STATE OF CALIFORNIA 2020 CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION (CRC)

In the matter of:

PUBLIC MEETING

721 Capitol Mall, 2nd Floor Sacramento, California 95814

> MONDAY, MARCH 8, 2021 9:30 A.M.

Reported by: Peter Petty

APPEARANCES

Commissioners

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

Staff

Alvaro E. Hernandez, Executive Director Marian Johnston, Interim Counsel Fredy Ceja, Communications Director

Also Present

Technical Contractors Public Comment Moderator Kristian Manoff, AV Technical Director

Presenters

Public Comment Jeanine Erikat, PANA

Reese Hollan Renee Westa-Lusk Karen Diaz, CHIRLA Deborah Howard, California Senior Advocates League Lori Shellenberger, California Common Cause

		3
INDEX		
Call to Order and Roll Call	4	
Opening Public Comment	5	
General Announcements	12	
Chair's Report	13	
Executive Director Report	14	
Counsel Report	16	
Communications Director Report	18	
Subcommittee Reports Census Finance and Administration Gantt Chart Line Drawer VRA Compliance Outreach and Engagement Language Access Materials Development Data Management	20 24 27 27 30 32 72, 94-101 83 84	
Public Comment	96	
Grants Communities of Interest Tool Cybersecurity Incarcerated Population Lessons Learned Chief Counsel Recruitment Legal Affairs	101 102 104 105 105 107	
Public Comment	111	
Public Input Meeting Design	121	
Discussion Future Meeting Dates and Agenda	151	

	PROCEDINGS
1	Monday, March 8, 2021 9:30 a.m.
2	CHAIR ANDERSEN: I will call this meeting to
3	order. Ms. Sheffield, please call the roll.
4	MS. SHEFFIELD: Good morning, commissioners.
5	Commissioner Fernandez.
6	(no audible reply)
7	MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Fornaciari.
8	COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.
9	MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Kennedy.
10	VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Here.
11	MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Le Mons.
12	COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here.
13	MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Sadhwani.
14	(no audible reply)
15	MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Sinay.
16	COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.
17	MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Taylor.
18	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Present.
19	MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Toledo.
20	COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Here.
21	MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Turner. I see you.
22	COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.
23	MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Vasquez.
24	COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Here.

1 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Yee. 2 COMMISSIONER YEE: Here. 3 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Ahmad. 4 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here. Thank you. 5 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Akutagawa. 6 (No audible reply) 7 MS. SHEFFIELD: And Commissioner Andersen. 8 Thank you, Ms. Sheffield. CHAIR ANDERSEN: Here. 9 It appears we have a quorum and the meeting is underway. 10 Good morning and welcome to the March 8 and 9, 11 2021 meeting of the California Citizens Redistricting I am Jane Andersen. I am the rotating chair 12 Commission. 13 for this meeting, and our rotating vice chair is 14 Commissioner Ray Kennedy. 15 At this point we are going to move right into the 16 What we commonly do is we request and open our 17 floors for any public comment. 18 Kristian, would you please read the instructions 19 for public comment at this time. 20 MR. MANOFF: Yes, Chair. In order to maximize 21 transparency and public participation in our process, the 22 commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. 23 To call in, dial the telephone number provided on 24 the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted, 25 enter the meeting I.D. number provided on the livestream

feed. It is 98938125973 for this week's meeting. When prompted to enter a participant I.D., simply press pound.

Once you've dialed in you'll be placed in a queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press star nine. This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it's your turn to speak you'll hear a message that says, "The host would like you to talk. Press star six to speak."

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

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

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

And it does look like we have some people for public comment. Stand by, Chair.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Please invite them in when you're ready.

MR. MANOFF: I will. Just a moment. Go ahead, caller.

MS. ERIKAT: Good morning. My name is Jeanine Erikat. That's J-E-A-N-I-N-E, last name, E-R-I-K-A-T.

I'm calling to say today that -- I'm with the Partnership for Advancement of New Americans, as you all know.

We appreciate that the Commission is providing interpretation upon request for someone who speaks a non-English language and wants to give public comment or provide community of interest testimony. However, that interpretation should extend to the hearing, itself.

Being able to hear the Commission's discussion is an essential part of participating in a meeting, and, at minimum, we ask that the Commission should provide interpretation for the full meeting whenever the Commission is providing interpretation of the comment period.

Under the current plan this means interpretation will be provided only on request when a non-English community member submits a request indicating they want to participate.

Public engagement with Commission meetings includes two-way communication, community members listening to what the Commission has to say, as well as sharing their own thoughts via public comment. Community members should be able to fully engage without being required to speak and understand English.

I know you all have been working very hard on this, and I thank you all for your time and look forward to

today's meeting.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you for your comment.

Yes, we are looking into that, and that is an ongoing concern of ours. Appreciate your comments.

Next in the queue, please.

MR. MANOFF: Go ahead, caller.

MR. HOLLAN: Hi, there. This is Reese Hollan (phonetic) from Simi Valley.

I couldn't quite tell from the agenda if the thing that I'd like to speak about is actually one of the subjects for today, and would request that in the future the agenda has a little bit more or close detail about each action item so we can have a bit better idea of what everything is about.

But the main concern for me is more just about the consideration of where the actual lines are going to go down. Simi Valley has been kind of gerrymandered out of Ventura County for a long time. It's been grouped up with San Clarita Valley, Canyon County area, I believe Fillmore and Piru as well, and really it doesn't have much to do with those areas. It's more trying to get out of that and rejoin more of the connected parts of Ventura County that it's associated with, you know, going into Moorpark and Thousand Oaks and further west into the county.

So, along those lines it would be -- I guess the

thing that I'm hoping will be considered during the redistricting process is getting Simi Valley out of Assembly District 38 and Congressional District 35, and instead, rejoining the county by going into Assembly District 44 and Congressional District 26, if, you know, those remain as they are by the time the process is done.

That's the majority of it. Thank you very much for your time, everybody, and I will appreciate hearing the rest of the meeting here.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you for the comment. That is something you can sort of address. We're very excited to announce our community of interest tool, which you can access through our website. It also has its own standalone website, and that is something you can certainly go in and draw your issues and try to put that involved in where -- what group your community is.

So, we invite anyone at this time, or in the future coming up to please look at that. It's called drawmyCAcommunity.org for the community of interest tool, and you can tell us where your community is and where you'd like it to -- what communities you'd like it to stay with. So, thank you for the comments.

Kristian, next in the queue, please.

MR. MANOFF: Yes, Chair.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: By him calling in, that is considered a public comment and will also be collected, correct? That's one of the ways to receive public comment as well as the tool.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, you're absolutely right. Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

MR. MANOFF: Go ahead, caller.

MS. WESTA-LUSK: Yeah. This is Renee Westa-Lusk. Name is spelled R-E-N-E-E, last name is W-E-S-T-A, hyphen, L-U-S-K. I have a few comments. One is a question.

The first one is I've been trying to find the videos for the 2010 Commission, and when you click on the archive, the video is going to the .CA.gov website.

They're like nonexistent. So, what has happened to the videos of the 2010 Commission?

I don't know. I haven't been able to watch all your meetings, so I don't know if this was discussed. Are they permanently gone, or will they be reinstated to the website?

And then my second comment has to do with I've been going over your Redistricting Basics handout, and you've revised it, but in there are you going to explain to communities how -- what kind of information you want on communities of interest other than just drawing a map? I mean because people will be supposedly attending virtual

hearings throughout the state. Will you be giving guidelines on what you want to hear from communities, and maybe things they should avoid giving testimony on like getting into partisan political issues, et cetera? Will there be any kind of examples that you can say, well, you know, if you're a community of interest, you should show this, and this, and this? I think there needs to be some kind of instruction so people know what to say about their communities that's important to the Commission. And that's the rest of my comments. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you for that. Regarding the 2010 videos, we are trying to restore the entire data from the 2010 Commission. Some of that we are having a bit of trouble getting, which includes the videos. We are working on that. Thank you.

And as far as -- thank you for the comments on the educational materials and the instructions for the COI. Later on today we will be discussing the education materials, and that's a very helpful idea in terms of what additional information we should be putting together. So, thank you for the comment.

Kristian, do we have any more people in the queue?

MR. MANOFF: As a reminder, if you have called in and you would like to give public comment, please press

star nine to raise your hand. We do not have anybody with their hand raised at this time, Chair.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. At this point we'll go into the agenda, itself. Next is some general announcements or Commissioner updates. Anyone have anything to report? Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think this is where we talk just about where we've been out in the community. I know we've gone back and forth. But I did do three of our overview redistricting presentations. I did one for 25 first-generation college students, the one big group at MiraCosta College, one at Palomar College. Both of those are community colleges in North San Diego County, and Encinitas North Coast Dem Club, so I did three, with the presentations.

And then we also, Isra and I -- I'm sorry,

Commissioner Ahmad and I met with the Imperial LGBT Center,

and this week coming up for statewide outreach, Neal and I

will be meeting with the GOP Leadership Equality California

and the NAACP, and Commissioner Ahmad and I are looking at

meeting with the Library Association -- State of California

Library Association. And these are all our efforts to make

partnerships with those groups to help the local outreach

efforts.

And then we have some zone outreach, including

the North San Diego LGBT Center, United Way of Northern California, Cal Strategies and San Diego Chamber of Commerce.

So, just moving along on doing both the statewide and the local outreach.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Any other commissioners? Seeing no other, it's time for the Chair's report.

At our closed session on February 24 to 26, the Commission did take action on two matters. The first was a personnel matter, and the second was a potential litigation matter.

Now, I would like to bring your attention on the agenda to a couple of items. Specifically, tomorrow we will be having an education panel. That's item number 11 on the agenda. Basically, there are no serious changes to the agenda. It stands as is.

I do want to report that there had been a bit of a glitch on our March 16, 17 agenda. It had been posted with incorrect days. The dates were correct, the incorrect days. We were a bit excited about our community of interest tool. We got a little ahead of ourselves. And, so, next week those meetings are on Tuesday and Wednesday, 16th, 17th, with also there will be -- as you see, there is also a subcommittee that will be discussed later on today,

and that's also on the 18th. So, that is currently up to date on our website.

2.2.

That's the extent of my report, so at this point we'll go into number five on the agenda, which is our Executive Director's Report, which we'll have by our Executive Director Hernandez.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, Commissioners.

So, we're moving on, as you heard already, with our outreach plan, and there will be more information shared at the subcommittee outreach and engagement report.

But I wanted to talk about some of the staff and personnel issues. So, Commissioner Fernandez and I will be interviewing for the Commission secretary later this week. We just got word that one of the candidates just dropped out, so one last candidate to interview.

We are still working on finalizing the field lead staff positions, and we'll be working with the appropriate subcommittees to finalize them. I think we're very close to getting those. Once we have those ready to go, we'll be posting them on our website, so you could look out for those.

I've also been working with the Finance and Administration Subcommittee to review our organizational chart we had talked about, including our staffing needs, so

we're still working on that and hope to have that available to you by the next meeting next week.

In regards to the protocols for Commission communications, we were informed last week that at the Department of Rehabilitation that there was a COVID case reported, so once again, we are taking the appropriate measures here as required. The face masks, as you can see, we're wearing the face masks here in the office, but just wanted to let you know that that came through as of last week.

I also want to defer to the subcommittee Finance and Administration to provide additional updates on other protocols that we have.

Next I'll go into the budget. The staff is working with the various subcommittees to determine possible budget impacts that they foresee with the delay of the census information. We'll then provide that information to the fiscal director who is going to put that information and adjust as necessary, and at that point we'll have that information available and posted.

We also received a letter from the Legislature asking that we make sure that we're tracking the expenses and differentiate those expenses that are attributable to the changing timeline. So, our fiscal director is doing that ongoing as well.

We also are preparing to submit the May revised letter that's due later this month, and so our fiscal director will be putting that information together to submit to the Department of Finance.

We also are going to be posting an RFP for our videographer and we'll have casting services very soon that people should be on the lookout for.

And as far as the date, the final due date, I think that's still something that we have not heard about and, hopefully, we'll be hearing more information in that regards, because I think that will help us in our planning and our budgeting as well.

As far as outreach, again, I'm going to defer to our subcommittee to provide additional information on our outreach and engagement activities.

That concludes my report.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. At this point, we're going to jump into our counsel report. Ms. Johnston, would you please give our counsel report.

MS. JOHNSTON: Thank you. There's a couple of pieces of legislation that I'm following that would affect you all, and I wanted to report on the argument in the Arizona case before the United States Supreme Court. I know you're going to be talking about this more in your subcommittee, so I just wanted to give you the highlights.

AB339 would amend Bagley-Keene to require translation if 5 percent of a population speaks a particular language. That would obviously change the requirements that you all would provide as far as interpretation goes, so we'll be following that.

HR1, House Representatives Resolution Number 1, did pass the House and is now pending in the Senate. It largely concerns voting rights, but there is a section dealing with independent redistricting commissions, so I wanted to call to your attention, and that's something you should keep an eye on.

on the argument in the Supreme Court, the issue is whether some of the changes that Arizona made for the last election violate Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act, and it was hard to tell from the Court's argument which way they're going to go. They did seem to allow practices that have been in effect for quite a while, even if they had an adverse effect on people who were less educated or were poorer, such as distance traveling, things like that. They seemed to accept certain limitations such as not having voting open on Sundays, but again, it's really hard to tell, so we'll be looking forward to that decision when it comes out.

Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Ms. Johnson. Those

are obviously extremely important issues, and I appreciate you keeping us up to date on that. We'll be definitely hearing more about those in our subcommittees, so I might not ask for questions at this time about those, but wait until they come up in the subcommittee.

And at this point we're going to our communications director report. Director Ceja.

COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR CEJA: Thank you very much, Madam Chair.

I wanted to thank all commissioners for taking the time last week to take the redistricting basics video. That footage is now with the videographer who was on the Zoom call with us, Joey. So, he'll start putting those together, and as soon as I have a draft, I'll shoot those out for your viewing pleasure.

I also wanted to mention that your backgrounds look amazing, so, very cool. You've got some California scenes out there that look really cool.

We did send out a press release last week for the COI tool, which is now live. Wanted to mention that the Statewide Data Base did say that they got a bump in numbers for COI tool submittals which is pretty cool. That's the whole point of sending this out.

And this week we'll be sending out an additional press release to highlight the new languages that will be

available for the COI tool, including Chinese, or traditional Chinese, simplified Chinese as Tagalog. I'm sure the committee will make mention of that. So, we'll get that ready and push it out as soon as that's ready to go.

CDC did issue guidance today regarding vaccinated persons, I found out in an email earlier today. So, pretty much indicating for those individuals that are vaccinated, they are allowed now to gather indoors without masks and without social distancing, which could potentially give us a green light in the near future to do in-person meetings. I just wanted to bring that up.

And Commissioner Ahmad had sent me an email over the weekend asking if it was okay to add California

Government Code Section 8253(a)(3) which we include in our presentation, letting the public know that we cannot take public comment outside of these meetings or public input meetings, and she was wondering if it was okay to add that to the signature for commissioners, so whenever you're messaging with the public that they know that they can't submit public comments through email, that that's not the proper channel, and then we would, of course, ask them to go on our website and send us a message or join us live here at the meeting.

So, if that's okay, I'll send out the language

and we can all add it -- or commissioners can add it to their signature line.

And then, lastly, just wanted to report that for this week and the next we'll be focusing on pitching stories for commissioners, so those of you that have made yourself available for stories, thank you so much. We have two stories in the works right now, and we hope to increase that over the next coming days.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Yes, please go ahead with that, including that language on our -- that will be extremely helpful. And thank you very much for the report.

We're zooming right along here. Now we're going to start with our subcommittee updates. And we'll just lead off with a big one, the Action on Census -- oh, I'm sorry, it's called now the Government Affairs Census Group. Commissioner Sadhwani and Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure, thank you. So,
Commissioner Toledo and I are continuing to work on just
coordinating with other groups around the census timeline
and talking with other key stakeholders.

As we already reported, we had a conversation with Ethan Jones of the Legislature. We are in the works to do conversations also with the Secretary of State's office, as well as potentially some of the other local redistricting commissions. We've made contact, at least,

with the L.A. City Commission and looking at others. If you have contacts for any of those, we would certainly appreciate that. Certainly there's several throughout the state.

We also just received contact information for a -- my understanding it's like a governing body of all of the county clerks, so we'll also be reaching out with them. We figure that might be easier than trying to reach every single county just to kind of have a good faith effort to talk with everyone about their thoughts in terms of the census delay.

Of course, we will need to take action at some point in the very near future to figure out what our timeline will be. I think that that should really be a key issue that we should bring up as soon as we have our line drawer on board and scheduled to speak with us in a meeting. I think getting their perspective on how quickly we can work would be very helpful, because, of course, even though we have until February of next year, if we think we can get it done sooner, I think that that would be helpful for many other stakeholders involved.

In addition, just to follow up, you know, on Marian's report on HR1, Commissioner Toledo and I will also be tracking that, and I think if there's any discussion here that would be great. As we read it, the mandate to

create independent commissions for all states is, of course, very exciting. We want to take a closer look at those provisions and just to make sure that that doesn't negatively impact our Commission at all. Marian had raised some potential concerns that there could be some impact to us and that perhaps we might want to reach out to our Senators to ensure that our Commission could move forward without interruption. So, certainly, that's something that we could do, but if there's any additional discussion.

And I'll stop there, and Commissioner Toledo, if you have anything else that you want to add.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Just one other addition, and that's that we'll also be helping Executive Director Hernandez as he maneuvers and sends our May revised request to the appropriate agencies, and, of course, work on any budget updates as they come along.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And I think just to add onto that, like, you know, I think -- is it the Finance and Administration Committee I think is doing a lot of work already on the actual budget. I'm thinking to the numbers of it. So, our role would be in terms of just making sure that it actually moves forward, or if any of the folks that we're in contact with thus far need to be contacted again.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: That's correct, yes.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, we're getting the presentations and we're talking about the deadlines. I found myself kind of not knowing exactly how to word it, word that we're working -- and maybe it is exactly what you said, Commissioner Sadhwani, that we're working with the diverse stakeholders to make sure that our timeline. Okay. Obviously you can see I'm struggling on it.

So, is there -- what would be the appropriate way to explain who we're talking to and what our purpose is?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That's such a great question. I mean, my guess is, and, you know, perhaps Fredy can massage this to some extent as well. But, you know, something along the lines of like none of us expected this much of a delay in the census, but we're also aware that there's many different stakeholders who are involved, not simply in redistricting, but planning for upcoming elections, who will have to abide by the lines that we draw.

And so, to be, you know, good or responsible partners in fair elections and good government practices we are actively reaching out to many of those stakeholders and will be finalizing a plan in the next few weeks. I hoping it's in the next few weeks or --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: But, though, actually, to be fair, there is in terms of our extension it's how many days

that the census is handed to us or handed to the State after July 31 that is how many days beyond December 15. So, if it ends up -- so the date you should be talking around is the 15th of February, but we're trying to see if we can possibly make that sooner to incorporate.

But don't just not -- I mean in terms of their thinking, oh, it's just the end of December, we certainly don't want to pretend that that is not -- it's a remote possibility, no. The extension that we got from July 31st is the extra time after from December 15th. So, we're just trying to see if there is a possibility that we can actually do that in a shorter period of time than the 2010 did. So, that's through the holidays. These are serious considerations. But we are trying -- we understand what's important, how we're all trying to work together. But February 15 is still a day you can certainly talk about, and we will work on that once we get the line drawer on board.

So, thank you very much. Any other questions for the subcommittee? I don't see any at this time. Thank you very much. There's a lot to do there.

So, moving on is now the Finance and Administration Committee, which is Commissioners Fernandez and Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, just briefly. We

approved three policies at the last meeting, and those policies are up added to our policy manual on the drive.

But for the evacuation policy we wanted to figure out how to make sure we knew who was in the building and that everyone was out. And, so, what Executive Director Hernandez did is he bought a white board to make an in and out board so people can check whether they're in or out of the office, and then the process will be whoever is in charge, you know, the most senior person there will take a picture of the in/out board, and then evacuate, and then check that everyone is out of the building. So that's the process we decided on, and that's incorporated in the policy.

That's all we have at this point.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. As Fredy had mentioned a little earlier, I had that question about including that note in email signatures about, you know, when we can and cannot accept public comment. And I just copied and pasted it from the presentations that we have already been using.

I checked in with counsel. Counsel thought it was a good idea, but counsel reminded me that I should probably bring this up to Finance and Administration

Subcommittee for consideration if we wanted to include it

as a policy and/or come to some sort of agreement across the board so we are all having uniformed approaches to this particular item. So, just wanted to bring that up for your consideration.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So, I mean, do we want to just have that conversation right now, then, or, I mean, as a group?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: We can just do a -- if you want to just do a head nod on that one. I don't know if that requires an actual vote.

All those in favor of putting it on the signature sort of indicate yes, thumbs up. Anyone who really does not like the idea? I see no serious -- speak now or -- great. Yes, please incorporate. Thank you very much.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I had the experience this week where someone posted something on my Twitter feed, and I just recommended that they please just go to our website and gave them our website address. Is that the correct protocol?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Director Ceja, do you want to address that, because that is certainly a communication issue?

COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR CEJA: I would say, yes.

Thank you so much. I think that's, for now, the best

approach because it lets individuals know the multiple ways to get their comments to us in addition to email.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Any other questions for the Administration and Finance Committee? Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So, I guess my question is who's going to send that wording to us for us to add to our email signatures? Fredy, thank you.

COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR CEJA: I already did. I think I jumped the gun, I'm sorry, prior to the vote.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. Any other questions? Thank you very much, Commissioners.

Moving on, we go to Item 9C, the Gantt Chart. Commissioners Kennedy and Taylor.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: I've not received any further input from colleagues, so we have nothing to report at this point.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. I believe that won't be true for the next meeting. However, moving on is Item D, Line Drawers. That is myself and Commissioner Sadhwani.

I'll just go ahead and jump in. I'm very pleased to say that we do, indeed, have a signed contract with our line drawer. It is a landmark moment for the 2020 Commission. We should all congratulate ourselves.

We have signed a contract with Haystaq and Q2,

which will be our -- now what happens with this point, the contract goes through the office of Legal Services, and it is not a completed and operational contract until we do get that back from them.

So, at this point, yes, we are committed. We have a line drawer on board. We cannot actually, though, have them and work with them until we have the -- it has come out of OSL. So, at this point, Commissioners, you unfortunately have to refrain from working with them because they are not able to work with us yet.

And, so, consequently you'll notice on Item

Number 12 we have the line drawers as proposer's

presentation. Unfortunately, since they're not on board
they will not be presenting today. We will possibly use
that time for discussing a little bit of the timeline
issue, but at this point that's about all we have. Any
other questions? Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'm sorry, did I miss it? Did you say when we might expect that the, or do we have an idea when the -- you know, be through the process?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, I'd love to say, oh, it's just a couple of days. It really depends. It could, theoretically, take up to about two weeks, but it is a very straightforward matter. They are prepared for us. Mr.

Villanueva has really facilitated this process moving

forward, and we hope to hear very soon.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Just one thought. I know that timeline is to be determined. I'm wondering if we should start to include on our agendas just a line item of the line drawer so that there's an opportunity if we have questions for them or we want to have conversations so that moving forward it's just a standard part of our agenda. And, of course, we can always choose not to use it, but at least then we don't have to like typically agendize each time.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: That's an excellent idea. Also, at this point if you do have questions for the line drawers, go ahead and funnel those to both Commissioner Sadhwani and myself, as we'll be sort of the go between until we get them on board and if we work out any other process.

So, if there's some issues that you need to -that you really have thought of, at this point we'll start
collecting all these ideas so we can hit the ground running
when we do get them on board. So, that's a good idea.
Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Any other thoughts at this point? Seeing none, we'll move onto the VRA Compliance with Commissioners

Sadhwani and Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Commissioner Yee, do you want to share the PPIC?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Sure. So, Commissioner

Sadhwani and I did meet with Eric McGhee and looked over

his draft of the report they are preparing free for us on

demographic changes in California, and it looks great.

So, they're finishing up the details for that, and will schedule a presentation when they can come, probably in April, just because the calendar is pretty full, to present that, and that will constitute our first look at actual demographics in this long process that we're on. And very interesting changes and observations to make at this point. Start thinking about, you know, our future line drawing.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And I might just add to that that we -- in having them prepare this we approached it more so from the community outreach perspective as opposed to the line drawing perspective. So, you know, they've overlaid with that our outreach zones. So, as we're doing our outreach in the various zones, we can be thinking about the demographic changes that have occurred, make sure that we're hitting some of those communities that have perhaps grown.

So, that's kind of the framework in which we approached it as opposed to let's think about VRA

considerations, or let's think about like where we need to start drawing districts. I don't think we're at that level of detail at this point in time, so I just kind of wanted to forewarn of that.

COMMISSIONER YEE: That's right. I keep jumping the gun. I'm so excited.

7 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioners. 8 Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: You said that they'll present in April but the report may be done sooner. Will we be able to get the report as soon as it's ready, just so we can start reading it and really digesting it for their presentation since we are out there doing outreach now?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: My sense is we can follow up and ask him that question. At this point they're maps. I'm not sure if they were going to do a detailed written report. Certainly, they're prepared to do, you know, a presentation of those maps with that detail. We can follow up and find out.

Also, I think we can still agendize for March 29th. We weren't sure if that date was going to change or move. That's also a possibility to get it in a little bit sooner to you all, but certainly we can ask them.

PPIC does put out a whole number of reports.

They're very beautiful and nicely branded, and so I'm not

sure if they were prepared to, you know, release a written document in advance of the presentation. So we can ask them.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: On the agenda item, at the end of the meeting we will be looking at future meeting dates and we will be laying that out. So, I would recommend that you as soon as possible post that -- you know, consider that, putting it on the agenda, and we will be getting to that at the end of this meeting.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I think we would definitely post it as a meeting handout, so --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Any other questions, Commissioners? Seeing none. Thank you very much. I certainly look forward to that report and looking at those maps, so thank you.

