michigan and they get the
12 contract in California. Yes, Michigan might be small,
13 but it is a new redistricting effort and so that takes a
14 lot of effort. I know it's up to them how they balance
15 that, but I did want to put that out there.

16 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.
17 Commissioner Turner.

18 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. To that
19 point, did I understand them to say they had a larger
20 group of employees or people that are going to work with
21 it, and that would be something that would be parsed out
22 specifically perhaps to a different group, and maybe if
23 we need to get clarification about that, we can, but I'm
24 walking away thinking that if they are awarded also
25 Michigan there would be a different group of individuals

1 working on that.

2 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sinay and then
3 Commissioner Fernandez.

4 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think clarity would be great,
5 because they did say that they were going to have a
6 different group, but it didn't sound -- it sounded like
7 the two -- the program director and the program manager,
8 the two top people would be working on both, and so I
9 think that's where we need the clarity.

10 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fernandez.

11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, I was just going to
12 validate what Commissioner Turner said, is that that
13 question was raised to them and they did say that they
14 would have separate set of individuals and line drawers
15 working on that effort, so personally I'm not concerned
16 if they are awarded that contract. And again, they are a
17 business and you can't rely on just one -- one contract.
18 So that's it.

19 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Sadhwani.

20 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I just wanted to share, I
21 failed to share earlier that Commissioner Andersen and I
22 did contact all of the references that were listed, and
23 happy to answer any questions there, but overwhelmingly
24 all of the different individuals that we spoke with spoke
25 very highly of both firms, of the work here in California

1 and San Diego as well, as Haystaq's work in Arizona in
2 the 2010 commission.

3 So I just wanted to add that, that we have done that
4 due diligence, and as expected, right. We don't
5 typically put references that wouldn't say bad things
6 about you, but a host of different political parties and
7 positions within the redistricting process, and all of
8 them came back with very high regard of both firms.

9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Any other comment before we go to
10 public comment? I am seeing hands being raised in public
11 comment. Commissioner Andersen.

12 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: On the line of the references,
13 and I did bring up Mr. John O'Neil, I spoke to the -- in
14 Arizona and they were extremely divided. It was there --
15 they actually had five commissioners, two Republican, two
16 Democrat, one independent, and to the point where they
17 actually had Republican legal counsel, Democratic legal
18 counsel. I mean, they were extremely -- and the maps,
19 not only were they -- I mean, the group did have to write
20 out a -- because Q2 -- not Q2, Haystaq was more of a
21 Democrat, and my understanding if by the end of it all
22 the Republicans were saying, wow, where was the
23 Republican version of these guys. These guys were
24 actually fantastic.

25 And John O'Neil, as I said, this was the first time

1 in Arizona's history, he was responsible for putting
2 together the map and it precleared Section 5. It was the
3 first time in Arizona's history.

4 So yes, he does have serious Democrat connections,
5 and I think that's something as a Commission I was
6 expected to talk a bit more about that, how do we feel,
7 what's the perception on it. But he does have amazing
8 credentials of impartiality. And you know, unfortunately
9 the redistricting portion only happens for about, you
10 know, two to three years maximum, and then what do you do
11 the rest of the time until another ten years. So I just
12 thought I'd bring that up. But raving, raving reviews
13 about everyone and each member on the teams.

14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.
15 Any other comments before we go to public comment?

16 With that, Katy, can you please open up the phone
17 line?

18 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Chair, I'm seeing
19 Commission Kennedy, real fast.

20 CHAIR TOLEDO: Oh, Commissioner Kennedy.

21 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I just
22 want to say that I'm not expressing opinions on this out
23 of an abundance of caution. I've had a sporadic
24 professional relationship with Karin Mac Donald since
25 2007, and so just to -- out of an abundance of caution,

1 and particularly if my vote is not necessary, I don't
2 intend to participate beyond listening. But just wanted
3 that to be out there. Thank you.

4 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.
5 Commissioner Akutagawa.

6 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'm sorry to ask this
7 question, but I am curious. I know we have people in
8 queue for public comment. I also want to just note that
9 I think we're getting past the time that we're required
10 to take a break, so --

11 CHAIR TOLEDO: I just asked the question to Katy and
12 to Kristian about a break.

13 MR. MANOFF: Chair --

14 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes.

15 MR. MANOFF: We are good to go, if we can just -- we
16 just want to get through public comment.

17 CHAIR TOLEDO: So let's do public comment and see
18 where we're at that point, given that we're planning to
19 go to lunch after that and then not come back for
20 public -- not come back to public session. Thank you.

21 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Sounds good, Chair. All
22 right. In order to maximize transparency and public
23 participation in our process, the Commissioners will be
24 taking public comment 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 I.D. number provided on the
3 livestream feed, it is 93047167360 for this week's
4 meeting. When prompted to enter a participant I.D.,
5 simply press the pound key.