Next we have Item F and it's the Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee, which is Commissioner Sinay and Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. So, let's see, I have a few things to talk about. I'm trying to capture the information about our approach to our education and outreach efforts. I kind of put together this document. I'm a little bit behind on getting it posted, but I'll talk to the document and then we'll get something posted as soon as we can.

So, you know, just to review the process for outreach for educations sessions for these private public education sessions that we're all holding. One commissioner present at a private public education session. Notice for all public education sessions will be posted on the website. We require recording posting of these sessions or broadcast these sessions on a site available to the public. Provide prerecorded videos for organizations who are unwilling to record or broadcast a live event. And then we can provide public education sessions during meetings that meet the Brown Act requirement.

So, those are kind of the basics for our private public education sessions. We've also decided to host some CRC noticed public education sessions, and we're working on what the design of those might look like and what the schedule might look like, so, we're kind of working on some thoughts for that that we'll be bringing to you at the next meeting.

We're also working on the -- we're working on the agenda for the input meeting design committee that we formed last time, and so, we're drafting an agenda. We'll work through Marcy on that agenda so that we can get input from all the commissioners who were involved. So, we'll work that through Marcy, but we're working on a draft for that. We're looking at -- as Commissioner -- Director

Hernandez mentioned, we're looking at the cost per meeting for different meeting types. You know, we have a draft of that at this point. We need to understand a little bit more deeply what, you know, what the meeting designs are. But, again, we'll have that when we get together as a subcommittee to kind of look at the tradeoffs for the number of different meetings and the cost that those different types of meetings are going to cost.

But we have a few things that we think we need to talk about as a group and kind of come to some conclusion back to our public education sessions.

So, I'm going to just try to share my screen because I've got a few bullet points here, if that's okay, and --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Fornaciari, while you're doing that I just wanted to remind everybody that when it comes to outreach appointments in your zones or a statewide outreach, that you can -- up to two commissioners can attend those, even if you're in the same subcommittee, because most of -- because all of our subcommittees are advisory subcommittees. They don't have authority to make any decisions. If we do create a subcommittee that has authority to make decisions, then only one person can attend those appointments.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So, can you guys see my

screen? Okay.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, thank you.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So, here's a few suggestions. We want to take the pulse of the Commission.

The first suggestion is that commissioners will not conduct -- well, we could say a private public education session at a meeting where a candidate for State Senate, State Assembly, State Board of Equalization or Congress is also on the agenda.

So, you know, basically we're not going to -we're not going to attend a meeting or have a public
education presentation at a meeting where there's a
candidate for office that we're going to draw lines. So,
that's a proposal.

I'll just go through the whole list and then we can talk about it.

The next proposed proposal is that we may conduct a private public education session at an elected official's invitation, but only if the elected official is not running for those four offices.

So, for instance, we've been invited to -someone has been invited to make a presentation by a city
council member, I believe, but in a sense we're not drawing
city council lines. You know, we think that's okay.

So, there are some groups we may find it not

appropriate to present to live. We would offer those groups a video of a presentation, and we can talk about what those groups might be.

And then, you know, if the demand for our public education, private education sessions continues to increase we can encourage small groups to cohost with other groups.

So, these are our thoughts. I know Commissioner Andersen had some thoughts about -- some concerns about groups.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, thank you. I need to see if I can see the whole board.

Yeah, this basically I believe is -- thank you very much for all this information on both commissioners.

This has been a lot of work, a lot of thought, taking a lot of input on these.

The item here is basically politicians and political parties, and it's -- the idea is, is this appropriate at all. We certainly want to educate, but at what point are we crossing the line of impartiality, and is it even -- is it a conflict. And we certainly do not want to have any implication that we have conflict.

So, I'd like actually to open up this discussion to think, you know, our people, how they feel about this, and I actually even would like Ms. Johnston to maybe say a few words about this entire idea, the pros and cons, and

then I see -- then I'll start picking names. I see Kennedy, Turner, Fernandez after that.

So, Ms. Johnston, if you wouldn't mind saying a few things about this one.

MS. JOHNSTON: Well, the concern that was expressed was that you not be seen as favoring one party over another party since you are to remain nonpartisan. And just the way same as your membership is composed of representatives of different parties, if you were to go out to political organizations, you should make an effort to be inclusive and cover all spectrum, and that can be done in a variety of ways, either by having a hosted meeting where they're all invited, or having separate meetings with each group. It would be up to you to decide, but to try and make sure that you are available to any and all political groups. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. My issue, obviously, with that is we're supposed to be out -- well, I won't get into it. I definitely have a very strong opinion about that, what we should do. Commissioner Kennedy.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: My question comes to the document that Commissioner Fornaciari shared on his screen, and how do we know that someone is a candidate. I mean no one is going to be a candidate until after we draw the lines because they don't even know what districts -- what

the district lines will be and whether they could be running or not. So, you know, how are we supposed to decipher whether someone is a candidate if we haven't even drawn the district lines yet? Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Sinay, do you want to answer that one before we go to the next question?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes. I think that's a great question, Commissioner Kennedy, but the truth of the matter is I can tell you here in San Diego several people have already expressed their interest to run even if they can't pull papers and they don't know what their district will look like. They have already put up websites and have contacted people. So, some candidates we won't know until after, but some people are very out in front to kind of try and scare off other candidates as well to raise money, so it's a mixed bag.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: But again, how do -- what is the bar? Is the bar a public announcement? Is the bar the formation of an exploratory committee? Is the bar the existence of a campaign checking account? We need a -- we need an objective bar that we can judge this against.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. I don't see any quick answers on that one. Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. One of the things is

I'm hoping when we determine what we would desire the bar

to be is that maybe we can just add that into questions to say do you intend to run, or have you filed, or have you, you know, established an account where we're asking everyone the same question because to go based on what we believe we know about a candidate can get -- I think we'll get into some areas we don't want to be.

A couple of pieces I wanted to talk about in the presentation. Now I'm focused on that conversation, I hope I don't lose it. Oh, presentations. It's been sitting with me since the last time we talked about them, and the suggestion I have for this Commission is I'm wondering why we are not creating, and, Fredy, we'll probably look for your help on this, but creating a letter or something that goes out to every conceivable body that we would want to present to as this is the Commission, introducing ourselves, and we are available to do public or general education in regards to redistricting. I believe that it will keep us -- right now we have 14 commissioners going out into an area from our own perspectives of who we're trying to reach out to, and we have a suggested list perhaps we can follow.

And, so, I'm thinking that if there was something that would go out to all of the major piece parts that we would be comfortable with it gives everybody an opportunity, whether I reached out, received the busy

signal and did not get back to them, and someone else called them every day and did get through, I think it would kind of level that playing ground a little bit, and then we still can continue with our outreach efforts as we're doing it. But I'm hoping that that will help the outreach look a little bit more consistent throughout all of California as the first piece, and then I'll let response, and then I do have a second thing I'd like to --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I see two hands up and assume they're both in response. Is that -- I'm getting a yes from -- okay. Then in order it was Commissioner Kennedy and then Commissioner Sinay.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: I did draft such a letter several months ago and shared it with staff for their revisions, so staff should be able to provide something.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: We have been using a letter statewide, and some commissioners had asked for it for their local outreach efforts, and we can get it out to all commissioners. It is created on our letterhead such that you can put your own outreach team names in there. And it basically has the, you know, who we are, a menu of what we can do and all that.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I guess for lessons learned going forward -- am I off mute? Yes. For lessons learned

going forward I think -- thank you Commissioner Kennedy for drafting that awhile back, but I mean even as a kickoff at the start of this approach so that everyone is on, again, a level playing field. Good that some commissioners have the letter and sending it out. I have not sent out such a letter. I missed that totally.

And, so, with that, again, my suggestion is is that we establish it now if the letter is available. Can we agree to send it out, and I think it can be sent out from all the commissioners collectively. I don't think it necessarily needs to go out from each of the 14 people specifically. This is from the 2020 Commission. These are the contacts for these areas. This is something that's available right now to you.

And then if, indeed, I also call it will be a reminder, a second call, oh yes, I did receive a general letter from the Commission. And, so, I think that just will serve us better and hopefully ensure there are no gaps in our outreach just for scheduling -- from a scheduling perspective.

And then the other is a little bit different on outreach. So, some of the -- I've gotten an opportunity to look at some of the videos and then there's questions and things that comes after the presentations. I'm hoping that we are capturing, staff, the questions that questions that

are coming up in the sessions, a lot of which I was, oh great, yup, I would have had that answer, and some I'm like, oh man, glad that wasn't me. I wouldn't have known how to answer that question.

And so, I think we should be developing some frequently asked questions and posting them, or at least making them available to the commissioners because at the end we are now beyond brand new in doing presentations. I don't know if everyone has done presentations. But at some point we need to be gaining proficiency, and I think the best way to do that is to share with questions that's coming forth and we all have a consistent answer in how we're responding.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Good point. Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I really love

Commissioner Turner's idea of sending out a letter broadly.

I guess my only question is who does that go to?

I think I'm still concerned about, you know, kind of like COVID vaccines, right. It's a patchwork approach. County by county it's different, state by state it's different, and I think that's ultimately what's happening with our outreach to some extent, and I think it leaves us open to being skewed.

So, while I love the idea of a letter, like who

would we be sending it to, like all 501(c) (3)'s? Does that include local political parties, like local clubs of political parties? I mean I hear some commissioners going and doing those meetings, some I think are opposed to it. I'm just not really sure. How do we systematize this in a greater way so that we don't leave ourselves vulnerable? And I don't have the answer to that question, but it is something I'm concerned about.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner

Sadhwani. Commissioner Turner, are you trying to reply to that one?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Go ahead, and then I have Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. In reply to that, I think, yes, I think it could be still -- I think that's the conversation that we need to have. I think we need to determine, here is the bare bone minimum that we want to ensure goes out to everyone, and I do think that there is danger of that being patchwork, but I think it will be less patchwork than 14 individual commissioners reaching out and not having that umbrella covering. And, so, it will require conversation. Let's agree on it, in this conversation or the next who should the letter go to. When you're announcing it here, anyone else that's

listening, it's not a letter that's exclusive to those, but it would be where we would begin as a base. But start here, and then we can keep sending the letter out as others remind us or if one of us say, oh man, we forgot about this particular group, let's send it to them as well.

But I think we will have a general tracking of where the letter went, where the invitations went. We have also the tracking, and we'll talk a little bit more when the data team later, subcommittee. But we'll have other tracking of people that's reached out to us that will jog our memory, oh yeah, we need to also do that in southern California or central, or what have you. But I think it just gives us a place to start to try and ensure the coverage to the best degree possible.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Commissioner Sinay, are you in reply because Commissioner Fernandez has been waiting? Actually, we might go with Commissioner Fernandez's question because I'm sure this is on the same topic.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Actually, it's not, so we started out with this conversation of candidates versus not candidates and now we're on a letter, so, I guess we should address one of them first and maybe resolve it.

So, if you want to deal with the letter, we can deal with the letter. I want to talk about the candidates.

I'm assuming you want to do the letter.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah, let's do the letter, and then we're coming back to the political party issue. Thank you. So, Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. These are all great ideas and I'm writing them down. I'm sure my partner in crime, Commissioner Fornaciari, is as well. Crime was quote, unquote, not real, since we're in a public meeting.

I do want you -- I do want to remind you all that we have a crowd sourcing document that we put out there this week or last week asking you to think of statewide organizations. We have been going to statewide organizations in a systematic way, Commissioner Fornaciari and I, and at different times we've brought in other commissioners. And they're receiving -- most of them, the letter actually came from them asking us for the letter so that they can send it out to all their local members.

And, so, in the crowd sourcing document we put a star by those groups that we've already been talking to, and we've been putting that they received the letter. It doesn't mean the letter went out. It doesn't mean that people will remember that they got the letter, but I think the more times they get the same type of letter, or same type of contact, they'll be like, oh redistricting. You know, it takes sometimes seven to eight times until people

actually remember something.

So, we've been constantly, Commissioner

Fornaciari and I, we've been meeting with staff to think of more statewide groups, so we definitely welcome, you know, again a reminder that it's a crowd source document, and once we've gotten all your input we can share it. It's a crowd source document. We don't know who it's coming from, and there's -- you know, it's pretty -- it's been really helpful for us, and in the document we have created links so you can find your local representative for whoever that statewide organization is. And, so, we're constantly working on helping for that. But that was kind of in response to what Commissioner Turner was saying, you know, what's the baseline. So we've been thinking a lot about that.

A lot of the community -- I mean a lot of the ethnic communities and refugee communities, immigrant communities and such are not on there because a lot of those are local entities. There are a few groups that were looking -- that may have a good list of all of them, and we'll include those as well.

Commissioner Fornaciari, I think you wanted to add something.

24 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. The document is called Statewide Outreach. It's in Google Drive, and if

you into just drive. Google.com and click on the documents shared with me, you'll be able to find that document. So, I just wanted to let you all know where to find it, and, yeah, add whatever, you know, we've missed.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. I think this issue will certainly come back, and we'll be doing more delving into who we're getting in contact with and who we aren't. I'd like to see counties on that list, things like that, which are different types of organizations.

But at this point I want to come back to Commissioner Fernandez and back to the political party issue.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you, Chair Andersen.

In terms of I think it was the first two with the if they're going to be a perspective candidate or if they're a candidate that is seeking reelection --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: What --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Pardon?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Fornaciari, as we're trying to discuss these could you please share your screen so we can all see these items again? I think that would facilitate. And please continue, Commissioner Fernandez. Sorry, I just wanted to get them up so we knew what items we were really talking about.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Yes, I share what Commissioner Kennedy said in terms of how do we know who it will be, if they're running, not running. But at the end of the day they're all -- regardless of whether they have an intention to run or seek re-election, they are still Californians, and I feel by us not doing it we're discriminating against them, which is not the intent of our -- not the intent of me or the Commission, nor should it be.

I'm thinking what we could request is to do our presentation early on prior to them speaking or being on the agenda. But I personally don't agree with not presenting because they have made a choice to run or not run.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner

Fornaciari -- I'm sorry, Commissioner Fernandez. I was
going to say thank you also, Commissioner Fornaciari, for
sharing this.

Any other comments? Any comments about this at this time? Let me see if I can see everybody. I can't quite see everybody right now. Ah, yes, Commissioner Vasquez. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Yes. I don't -- my intent is not to change what we have here. I do agree with Commissioner Fernandez that I think there may be a way for

us to be able to present to these groups if someone is on the agenda, and we just make sure that there's a bit of a clear distinction with our presentation in that we're sort of not associated with the rest of political candidates' remarks. But I do -- for clarity for us, I'm wondering if the committee would consider adding meeting where a candidate or current officeholder. Most current officeholders plan to run for reelection in those same offices unless they're being termed out or they have their eye on a senate or governor. But I think just for clarity, yeah, adding current officeholder to me makes sense.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Director Ceja.

wanted to bring to the attention of the Commission that you have the option of sending the video and not making public appearances as well. So, we'll have the presentation in video format fairly soon, so we can just shoot that, whatever, when one of these situations presents itself where you don't even want to be in that meeting, you just send the video and not set a lot of the worries or concerns.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Go ahead. Follow up for Commissioner Vasquez.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Yeah, I guess -- sorry. I was just going to -- a question for maybe the Commission.

Are we comfortable with -- how do we feel about elected officials in these offices convening their stakeholders but not appearing at a meeting? So, they have stakeholders.

If they host the meetings but they are not present or don't plan or, you know, don't attend our meeting, how does that sit with the rest of us?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I might sort of jump in here, and I think that sort of brings the whole focus is it's not so much, yes, we're -- obviously candidates are an issue. I agree with Commissioner Fernandez in that we don't want to discriminate against a particular person. It's the group, itself. Who is the private group that we are presenting to? And I feel that if -- you know, if an assembly person is saying, hey, you know, there's a city council meeting, or -- they're going to be there. That's one thing. We're presenting to a city council. We're presenting to a -- the League of Women Voters. It's the group that we're presenting to. And where I feel if we're presenting to a political -- a group of a political party, then that impartiality there I have a problem with.

I think that's -- I don't -- I think it's too tricky in terms of it's one political party versus another political party, and these -- we're trying to educate people who really don't know anything about this topic, and what is their purpose. We're trying to get more people

involved in the entire process. The political parties are very well involved, and they do -- I mean their mission is to get more of their own elected, and to bring their (indiscernible) forth, which is -- they're certainly more than entitled to.

But our job is to try to stay nonpolitical and bring forth people who are not of the political parties and also want to have a voice at the table.

So, I would really feel much more comfortable if we requested political party groups to come and attend some of our presentations, the presentations that we are hosting and sponsoring as opposed to going to their private events. And that way it isn't so much is a candidate there or something because often the candidate is a person who will say I want to get these people involved in the entire process. So, rather than look at, well, a candidate is here or not, it's what is the meeting? What is the meeting we're being taught in by the two?

And I feel that I would prefer if -- it's just such a slippery slope in terms of, you know, what are the rules, what are -- you know, how do you define it. I would think it's just sort of cleaner and easier to say that political party groups, we don't go to their private presentations, but they're more than welcome to come to any of our video educational presentations. And if they want

to team up like the item number four, if they want to put together another group, a local group of League of Women Voters, Common Cause, the city councils, those would be certainly groups that anyone can attend.

But I'm very concerned that how that's in terms of we use our total impartiality, and that's something that I would really like us to consider. And I think it's a nice clean, easy -- and it's not like we're -- it's just one policy. I think it sort of makes it very easy, and that way you don't have to worry about what parties we did not make it to.

And I see lots of different hands on that one.

At this point I can't see the full screen, so, Commissioner

Fornaciari, could you stop sharing, and then I have

Commissioner Vasquez and then Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Yeah. I understand where you're coming from, Chair, and I want to be mindful that ability to be impartial I think is distinct -- is important and still distinct from sort of partisanship. And if -- I feel, this is my personal interpretation, I feel that if the intent of this Commission was to be completely nonpartisan, then we would be 14 no party preference commissioners. We are a multi-partisan independent Citizens Redistricting Commission. So, we, by virtue of our composition are acknowledging partisanship as a key

driver of electoral power.

And, so, I just want to -- I want us to make a distinction. I would like for us to make a distinction between impartiality and partisanship because I do believe we as a Commission can be impartial while also being mindful of the very clear partisan interests at play in redistricting.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you. Yeah, you know, I understand the concern about impartiality and perceptions, but I, myself, am leading towards Commissioner Fernandez's thoughts. And, you know, as a citizen if I were not on a Commission, just looking at Commission's work, you know, what I'd want to see is that you just went out there and circulated widely, and that you didn't focus on just one party or another.

You know, individual appearances, I mean you go where people are at, right. For some people maybe their local Green Party group is the only political group they're a part of, and they don't have time and energy to also go to a League of Women Voters, you know, group.

And, so, as long as we're going to lots of different parties, you know, I think that makes the perception safer.

Also, the way the proposed policy is written, I

wouldn't be able to go to even the League of Women Voters candidate's panel night, you know, where there's not just one candidate, several candidates. Why not? Why not show up, you know, and be part of something like that.

So, I'm thinking it's actually better to glean towards meeting all kinds of meetings. As long as there's all kinds of meeting, I feel okay with it. I'm not too worried about showing up at a meeting that happens to be a Democratic club or whatever, as long as we're doing lots of other meetings as well.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you for this great discussion. And, Fredy, when you raised your hand I thought you were going to give your wisdom that you gave me when we were looking at a lot of this work.

The reason we had said candidates versus elected officials, even though I really like what Commissioner Fernandez said about -- and I agree with Commissioner Kennedy, when do you know. I was just sharing -- Commissioner Kennedy, that, yes, you're absolutely right, but there are people who are running all the time.

But what I -- what Fredy said to me about the difference between someone who's been elected and someone who's a candidate is -- it goes similar to the political parties. And I know, Commissioner Kennedy, and I think,

Commissioner Turner, you've done some to political clubs.

I would be interested in your input.

But mine so far has been that most groups can get you 20, maybe 30 people, even the school, they're going to post it and more people will see it, but that the clubs, even the -- I mean I was surprised at that the small club that I went to on Saturday had almost 50 people there. And those are the people that are the most engaged. And, you know, if people are going to their club meetings or they're going to legal (indiscernible), or a lot of these meetings, they're the most engaged, and so, as we've said before, just because they're engaged doesn't mean that you're necessarily educated in the process we're here -- I'm not meaning educated in a negative way, but just aware of what we're looking for and such.

I end every meeting asking them to please talk to at least three friends and have those friends talk to three more about redistricting, but I would say that, you know, as Commissioner Yee said, the number one rule for outreach and successful outreach is going where people are at. It's very hard to get people to come to you. You're more successful if you go where they're at.

And so, as I said, I'd be interested in hearing others who have presented at political clubs, if they had a higher attendance or not, or if it was just a fluke on my

experience.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Fernandez and then Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. And thank you, Commissioner Sinay for that.

I just wanted to respond to a couple of the comments that were made in terms of being for this proposal.

One of the concerns was if we only go out to one political party versus another, we are -- right now we are open to whoever. So, if a certain political party doesn't request an educational session from us, then they don't request an educational session. We're saying if you want a request, put it in and we'll try to fulfill it.

And again, I need to piggyback off of what Commissioner Sinay said. Just because you're in -- even in a political party doesn't mean you're fully educated in the redistricting process.

And again, I see our mission as trying to get the word out to as many as possible, which means including everyone, regardless of their status as an elected official, or not official, or going to run for office.

So, hopefully, we make the decision to include everyone and not discriminate how much they know, who they are, and just be equal to all. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. I just want to say in terms of is it our purpose just to reach whoever is out there and already aware and interested, or is to try to reach people who are not aware and not interested?

I mean the idea of, well, you know, sure you can come if, you know, just ask us and we'll come out, is that how we're handling a lot of the different people who are totally underrepresented and wouldn't really no? No, we're actually reaching out.

These are two different groups. I think we're mixing a little -- we're mixing different things.

Of course, I believe you would -- in terms of having a number at a political group, yes, these are the ones who are already involved. Do they -- do we need to reach out to them? We need to keep them informed of everything, you're right. But in terms of our reaching out to hard-to-reach people, I would hate to not present to a group of people who are very underrepresented in the political process because, oh, we're already scheduled attending a bunch of these meetings at political party groups. So, that's where I'm airing on and what that might look like.

Commissioner Vasquez.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: I -- again, I hear your concern, and I actually think that maybe that there's a way

we can establish even just like an informal practice at first as we open sort of our outreach process up to more partisan seeming groups, so that if we're presenting at a Democratic club, perhaps just our practice is to be proactive and ask, hey, do you have other partisan groups, including Republican groups, Green Party groups, what have you. Are there other partisan groups in your area that you could connect me with or that I should be connecting with? So, again, we're sort of trying to do our due diligence so we're not just waiting for people to come to us, but that are going to them.

And I also just want to add to this conversation about sort of who is connected to these political -- like local party groups. I imagine that these would be more events hosted by the groups and reaching out to their broader networks. So, I can imagine, depending on what the host outreach looks like, the folks who attend a redistricting education session is going to probably be a much bigger group and a much less -- sort of on the tiers of engagement a much less engaged group than the sort of like 10 people who attend every Democratic Party's meeting once a month, right.

But there's maybe someone who is still on the list and will sort of squirrel through events and see, oh, this is new. I've never heard about redistricting because

this has really only happened once before for anyone.

So, again, I don't want this. I don't think it's true that presenting partisan groups would only get folks who are really engaged in the process. I do think the more likely outcome is that we are reaching people at a sort of lower tier of initial engagement and understanding about redistricting, just because of the broad networks that partisan political groups have.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I have, actually, Akutagawa,
Turner and Toledo. We are approaching kind of the 11:00
o'clock, so I might -- we have a few minutes, just kind of
keeping an eye on that. But let's go with Commissioner
Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, thank you, Chair.

I want to just, I think, weigh in on this conversation,
which has been great.

First, I just want to say I do -- I do appreciate what Commissioner Fernandez says. It is true. I think, you know, we've all as a Commission have made choices about what our future is going to be, at least for the next 10 years, about, you know, if we have any aspirations for candidacy and other things like that, but that's a choice that we've been willing to make.

But I do agree that, you know, for anyone who chooses to run for office or is currently in office, you

know, their presence being, you know, at a meeting where we might want to present or be invited to present should not preclude us from presenting. And whatever process we need to follow to, you know, enable, you know, us being there beyond just the video, I'm open to and would like to have that continued conversation.

I also -- you know, you were saying something earlier, Commissioner Andersen and then Commissioner Vasquez also talked about it as well, too. A couple of observations that I'll just make.

One is I think that to the point that you were making, Commissioner Andersen, about, you know, some of the hard-to-reach groups, I would say that, you know, politically we could say the same thing, that some political organizations are going to be a little bit harder to reach for various reasons. And I'll point to a conversation that Commissioner Sadhwani and I had in our region. And for various reasons there may be certain kinds of organizations, you know, that are more politically leaning that may not want to reach out to us. But I think, just like any other hard-to-reach group for the sake of being balanced and to ensure that we're actually, you know, really trying to be intentional about being multi-partisan, it may require us to reach out to certain political organizations to ensure that, you know, as others have

reached out to us more readily, others may be a little more hesitant and in those same ways that some of the hard-to-reach, you know, communities may not reach out to us, we have to go to them, we may need to do the same with certain kinds of partisan organizations.

I think Commissioner Vasquez also talked about, you know, there are sometimes other organizations that are, you know, nonpartisan in their mission statement but obviously may -- I shouldn't say obviously -- but may lean a certain way, and I think those are also ones in which, you know, we should seek to also ensure that we're reaching out to.

The other thing I also want to just mention, too, is that, depending on where an organization is, whether it's a club, whether it's formal nonprofit, you know, in different places around the state, and I think we're learning this, especially for you and I in our zone which is much more rural in the Eastern Sierras and in the Gold Country, one, there may not be a lot of organized nonprofits. There may not be a lot of other organized, you know, clubs or other organizations because, you know, some people are in some of these areas because they don't really want to interact with a lot of people. But if they do, you know, they may do so with other likeminded people, and it may not be -- you know maybe they are likeminded. It could

be that, you know, that's just the only social game in town maybe for what little social activity they may want to engage in.