6 Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a
7 queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press
8 star 9. This will raise your hand for the moderator.

9 When it is your turn to speak, you will hear a
10 message that says, "The host would like you to talk", and
11 to press star 6 to speak.

12 If you would like to give your name, please state
13 and spell it for the record. You are not required to
14 provide your name to give public comment.

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

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

21 The Commission is taking public comment at this time
22 on the line drawing -- item 11. Sorry.

23 And we do have someone with their hand up, and I
24 will open their line. And the line is open for you.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I was listening to the

1 presentation earlier, and I understand that it is a
2 challenge for a firm to work with the Commission to know
3 what to do for the next ten years. And it's one thing
4 for Commissioners to say they won't run for office for
5 the next ten years, but when you have actual jobs to go
6 back to it's more difficult for these firms that are
7 doing -- putting the bids in for the redistricting. And
8 I assume you're not planning on paying your consultants
9 enough so that they don't have to work for anyone else
10 for the next ten years. Paying them that much would
11 honestly be a terrible waste of taxpayer dollars, so
12 conflicts may be inevitable. It is a challenging
13 balancing act.

14 And I will say you should give these firms credit
15 for the fact that they actually did disclose to you. You
16 asked a lot from them and they provided a lot of
17 information to you. As I said, I was listening a little
18 bit earlier today.

19 You saw a letter about another firm not doing all of
20 their disclosures. This team, on the other hand
21 indicated they were not only happy, but thought it was
22 important to do those disclosures. That speaks an awful
23 lot for their willingness to live up to the spirit of the
24 law to ensure citizens and not politicians draw the
25 lines. And I have no doubts, based on their

1 presentation, they will work with the Commission to
2 address any issues that may arise.

3 I want to thank you all for the work that you do,
4 and thank you for taking my comment.

5 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And for those in the
6 queue, if you would like to make a comment, please press
7 star 9 to raise your hand. But as of this time, that was
8 the only person that had raised their hand.

9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Katy. We'll wait a
10 minute.

11 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Just so you know, Chair,
12 the instructions are complete on the stream.

13 CHAIR TOLEDO: Appreciate it. Thank you. With
14 that, we'll close public comment and go to a -- are we
15 ready to take a vote? Commissioner Andersen.

16 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: I do want us to mention,
17 because, you know, the cost portion is open. We have not
18 actually discussed that, which we should. And it's on
19 our website. It actually was forwarded to us -- I see
20 Commissioner Sinay. Or I can just give it.

21 Essentially, the basic cost is at 1.5 million, and
22 with the additional meetings that we asked for you know,
23 based on different ones, it's 1.6. So that's kind of
24 what's in our -- I think people were thinking about that.
25 I don't remember exactly what it was in 2011. Well, I'll

1 just say that. I'll just say that. And I see other
2 hands up.

3 CHAIR TOLEDO: Commissioner Fernandez.

4 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just wanted to comment on
5 that, that we had budgeted 1.5 million for line drawers,
6 so it's right in the -- basically the same amount, and
7 that was -- did I go off? That was 1.5 without
8 additional.

9 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez. I
10 don't see any other hands up at this point. Given that's
11 the case, I'm willing to ask Ms. Sheffield for a roll
12 call, or for a vote.

13 MR. HERNANDEZ: Ms. Sheffield is not here, so I will
14 go ahead and do that. This is Executive Director
15 Hernandez.

16 Okay, so the motion is to move ahead and vote to
17 approve HaystaqDNA and Q2 Data and Research with the
18 intent to award. It was motioned by Commissioner
19 Andersen, seconded by Commissioner Sadhwani.

20 Commissioner Turner.

21 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

22 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Vazquez.

23 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.

24 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Yee.

25 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

1 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Ahmad.

2 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.

3 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Akutagawa.

4 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

5 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen.

6 VICE CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes.

7 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fernandez.

8 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

9 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fornaciari.

10 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.

11 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Kennedy.

12 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Abstain.

13 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Le Mons.

14 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

15 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sadhwani.

16 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

17 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay.

18 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

19 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Taylor.

20 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

21 MR. HERNANDEZ: And Commissioner Toledo.

22 CHAIR TOLEDO: Yes.

23 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay, so we have all but one.

24 CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Director Hernandez. We

25 will be going to lunch at this time, and coming back into

1 closed session. So we won't be coming back to public
2 session today. We'll be coming back tomorrow at 9:30.
3 In terms of closed session, we'll be starting at -- it's
4 almost 1 o'clock right now, so let's aim for 2 o'clock
5 for closed session, and go from there. So we'll see you
6 back at 2 o'clock at closed session, and we'll see the
7 public tomorrow at 9:30. Thank you.

8 (Whereupon, the CRC Business Meeting adjourned
9 at 12:52 p.m.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF 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

TRACI FINE, CDLT-169

June 27, 2022
DATE