You know there's a lot of what ifs that we don't know about, and so I think it's important that we do take that into account that, you know, our role is to not only ultimately to draw the new district lines for Congress, the State Assembly, State Senate and Board of Equalization, but it is also we've taken it, I think, upon ourselves that we want to educate the broader public in California about redistricting and what that means, that may mean, as we've been talking, you know, for a long time, I think, since we started really about how do we reach those harder to reach communities so that we can educate them and encourage their public input.

And, so, you know, maybe a long-winded way of just getting back to, you know, saying that regardless of whether it is partisan or not, you know, some of these groups may be the ways in which we can reach, you know, people that may not normally engage in. And that's why I think to Commissioner Vasquez's point -- I think it was a good one -- we are multi-partisan. It may be that in certain cases we'll, you know, deploy a member of the Commission because they're from a community, whether geographically or, you know, from whether it's an ethnicity

race, or even language ability, but it could also be based on partisanship as well, too. And a group may be more, you know, familiar with having someone, you know, who they feel at least shares their shared partisan identity.

And, so, you know, it's just of several different ways in which we're looking at different communities of interest, although partisanship isn't necessarily, you know, a factor in what we draw from, but it is an identity that, you know, I'll just say, agree or disagree, that has become very much part of people's identity, you know, in this day and time, and, so, I think something that we should keep in mind as we think about, you know, these quidelines.

And I know it's for the best of intent, so, you know, I think that that's what we need to also remember, you know, what is going to be the most fair, what's going to be the most equitable, what's going to be the most impartial as to the degree that we can be. But, how do we also educate and engage, you know, the broad swath of California, too.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner. At this point we are at the 11:00 o'clock hour. It's time for our 15-minute required break, so I would like to do that. I would encourage any of the public who are listening to consider these and weigh in as we come back in our lunch

period, obviously, and when we come back I have

Commissioner Turner, Commissioner Toledo, and then we will

continue this conversation.

So, at this point it's 11:03 I have, so let's come back 11:18.

(Off the record 11:04 a.m.)

(On the record 11:18 a.m.)

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Welcome back, all, to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission meeting. And we are -- on the agenda we're in the middle of a discussion on Item 9F, Outreach Engagement. We were actually talking about doing education presentations to private meetings of political parties. And I believe we have more questions and things from we have Commissioner Turner, followed by Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, and I'd like to pass at this time.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. And, so, I'll go with Commissioner Toledo, who I do not see at this point. Commissioner Yee, and we'll come back.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. A quick additional comment about current officeholders. You know, just to be contrary, and I think if I'm a current officeholder, you know, I'm thinking part of my responsibility is to help educate my constituents, and, you know, reaching out to the

Commission for a presentation would make perfect sense, you know, as a discharge of that responsibility. So, maybe it's a little bit of the incumbent advantage, you know, but still, I could easily see that. It actually would be a perfectly appropriate use of office and an appropriate appearance for us.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Again, I don't see the issue of being a candidate. Candidates is not the issue; it's to what meeting are they inviting us, because typically you'd think it was be a government-type meeting, city council, something like that. But, let's see I have Commissioner Vasquez.

with you, Commissioner Yee. The challenge there that I think then loops us back to what Commissioner Kennedy is saying about how to distinguish between candidates and -- and objective way to distinguish between candidates and current officeholders because current officeholders can absolutely and many are candidates for either their current office or another office for which we are drawing lines. And, so, they often -- they, you know -- folks in those offices are savvy in terms of how they distinguish, sort of I'm doing this in my role as a candidate, versus I'm doing this in my official capacity as, you know, a State Senator or a State Assemblyperson. So, we would just -- I'm --

again, I'm more -- I am comfortable with presenting at hosted elected officials' meeting, you know, State Senator, State Assembly, whomever. Then we just need to be objective about like sort of who -- where we're drawing distinctions between candidates and current officeholders.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So, I just -- just to kind of bring this to a close, if we can, I'm kind of getting the general consensus from the group that we want to keep it open -- open without restrictions.

You know, Marian's comment earlier was, you know, to be not favoring one party over another and make an effort to be inclusive. You know, to that end, we've had a number of Democratic clubs reach out to us. Commissioner Sinay and I, as she mentioned, are reaching out to the State Republican Party. I mean we can certainly, you know, make an effort to reach out to other parties, too, and ensure we're being inclusive in that way.

So, I mean, it just -- you know make it -- I think the idea would be we'd make it clear when we make presentations that, you know, we're representing the CRC, what the CRC is, and, you know, we'll present at the invitation of candidates, or at the invitation of elected officials, or the invitation of party clubs, or party organizations. I mean is that -- I get the sense that

that's what I'm hearing from the group. Commissioner Kennedy.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. I mean I think that, yes, I'm in agreement, that's the general direction we're going. I would say that if any individuals are not comfortable presenting to any specific group, whether it's political or any other type of group, there are 13 others of us and we can find out who is available to speak to that group.

The other thing is if we do, in fact, end up with conflicts between, you know, a group that potentially already knows a good bit about redistricting and a group that doesn't, I have no problem prioritizing the group that doesn't. You know, we can always prioritize things without excluding. So, I just want to put those two considerations on the table. Thanks.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I have a -- there's still outstanding Commissioner Turner and also Commissioner Toledo. I don't see Commissioner Toledo. Commissioner Turner, did you want to speak at this time?

22 COMMISSIONER TURNER: I did not request again to 23 speak, Madam Chair. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. And, Commissioner Le
Mons, did I see your hand up? No, okay.

Well, at this point, you know, I'm just wondering is it too -- considered a burden to request that the private parties, private political parties, just to have one of our videos or present, or please come to one of our presentations. That's just considered a bit discriminatory because that's what the group is thinking. I'm seeing a couple of nods on that.

So, then, I'd like the public to comment, because it will be very interesting to hear what they have to say.

And other than that, Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner Sinay, do you want to proceed with the subcommittee recommendations?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So, I think where we're at is, you know, we're going to present to the groups that ask us, and we're going to reach out to parties in -- you know, try to reach out to all the parties, or I'm sure we can't reach out to all of them, but, you know, do our best to reach out to political parties and include them and make the offers to those parties. I mean, Commissioner Sinay, do you have a --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: The only thing I would add what I had drafted from the whole conversation is CRC may not favor one party over another. We will make sure we're being as inclusive as possible. For all presentations CRC -- for all groups CRC will make it clear that the CRC

presentation clearly be separated from other speakers so that there isn't a confusion on the agenda, you know, that we're holding our space in the agenda.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Sorry. I do see Commissioner Akutagawa. I just wanted -- these are being recorded, correct? That is part of the criteria. Okay.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I guess maybe a question of I don't know if this is process or maybe. The document, Commissioner Fornaciari, that you shared with us, I know that after this discussion it's probably going to change, but I am sure there's numbers of the public that are also going to want to read through it as well, too. Are you planning to share -- I guess share it, but will it be shared in its original form and in its amended form, or just in its amended form?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, at this point I was going to share it in its amended form, since I've been amending it as we go.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: And, then, would that be part of the outreach plan and you'd be sort of asking just kind of for general approval on the continued --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: We'll incorporate it in the outreach plan and repost the outreach plan.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. And, so, in terms of -- I

see at this point there's no need for any kind of vote, or anything like that. This is just part of your recommendation and -- does the group -- would the group like to do a vote on this particular thing, or I believe we're already -- this is just an update on the outreach.

2.2.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I mean it seems like we have consensus among the group, and so we'll just go forward at this point, unless anyone objects, and update the outreach document.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I certainly would not like us going in this direction, but that's --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. It seems like the consensus of the group, though, is to go in this direction.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Correct. And with that in mind, are there any other questions for the subcommittee? Then thank you very much. Oh, I'm sorry, yes, Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. I wanted to know how we were going to proceed. I had also suggested that we capture questions that's coming from the meetings, a little bit of a different vein of the same question. I was not clear with what was the result of that. Are we doing that or not?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I'm asking specifically about the frequently asked questions, questions that are coming up from the presentations. Are they being captured, and will we receive that information on a regular basis going forward?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think that's a great idea, and I did put it on our to-do list to circle back with staff and figure out how to do exactly that. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. And just to continue on that same vein, in terms of adding groups to who we're considering in this -- in our outreach, specifically like county offices, those sort of things. Do we just add that? Do we just get in touch? Anyone can submit their suggestions to the subcommittee who will be addressing those. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Because you can't -- we can't talk directly with each other when we're not in meetings we've set up crowd sourcing documents so that you can put it in there, and ideally, you would add a link in there to make it a little easier who will do the research.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Perfect. Also, of course, you may submit that to our Deputy Outreach Director as well, any ideas. So, thank you very much, both of you, for this update, and I think with that, we'll move forward to Item

G, 9G, the Language Access, which is Commissioner Akutagawa and Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, thank you. So, just briefly on that one. We're still working on a number of open items, specifically the language interpretation, and then, secondly, I want to just report to the Commission that we are proposing to translate the Redistricting Basics PowerPoint into the 12 languages so that it would be available for use by any organization or any person who might want to utilize the PowerPoint to organize their own presentation.

Commissioner Fernandez, is there anything else that you might want to add to that?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Just that we're finalizing the contract for a couple of the -- I think we'd planned to have three or four different vendors for translation interpreter services.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Yee, then Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. Thank you to the subcommittee for the progress on this.

I'm wondering if we could, maybe even on our website have some kind of schedule of when what different materials will be available and which language, because I'm sure they won't all come out at once. So, for instance,

1 I'm in conversation with a Punjabi Sikh group right now, 2 and so, I could tell them, well, that will probably be 3 coming out in May, you know. That would help, you know. 4 There might be a lot of TVDs in it, you know, for now, but 5 just so we can have some idea what to tell people. Thanks. 6 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Fornaciari. 7 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: That was my question. 8 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think there's going to 9 be some TVDs right now because we're still trying to 10 finalize the contracts. I think our hope is that we'll 11 have the -- at least the first of the three or four 12 translation interpretation company contracts finalized 13 within the next -- maybe this is something that I should ask either Director Hernandez or perhaps Director Ceja to 14 15 comment on if they are aware. But my guesstimate is within 16 the next couple weeks, but I'm only saying it's a 17 quesstimate because I don't know if there's any other 18 additional reviews that the contracts have to go through 19 with other departments within the state. 20 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, Director Hernandez. 21 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: I will follow up 22 with Raul just to confirm the timeframes for you. 23 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. 24 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Then if -- I'll just 25 make one other comment. It'll -- well, actually, no. I'11

just save it for the COI tool update.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: The contracts, these are vendors that we already have a relationship with, correct? Not that we, that they have a relationship with the State and, therefore, we can move quicker, and that's why we haven't done an RFP, or an RFA, or an RFI, or whatever. Yes?

I was asking this because, you know, our subcommittee in putting together some of the information was made privy to kind of the cost of that, and it seemed like the bids are really, really high compared to my experience locally.

And, so, I did ask local translators and interpreters what they charge, and their rates were about \$65 an hour, and, so -- and these are professionals. And, so, I was just curious on how we came into partnership with, you know, why we're using some of these groups that seem to be so high. And I guess we have three bids so they compete against each other, but anyway, I was just kind of shocked by that.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Just to clarify, I believe some of them are ones that the State is already using, but I think a couple of others may have been ones that we got recommendations from others. But, Commissioner

Fernandez, you might know more details on it.

know that they are certified small businesses, and maybe,
Director Hernandez, if you could also follow up with Raul
on that. I was under the assumption that they were already
either on the multiple award schedule, California Multiple
Award Schedule, or a certified small business, and that's
how we found the different contractors and then requested
bids from them. So, if we could just look into that as
well. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. One item also for the committee. You did hear one of our comments this morning, and that's come up several times before, is the actual translation of our meetings. Is that something that the committee is looking into, and is there progress on that, or --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, it is something that we are looking into. It's a lot costlier than we had imagined, so we're trying to maybe put some parameters on it versus -- once we get into the input meetings maybe translating or interpreting those meetings versus our business meetings that I would consider like these type of meetings. So, we're continuing to research that to see -- to bring different scenarios forward.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. I encourage that

particularly given that, you know, the AB339 will sort of mandate that, so I'd like us to be ahead on that as that's something we have talked about from I think July. I'm looking at Commissioner Kennedy nodding his head on that, so if we could move forward on that I'd really appreciate that. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: If I could make clarification on that AB339. I haven't had a chance to fully look at that yet, but perhaps, Marian, does that pertain to just translation of materials, or does that include simultaneous interpretation of all meetings?

MS. JOHNSTON: It includes meetings, but right now it's just a proposal. It was just introduced. I have no idea if it's going to go anywhere.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So, I just want to also piggyback on what Commissioner Fernandez did say. We are -- we have, actually, since even before we made our proposal to the Commission we have continued to look at the question of simultaneous interpretation. We had been very cognizant, and we've had many conversations, but as with many things, you know, as we speak about one thing, we also ran into other questions that I think in -- for the sake of a more focused discussion we're just trying to investigate and make sure that we have answers to many of the other kind of questions that are most possibly going to come up,

and so there's still, because of the contracting process and everything like that, it's just taking us a little bit more time, but that's why I just wanted to let everybody know that we are very diligently looking into all of this, and we're very cognizant of the request.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, thank you, and I appreciate the work that the subcommittee has been doing. Commissioner Fernandez, go ahead.

right now, Marian, you just said it's a proposal and normally as a state agency you would provide information or feedback as to what the costs of the proposal would be, so would it behoove us to -- I'm not thinking clearly right now, so I apologize. Would it behoove us as a Commission to maybe come up to provide some sort of, I don't want to say opposition to it, but just some information so they actually understand what the cost would be to just translate in one language for all of the meetings that we are projecting to have? Because it's a huge number, and we're just looking at it right now with one language versus if we have to do multiple languages.

So, is there an avenue for us to do that, because I really do think as part of any passage of any bill or any legislation they really need to understand the back end in terms of what that means in dollars.

MS. JOHNSTON: I would suggest working with the

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm sorry, I can't hear.

MS. JOHNSTON: I'm sorry. I would suggest

contacting the staff of whoever the person is who submitted

the bill, and I don't recall it. I'll find out and get it to you. I assume that is something that they're going to be considering. Budget considerations always come up with State agencies giving new duties.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. So, I'm trying to think procedurally would that be our subcommittee or would that be Commissioner Sadhwani and Commissioner Toledo? But I'm also thinking that the initial contact may need to come from Director Hernandez to try to facilitate that conversation. I'm just trying to figure it out.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Procedure-wise I would recommend the subcommittee go to Director Hernandez who could then address, you know, the appropriate group. I do agree that this is something we should give a heads up to the Government Affairs Committee on, as they are working with different parts of the government groups on this.

I would also like -- so, that's for the process.

I would also like if anyone has ideas about translating

meetings, if they could go ahead and give this information

to Director Hernandez for the subcommittee in terms of

possible other venues, like what do other state agencies do, it would be very interesting, Commissioner Fernandez. I like your approach of this is how much you're saying it's going to end up costing. What other state agencies are doing this and how are their projections? How are they -- how are they doing this at this time, and, you know, what are their costs? So we could have also similar numbers, but possibly other ideas which we were not aware of.

So, thank you very much for your work on this item.

Any other questions? We have Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Just to let you know, in conversation that -- conversations that Commissioner Sinay and I have had with the Outreach Committee, this topic has come up and specifically the topic of how to do it within Zoom, because Zoom offers these Zoom rooms. So, Marcy and Patricia Vazquez Topete is looking into this, too. I don't know if you've talked with them about it. Okay. So, I just didn't want to make sure we weren't going down two different paths here.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. I do want to also assure that as we -- as I've said, we've been looking into

this since our initial proposal to the Commission.

I think one of the things that we have requested, but we're still gathering further information, I know that we've gotten suggestions about the Zoom rooms, you know, where I will say that looking into the Zoom translate, it's not as easy as just saying, okay, you know, the current meeting that we're on, let's just have, you know, these translations rooms available.

First off, there's a limit of five rooms, so, we're looking at only five languages. So, if there were, you know, a request, either an open request for any language that there's a request, or if we can say we're only going to do the 12, you know, the Zoom technology as far as we've seen is limited to five. Then it gets into other questions around, you know, how we then accommodate multiple languages.

I believe that -- and perhaps this is a further conversation that we need to have with the staff, but we have tried to -- we're in the process of trying to gather as much information as we can to make a recommendation to everybody, part of which includes, you know, what the technology is, part of which includes, frankly, the cost. And I will say that as Commissioner Fernandez mentioned, some of the initial costs are pretty shocking. Honestly, I mean, I'll just say that. I just thought, you know, hey,

how bad can it be, you know, and it was a little bit more shocking than I had even imagined.

And I think that's why we want to just be careful before we come forward and before we say anything to anybody because, you know, on the one hand I am very cognizant about a couple things. One is, you know, should cost be an issue to stop us from, you know, providing this when it should be an important part of, you know, people's civic participation and civic engagement in this process. I hear that, you know, I think there can be a case that could be made to say, you know, people, you know, may not be participating because they are not able to because English is -- you know, they're limited English proficient, and so, therefore, it's difficult for them to participate. And I think both Commissioner Fernandez and I, you know, very much had a robust conversation about that as well, too. It's kind of a little chicken or egg, right.

We also did talk about, you know, what has been brought up in terms of, you know, if you're providing public comment, you know, we should provide a whole meeting.

I think that there's some other things that we're trying to make sure that we have an understanding of, so that then when we come to the Commission and for the public to also, you know, hear as well, too. We're coming to it

with as much of a strong understanding of what the options are versus just the what ifs, and we still have to continue to go back and shape it. I would rather shape from having a place where this is what we understand as of right now, and then if we have to shape more, we will, but right now we're still in a very much like -- there's a lot of unknowns that we're still just trying to figure out and to get costs for and to the what ifs, and once we have that I think we can come -- I think we could have a more focused discussion as a Commission.

Also, I will just say this as well, too. I believe that when you look at most government agencies there are limited simultaneous translation provided. I believe part of it is because of the requirements of what the both Bagley-Keene and other government statutes require in terms of accessibility, and so, it's not just as simple as let's just set up the Zoom room or telephone line. I think there's some other things that we're just trying to make sure, you know, we're crossing our t's and dotting our i's on all of this so that we're taking into account all of these, you know, potential factors so that we're not taken by surprise later on that could exponentially, you know, maybe drive up costs and maybe other kinds of factors that could surprise us. So, I'll just stop there.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, thank you very much for

telling us a little bit of the actual details that are involved in this, because on the surface some of these things sound very easy, and obviously they are clearly not. The subcommittee has done a great deal of work and the Commission really appreciates that. Thank you.

Any other questions on this before we -- I don't see us at that point, so we'll move ahead to Item 9H, which is the Materials Development. Commissioners Fernandez and Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Let's see. Since last week I think Communications Director Ceja did bring up the fact that I believe all commissioners participated last week to do their video slides. I think we're continuing to work on the document that Commissioner Kennedy drafted.

I think that's pretty much it so far. Anything else, Commissioner Kennedy?

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: The only thing that I would mention is that I gave a very brief presentation to the Inland Empire Media Roundtable last week. They actually allotted me four minutes. So, I came up with a radically compressed version of the script and shared it with the outreach staff, so if any of you is invited to give a five-minute or even 10-minute presentation of Redistricting Basics, we at least have a starting point that you can use.

CHAIR ANDERSEN:

Thank you very much. I'm sure

that -- actually we're all smiling, but I think that's probably going to be way more helpful than we realize, so thank you for that.

Any other comments from either the subcommittee or any questions? Director Ceja.

add that all the updated versions of documents are on our website under the Outreach Material section, including the presentation on the script in order to avoid different versions going around or having older versions. Always make sure to go onto our website for the latest versions of presentations or any other documents. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you for that. Seeing no other comments, we'll move on to number 9I, Data
Management. Commissioner Ahmad and Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. I'll present -- start out for us today. So, for the Data Management Subcommittee we have three updates that we'd like to provide, and also give you back our time later on on the agenda. We believe we can just present here.

First of all, wanting to let you know that we did have our meeting, our regular standing meeting with USDR, and wanting to bring to this Commission's attention, in one of our earlier meetings it was determined that we would try to move forward with an MOU, and as we tried to kind of

research that without staff, we've determined that really an MOU is not plausible in that there is -- it's a no money exchange agreement.

And, so, as they try to research that, that does not appear to be the right direction, and so, before we totally, you know, moved with that, we wanted to at least bring it back to the full Commission and let you know that. An MOU no longer seems to make sense in this case. No money exchanged. There's nothing really to hold them accountable to. And, so, if there are any reactions to that, let me know, but our staff is recommending no MOU for this agreement.

The other piece is that we are moving forward with our data manager. Staff is working on a duty statement right now, and we know there is more clarity about the interaction between our data manager and the line drawer, but until they're on board we won't be able to gain some of that clarity, but we are going to move forward still with our data manager and get the duty statement completed and then be able to get that requisition out.

And then the last piece is, is in the meantime USDR has been asked to support our staff with a new project which is like a new database creation that will be able to track and display our presentations. Earlier we saw that, of course, demand is increasing right now for all of what

our staff is having to do to make sure that's available to the public, where the meetings are occurring, et cetera. It's getting to be a little bit of a larger project than need be, and so, USDR, we have put them into contact with our Outreach Manager, Marcy Kaplan, and they have graciously I believe, agreed to consult with her and see how they're able to support that effort as well, which will be totally separate, a totally separate project from the database that they're creating for us. And, so, they're willing to do that. We're excited about it, and that is our update. Any questions?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I see some right away. Commissioner Kennedy.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, thank you. I wanted to get a better understanding of the guidance not to put in place an MOU. I mean in the professional world that I come from there are MOUs all the time between organizations that involve no exchange of funds in either direction, so I'm just a little confused and just to understand this better. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Before you jump into that, could you please for the public and everybody, what is an MOU?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. An MOU is a memorandum of understanding, also some use MOA, memorandum of agreement, but it's the same. And I'm wondering if

staff wants to chime in here on any greater details.

Basically, I walked away with the understanding, and I hear you, Commissioner Kennedy, that you're used to having MOUs even when there is no money exchanged. But, basically, I think as we attempted to research, and there was wording that was provided for us from USDR should we need to have an MOU. It was us that initially brought it up. They thought, okay, we can do it. Let's research, and they provided words for us. We started with those words. But I think on our side in trying to make that happen in the channels that we have is where there got to be a sticking point.

So, I ask, let me ask, first of all, Commissioner Ahmad, do you have any additional detail other than that, or staff can chime in.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: No, Commissioner Turner, my understanding is the same as yours. Director Hernandez explained it much better than I could in terms of the state process used and what flags arose when talking about a no monetary exchange MOU, so I'll defer to his expertise.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Please answer, Commissioner -I'm sorry, Director Hernandez.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. So, eventually in creating the document we would be asking for someone to review it, and when they start to do the

review of this memorandum of understanding, a lot more questions would come up, some of the legal language. And, so then, they would lead us down the path of maybe this should be a more formal agreement that goes back to the contracting process. Now we have additional delays, we have additional requirements that USDR might not want to participate in those requirements because they are required by the contracting guidelines.

And so, trying to get away from having to do that part because of the oversight piece, someone would have to take a look at that, and in doing so it's going to ask, well, what is the money being exchanged. There isn't any money being exchanged. What are we agreeing to? They're going to provide a service to help us do our work, and so, that may lead to more questions and lead us to a different path in creating more of a contractual type of an agreement which we don't need essentially for the services that they're going to be providing.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: So, Marian, do you have an input on this one? I'm sorry, Ms. Johnston.

MS. JOHNSTON: I was not involved in this.

(inaudible)

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yeah, he was. I can bring him on board if you'd like, for Raul to explain, or get back to you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: This is an item that, you know, we -- as long as this is not -- right now it seems a bit like, you know, well, we don't want to put a contract -- put a memorandum together just for time, and certainly that's not where the thoughts are. There must be a little more of doubt to it than that.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Sure. There's more to that than just the time factor, but essentially, you know, what is being exchanged, the service, the monetary part of it. There is no monetary part of it, and so, that's where I want to make sure that we're clear. We're not required to have an MOU for that type of service. If we do go that route, then it opens up the other requirements that we may need to now follow.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: And while we're waiting to see if Raul is going to come on or we'll have to table it, because we're often asked, so I just want to respond on behalf -- yes, I want you to have your answers.

In addition to that, from the conversations that we've had with USDR from the beginning, the recommendation of the subcommittee is that we are willing to not have an MOU. It does not seem to be anything that would be a driver of USDR. They're very committed to the process and ensuring that they carry this all the way through, so it is our recommendation that we don't have one. And, so, if we

did not say that or I did not say that before, I wanted to also put that on the table, so as you're waiting for other response.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Turner and Commissioner Ahmad, is there already correspondence between the two, like written correspondence in terms of who is going to do what? I mean that could also be a statement of understanding that is an internal document versus something that we process through like the Department of General Services. So, if we already have something like that that details out kind of what the responsibility is on both sides, I think that, in my opinion, would be sufficient to, you know, it's just something showing what the responsibilities are.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you. I believe we've had conversations about exactly what you're talking about, but until we have our own data analyst on board and that clarity between the line drawer role and what our internal data processes will be housing, the fine details to that, is to be determined. And we're really excited to get that line drawer on board so we can ask a million questions, but, don't worry, Commissioner Andersen, we're holding off.

But at the end of the day I think this comes down to the monetary exchange. Even if we have a statement of agreement in place, or some type of agreement in place, if in the case that USDR does not follow through, then what? We don't pay them? Well, we weren't paying them anyway. So, it really comes down to that exchange of monetary goods, and in this case, USDR, like Commissioner Turner said, is super, super dedicated to this particular project. They've been committed week by week.

So, again, I'm with Commissioner Turner on this.

Our recommendation is just to continue moving forward as we have been, and if we do as a Commission want to go the route of the formal contract, then we can do that. We can go solicit services, have that monetary exchange and get that in place. But as of right now, this is what we have, and if we as a Commission want to change course, we are certainly open to having that conversation.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Would the subcommittee be amenable to the idea of continuing on as we are with the idea being to -- as the line drawer comes aboard and it becomes a little more specific to then just having an internal written understanding of who is -- the roles? I think as Commissioner Fernandez says, the Commission, I believe, would feel more comfortable with certainly something in a bit of writing.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Correct. And we don't necessarily -- it isn't the contract per se because there is no money. So --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair, and there is and has been written conversation on, again, USDR. We meet with them every week, and every week we kind of capture what the agreements are. They've led many of those conversations and set up the calls, and, you know, who's going to be on the call, et cetera, and so, there is a trail. There is an email trail of what has transpired so far, what the expectations are. Their willingness to work around us as a subcommittee and then as the Commission waiting for next direction before they move.

So, I think internally, of course, once we receive our data manager, data analyst, once they're on board and the agreements are set, I know we all heard the presentation from Haystaq and Q2 as far as the role that their data people will play. And, again, that just has to be refined before we can give USDR any more detail. And then when we work it out, yes, there will be more email exchange. We are capturing it. And probably more comfort level if you all were directly dealing with them, but take it from us, we're extremely comfortable with USDR. They are going to get this done for us. They're committed to

doing so. And, yeah, we're willing to stake our conversations with them and confidence in them to be able to just say to you that internal emails, we have that captured, MOU, don't see a need for it or concern for not having it.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. I see Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'm good with the recommendation of the subcommittee.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I could not agree more. Do we want to have a -- would the subcommittee, are they looking for further actual vote on this or is this just a --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I don't believe so. If you can recall to mind, I don't think we voted to get the MOU, it was just kind of move thing, and, so, I don't think we need a vote.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. No, I believe. This is great. Thank you very much. And are there any other questions?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Chair, just to close the loop, I wasn't sure since I'm not in the room, if Raul was going to come forward and provide that additional explanation.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: I was going to touch base with him and respond back to the Commission

after lunch.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay. Sounds good. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: And at this point does the -you know, additional information is always good. Does the
Commission feel we need to have that additional
information? Does anyone feel very strongly that we do
need to have a discussion? No, okay. Thank you very much.
Tell Mr. Villanueva that he does not need to be present.
Thank you.

Any other points from the Data Management Committee?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: No, we rest. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. That was a great update.

At this point I believe -- I did get a message. We were supposed to be doing something with the language access. We might actually go back to them.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Chair. My apologies. I think we got so much into the other conversation around interpretation that we forgot to request a vote for approval from the Commission about translating the PowerPoint, the Redistricting Basics PowerPoint deck because it is not in the Outreach Plan, so we do need to seek and request formal approval from the

1 commissioners, all of the commissioners. 2 CHAIR ANDERSEN: So, do we have a proposal on the 3 floor? 4 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So, I quess if I can 5 make the motion. I move to translate the current 6 Redistricting Basics PowerPoint presentation into the 12 7 languages that we are providing translations for for the 8 other materials, specifically about the Redistricting 9 Commission and the FA2s. 10 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Do we have a second? 11 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'll second. 12 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Any discussion? Commissioner 13 Yee. 14 COMMISSIONER YEE: Just to clarify, is this 15 simply the PowerPoint, itself, not the audio version of it? 16 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, just the PowerPoint. 17 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: It's just the written 18 materials, yes, and not the script, either, just for 19 clarification. It would only be the PowerPoint. 20 CHAIR ANDERSEN: So, at this point we want call 21 the vote. 22 MS. JOHNSTON: Public comment, Chair. 23 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Public comment. 24 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, I'm sorry. Public comment, 25 Kristian, would you mind, just read the please.

instructions for public comment.

MR. MANOFF: Sure thing. In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the commissioners will be taking public comment by phone.

To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted, enter the meeting I.D. number provided on the livestream feed. It is 98938125973 for this week's meeting. When prompted to enter a participant I.D., simply press pound.

Once you've dialed in you'll be placed in a queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press star nine. This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it's your turn to speak you'll hear a message that says, "The host would like you to talk. Press star six to speak."

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

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

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

And there are no callers at this time, Chair.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. We will rest for a few minutes to allow the live feed time to catch up and allow people a chance to call in.

MR. MANOFF: And we do have someone in the queue, Chair. Stand by.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Go ahead, caller.

MS. DIAZ: Hi, good afternoon, Commissioners, and thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I would like to speak in regards to Item 9F.

My name is Karen Diaz and I'm here on behalf of the Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights, also known as CHIRLA, an immigrant rights organization with national presence in California.

We appreciate the Commission is providing interpretational requests for when non-English want to give public comment or provide community of interest testimony. Today we ask the interpretation be extended to the Redistricting Basics presentation.

As an organization that has helped hundreds of limited English speakers in town communities on the census, and has been part of the redistricting process from the start, we want to remind the Commission that in order to create our process that is accessible to all, including creating maps that are equitably reflecting the voice of

California's diverse population that should not be a requirement to speak and understand English. Redistricting is a very (indiscernible) topic that can be difficult to understand, even when it is discussed in language one is fluent in.

There are 6.7 million limited English proficient Californians, and they should be able to attend educational meetings and follow public hearing content in language that they're comfortable in to maximize their ability to understand the proceedings. Being able to hear the Commission's Redistricting Basics in language will allow English as second language speakers to learn about the redistricting process and invite everyone to participate. Removing language access barriers will play a crucial role in the redistricting process and will shape the Commission's engagement with the public and the final maps that will be in place for the next decade.

Thank you for your time, and we look forward to having Commissioner Sara Sadhwani join with us this Saturday to present to CHIRLA members and staff on the Commission Redistricting Basics.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you for your comment. Are there any other people in the queue? Kristian?

MR. MANOFF: We have no other callers, Chair.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: We have waited a few minutes. I

99 believe that's sufficient. Thank you so much. Can we call 1 2 the vote? 3 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Okay. The motion 4 is to translate the PowerPoint into the 12 languages like 5 the other collateral materials have been or are going to be 6 translated into. 7 Fernandez -- Commissioner Fernandez. 8 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. You caught me off 9 guard. 10 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: I'm sorry. 11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I was never first. 12 Okay, yes. Sorry. 13 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner 14 Fornaciari. 15 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes. 16 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner 17 Kennedy. 18 VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes. 19 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Le 20 Mons. 21 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes. 22 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner 23 Sadhwani. 24 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. 25 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: The motion passes.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. Thank you for having us come back to that item and taking care of it.

So, now, was there anything else for this committee? I don't see anything, so now we'll go on to Item Number 9J, Grants, which is Commissioner Akutagawa and Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Le Mons, do you want me to just go ahead and start?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes, please.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So, I do want to say that the Grants Subcommittee did meet. We are -- at this time right now I just wanted to give a heads up or kind of a -- just give a -- I don't want to call it a warning, but just a heads up that currently right now the staff is working through the details of the RFA. However, there is a possibility that it may switch from an RFA to a RFP. So, an RFA is a request for application. It may switch to request for proposal, so more of a contracting, primarily because we're finding some contradictory kind of guidance on which is the proper route to go, and so, we're still working through those details.

At this time right now I think we are looking most likely at a timeframe that is probably going to be late April when we'll be actually putting it out for

organizations to apply for the funds as an intermediary and then, therefore, there may be, you know, from a rough timeline perspective it's probably going to be in May when organizations that will be applying to the intermediary to apply for those funds, mainly because of the clarification that we're seeking out in terms of some of the guidelines around which is the proper way we felt we were going in the right direction but there's now been some additional questions. So, there's a possibility that we're just trying to make sure that we're clear that we're utilizing the right direction.

And that is it for our report right now, unless, Commissioner Le Mons, if you want to chime in on anything else?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: No, I don't have anything to add.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Any questions about that? Well, okay. Thank you very much for the presentation. It is unfortunate, but obviously it's extremely important to get things done properly, so we appreciate the subcommittee's work.

Moving on to Item 9K, the Community of Interest tool, which is Commissioners Akutagawa and Kennedy.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa, would you like to start?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Go ahead, Commissioner Kennedy.

2.2.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: We are now getting regular reports from the Statewide Database. The latest report was there was nothing significant to report.

As Director Ceja mentioned, we do have indication that we can expect some additional languages to come on line, perhaps by the end of the week, so, once we have confirmation on that. We're already working with Director Ceja on getting press releases ready for that event, and we certainly look forward to rolling those out for the community.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Specifically I will mention that traditional Chinese, simplified Chinese and Tagalog, and both the Communities of Interest tool and the tutorials will become available by mid this week. They're estimating Wednesday.

I do want to just mention that a press release will be issued in English. We did have the idea initially of trying to also issue press releases in the languages in which the Communities of Interest tool would become available, but due to the fact that we don't have the interpretation contracts in place yet, we're not in a place to provide press releases in those languages. So, I guess,

Director Ceja, if it's appropriate for me to say if any ethnic media outlets are going to be translating the press release into either simplified or traditional Chinese and/or Tagalog and they want to share that with us, we will be I think more than happy to amplify through our own website as well -- or our own social media and website.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: One quick question. Can you go ahead and tell us what language the community of interest tool is available in right now?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Right now Spanish and -Spanish is currently available, and then this week both
forms of written Chinese, simplified and traditional
Chinese will be available, and also Tagalog, which is one
of the Filipino languages, and then they are working -continuing to work on the other languages. As far as
Commissioner Kennedy and I know that the Statewide Database
is estimating to have the remainder of the 12 languages
already to go by the end of this month.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. Any questions? Thank you to the subcommittee.

Moving on, Item Number 9L, which is Cybersecurity.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Nothing significant to update.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Number 9M,

Incarcerated Populations. And that is Commissioners Fernandez and Sinay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, you or me? We are still waiting for one more conversation with the final third piece to our puzzle, and we have that scheduled either next week or the week after, and then once we have a conversation with them, we'll gather the three agencies together to then come up -- brainstorm and come up with some recommendations on how we move forward to engage the incarcerated population. Anything else, Commissioner Sinay?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. So, next is Item Number N, 9N, Lessons Learned.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: As always, please keep them coming. Commissioner Ahmad and I are keeping a running list, adding our own and looking forward to the time next year when we sit down and review all of this. So, please keep them coming.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. One item I do note that we should all be paying attention to is we do have this extended time, so all of our subcommittees need to keep in mind what -- moving forward we hope that these things are not occurring for them, and so, what portions would be affected. So, make sure that we kind of keep that in mind as we make our suggestions to the Lessons Learned

Subcommittee. Thank you very much.

2.2.

Let's see. I'm looking at our next item. When we put our agendas we must post them two weeks beforehand, and Item O is our Executive Director Recruitment.

Commissioners Fernandez and I think it was Ahmad. I think they've done a very good job. Thank you very much for your services and we'll retire that subcommittee.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: We were done before we started. Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: And we are certainly glad to have Director Hernandez as our executive director moving forward.

I'm looking at the time here. We do have one new subcommittee that we have created and has been added to our list, and it was created at our last February 24 to 26 meeting. It is 9P. It might move up now. It's called the Public Input Meeting Design Subcommittee. That is a mouthful. They have a very interesting charge, and it's a lot of -- it's a very involved statement.

I think at this point I would like to -- at the subcommittee's approval I would actually like to put that off until after lunch. We might go ahead and take lunch early. It's now 9:24 (sic.) unless we have other discussions about that. And I see Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Not a discussion about

that. I'm fine with delaying it until after lunch, but I was just curious if you would like to establish the Chief Counsel Recruiting Subcommittee.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, thank you very much. Good catch. Yes, we do need to reactivate the Chief Counsel Subcommittee, and to reactivate that, that is Commissioner Toledo and myself. So, that is reactivated just now. Thank you very much.

So, at that point I'd like to adjourn for lunch, and we'll come back at 1:25, continue with Public Input

Design or -- actually, we might jump right into -- move that to the end because I think that's a very fruitful discussion. We might end up jumping right into number 10, Legal Affairs Committee update and then come back to our new subcommittee.

So, with that in mind, just to give everyone fair warning of what we'll be starting with. When we come back from lunch we'll obviously be going into public comment, and then we will jump into Legal Affairs Committee update.

So, would everyone please be back at 1:26.

(Off the record at 12:26 p.m.)

(On the record at 1:30 p.m.)

23 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, good afternoon. Welcome 24 back after lunch to the 2020 California Citizens 25 Redistricting Commission. And in the agenda we are on -- we're going to jump into Item Number 10, which is Legal Affairs Committee update with Commissioners Yee, Toledo and Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, thank you, Chair. So,
Russell Yee here. I'm the rotating chair for the Legal
Affairs Committee for March, and Commissioner Toledo will
be the vice chair. The immediate past chair, Commissioner
Sadhwani, has kindly continued to follow up some of the
items that were live when she was chair last month, and so,
we'll let her go ahead and update you on those items.

Yee. As you all know, we chose to postpone the interviews for the hiring of VRA counsel and outside litigation. We have moved forward in rescheduling those interviews, and a separate meeting of the Legal Affairs Committee, which will take place on the 22nd and 23rd. The 22nd will primarily be interviews of the Voting Rights Act counsel, and the 23rd will be our outside litigation interviews, with the 24th being reserved for any additional deliberation, should we need that day.

In addition, as we reported back last time, we had received public comment suggesting that there was a need for additional review of our applicants in terms of their lobbying activities and political donations. We have asked Tina, our legal -- excuse me, paralegal, to assist us

in ensuring a full review of all of the applicants, including all of the team members listed on any of the applications. So, we are actively doing that and hope to have a report back from her.

My question, actually, Alvaro, do you know, were we able to finalize the agenda? I know we have a couple more days, I think, before that has to go live. I don't think it's posted yet; is that correct?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Let me double check for that, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay, no problem. I guess just for folks watching that should go live fairly soon. Thank you. And thank you to our new chair, Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you for that good work, Commissioner Sadhwani.

The committee will be meeting this Wednesday morning, March 10th, to prepare for those interviews, finalizing our evaluation approach and making other arrangements.

I should also note on the agenda, the fourth bullet item, discussion of advice on use of closed sessions, that item has actually been settled since the agenda was assembled, and we have taken the advice not to do any of the deliberations in closed session, so our

meeting will be in open session.

Anything else for our Legal Affairs Committee,
Commissioners Toledo or Sadhwani?

Okay. We do have numerous irons in the fire and we'll keep you updated as we proceed.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Any -- Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Are we going to talk about the search for the legal counsel -- for the CRC legal counsel? Is that -- I thought it was under this and it doesn't make sense for it to be under here, so I apologize. But I didn't know when we were getting an update on that.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: No, that's a --

COMMISSIONER YEE: The bullet item in the agenda refers to counsel during the interviews, not the overall need for counsel. I'm sorry if that wasn't clear.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And I think just as way of an update, the Chair just appointed -- reignited the subcommittee for the hiring process. I don't know if they have a timeline or not yet, but my understanding is that it's separate from Legal Affairs.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. That's an issue we'll address at our next meeting.

Any other questions for the subcommittee? I would like to, given HR1 and its potential implications

with the Voting Rights Act, I think that might be a good topic for additional questions to run by the applicants, how they would -- if they're following this and how that might impact their work and their work with us. So, if you could -- just a suggestion in terms of questions, which I know you've might have already put the list together. I just don't quite know what the status is, but I thought I would bring that -- mention that.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Excellent.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Any other items? Okay, great. Thank you.

At this point, I did sort of jump into Legal Affairs. We did not actually do public comment, and I delayed that a little bit purposely. Some people often expect us to return from lunch about 1:45, so I didn't want anyone to miss our public comment period. But it is time to -- typically after lunch come back and we have public comment. So (inaudible).

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, chair. In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the commissioners will be taking public comment by phone.

To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted, enter the meeting I.D. number provided on the livestream

feed. It is 98938125973 for this week's meeting. When prompted to enter a participant I.D., simply press the pound key.

Once you have dialed in you'll be placed in a queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press star nine. This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it's your turn to speak you will hear a message that says, "The host would like you to talk and to press star six to speak."

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

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

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

And the Commission is taking general public comment after lunch at this time, and we do have one caller in the queue with their hand up. I will allow them to come in. And the floor is yours.

MS. HOWARD: Thank you. Hi. This is Deborah Howard with the California Senior Advocates League.

I have a couple of comments and I think they all

fall under the umbrella of transparency. I submitted a public records request for the Barreto analysis this past week, and it was responded to really quickly, but it was also responded to pretty unsatisfactorily.

Essentially, the report said we don't have it; it was created by the old Commission, and this was the information that was available publicly by the old Commission in 2010, and this is what you can have now.

And, so, my question is does the 2020 Commission just simply wash their hands of this now and say, no, not my deal? Would it be appropriate to follow up with the Legal Subcommittee? I mean really what is the next step here? I don't think it's an acceptable answer to say it's not in our possession and it's not our duty to find it for you, because I'm pretty sure I have no standing as a simple member of the public to reach out to the law firm and ask Gibson, Dunn for it. So, I have that as my question.

And then this is really following along the lines of the comments that Renee Westa-Lusk also made this morning about the videos from 2010 not being available.

I'm actually looking more towards the more current transcripts of 2021. I know you make the videos available, but the likelihood that anyone has the time, or the capacity, or the interest, actually, to go through hours and hours and hours of those videos to find a decision

point. It seems to me that it might also be valuable to the commissioners, themselves, to keep a track, while it just could be simple I do want the transcripts, the written transcripts, which I know you're working on, but it could be facilitated a little more quickly, I'm hoping. But also just the decision tree of what did we decide with which vote, because I notice in your conversations you're questioning yourselves. Oh, do we need to vote on this? Did we vote on this last time? We're changing our direction now. Is that a vote or do we just need a nod of the head? I mean, I think operationally you guys as a team, you're staffed up. You've been operating. Some of this can work a little bit better.

And then on the outreach calendars, this is obviously an area where you've spent a lot of time. I just want to say to you in context of that whole discussion you had this morning, transparency is your friend. Speak to any group that invites you, and do it in public, because that will protect you from any -- you and the public from any accusations of partisanship.

But the question is when you're doing those, this morning Commissioner Sinay reported out very quickly several of the groups that she had reported -- or had presented to. I wasn't able to catch them all.

I think your heart is in the right place about

transparency, but the systems really aren't building that capacity for you.

And I realize I'm going over my time, but if you could address the question about how to pursue the request for the Barreto analysis, I would like to know that, and also, I guess it raises the question to me of where would I know what other public record act requests were coming into the Commission, since that was not reported out by the chief counsel this morning.

And, actually, I have one more comment that also falls under the headline of transparency, and that is I believe when you take action in executive session you actually have to report out what action you took, not just simply that you took action.

And based on the comments before you left for lunch, I'm guessing that part of your personnel decision was that Kary Marshall no longer works for the Commission. I don't expect that I have a right to know why that decision was made, but if that decision was made or she resigned and that decision was made in executive session, I think that the public needs to be notified of that.

So, those are all my comments. I'm sorry for the machinegun approach. I did try to call in this morning and my phone was just simply not cooperating with me. So, my apologies to that, and I will just stop talking with the

caveat that I know you're doing really hard work in really difficult circumstances and I appreciate that most of all, so, thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. There are a few items as we're switching the location of our websites, some items have not been crossed over yet, and we are still working out all the bugs on that, which we will certainly get around to. In terms of the records, what is being posted, that certainly is there.

The outreach, there is a list on under outreach in terms of where the meetings have been, so you can always look there in terms of what -- if you didn't quite catch where the commissioners have been, you can always go back to the website and have a look at that.

We're working on several different items. We appreciate your coming back to that. And I will have to -- in terms of the request for information, I'll have to go back to our staff, and they will follow through on that.

Yes, Ms. Marshall is no longer with the Commission. That was just one of the -- we did report on actions, that we took action.

But thank you very much for all your comments, and we'll work on the transcripts as well. Thank you, and is there anyone else in the queue?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Chair, your counsel.

MS. JOHNSTON: Just a response on the public records request. The answer was actually that the 2010 Commission never had the Baretto report. It was prepared for the 2010's counsel, Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher, and all the Commission ever got was the summary that was provided to Ms. Howard.

I don't know what the process would be for getting it from Gibson, Dunn, since it's not the lawyer for this Commission. There's nothing you can do to get that released. It was maintained by them as attorney work product.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much, Counsel.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And we do have other people in the queue.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Invite them in, please.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. And the floor is yours.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Good afternoon. This is Lori Shellenberger, L-O-R-I, S-H-E-L-L-E-N-B-E-R-G-E-R. I'm the redistricting consultant for Common Cause.

And I also want to echo thanks for your service and your commitment.

Also, I'm calling in about the Outreach Report,

Item 9F. But before I go into that, I did want to give a

shout out from the public to congratulate you on the hiring

of your line drawer. That is a really big milestone, and it was a little anticlimactic when you announced it and there's no one in the room to clap and cheer for you, so, congratulations to the subcommittee that put so much work into that process.

I just wanted to flag something regarding those criteria that you discussed before lunch. I appreciate all the work that you're doing to do these outreach presentations. It's really incredible how much time you're putting into that, and also the need to seek some parameters that may make it a little bit more manageable.

I just wanted to -- there wasn't much discussion about the criteria that Commissioner Fornaciari put on the screen regarding "some groups that you may not find appropriate to present to live." And that is incredibly ambiguous language, and it wasn't clear to me what that meant or what groups might fall into that category, and that was concerning.

And, secondly, and more importantly I think, something like this, it wasn't clear to me from your discussion what exactly the charge was to staff on this. I think you said it could be incorporated into your outreach plan. It seems like something that really should be more of a formal policy, that it shouldn't be up to staff discretion, or even to individual commissioner discretion

as to who they'll present to and formalizing the policy that will insulate and protect you and make sure that any policy you adopt or apply, or any criteria that you articulate or applied is equitably as possible and in the most transparent way possible.

So, again, that's my comment. I thank you, as always, for your receptiveness to public comment and for the opportunity to speak to you. Thanks.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Ms. Shellenberger, for the comment. Obviously, the Outreach Committee will certainly look into it.

Do we have any other?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair, we do. We have one more. And the floor is yours.

MS. WESTA-LUSK: Hello. This is Renee Westa-Lusk. I'm calling about the Subcommittee Outreach Engagement Report, 9F.

I agree that you should present to political parties because you'll probably get better public input at the virtual hearings and the written public input for the redistricting process, especially if you can educate the political parties that you're not looking for partisan political comment, that you're looking for community of interest comment.

And I think it also helps allowing political

parties to ask you to present, you know, educational outreach in the geographically hard to reach areas as well, because in some areas there aren't a whole lot of organizations available to communities, and maybe they're not informed. If they do get contacted, they might not divulge the information to the community, and maybe the community may be totally cut off, other than maybe through some political party organizations communicating on redistricting, because like a lot of organizations they don't care about redistricting, and it may not be, you know, germane to their subject area. So, that's why I think it's a good idea to reach out to all groups that contact you.

And the other thing is I'm sure that the 2010 Commission, if you have any way to look up records, I'm sure that they did reach out to the political partisan organizations in the state. I'm almost sure they did that. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much.

Interesting point. And do we have anyone else in the queue?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: No, that was it,

23 Chair.

24 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. So, 25 getting back to the agenda, Item Number 11, which would be the next item, obviously, in order is our Education Outreach Panel which will be tomorrow at 10:00 a.m.

We have -- number 13 has been removed from the agenda as Commissioner Ahmad and Turner they said that their committee report was certainly sufficient on that.

You've already heard -- oh, thank you very much for the shout out about congratulations to us for signing the contract with the line drawer. And we will not have them on board, so they will not be doing a presentation. So, we could talk about a little timeline in there.

But basically what I'd like to do at this point, as you can see, we're running short on the agenda for this time period, and what I'd like to do is go back to and sort of open it up a little bit. At the February 24th to 26th meeting we established a new subcommittee, which is called the Public Input Meeting Design Subcommittee. And I'm going to invite them to speak, kind of give a bit of an idea.

Please introduce what the purpose of the subcommittee is, just a bit of a rough idea of what it's going to cover, and get some input on ideas or issues that some of the commissioners might have thought about and where we might go on this one. I see I have Commissioner Fernandez with a question.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. Actually, I think

we need to clarify what the membership was made up of initially because it's different than what the agenda is for next week. And then there are other concerns that I had which I had forwarded to you, so I'm sure we'll talk about that later. I just want to make sure that we are clear on what the membership is now and then moving forward.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, thank you. And with that, I'd like to turn over to the -- Commissioner Sinay and Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. So, let's see. As we talked about at the last meeting, you know, the purpose of this subcommittee is to design the public input meetings and to talk about different novel approaches that we can take, or think about different approaches we can take to designing these meetings, you know, considering we were in the -- the COVID environment we're in.

So, one of the things that we talked about -Commissioner Sinay and I had a meeting with the outreach
staff. We talked to them about looking into different
approaches that other public institutes are taking at this
time to post public meetings, how they're managing input in
those public meetings, how they're setting up a queue, for
instance, so people would, you know, have a specific time
to provide public input, and how all that is being managed.

So, we asked Marcy and Patricia to look at a few specific places or a few specific organizations to kind of see how they're doing it, the Ventura County Board of Supervisors. They came up with a few more organizations to look at, to, you know, come up with different ideas about that.

You know, and obviously the things we're thinking about are language access and how we're going to manage language access, how we're going to -- you know who are we going to interact -- you know, how we're going to work with the -- we'd like to work with the line drawing team to kind of come up with ideas from their perspective and how they could manage this input most effectively in real time, and, of course, our outreach staff, you know, they've given this some thought already, you know, partner with them. And who am I missing here?

So, I didn't write down what the membership -COMMISSIONER SINAY: I have it.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: If the final people will raise their hand. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So, what we wanted to do -the way this all came about what the idea that there's a
lot of different moving pieces, and because of the way
things work, and we're only two people committees and we
can't talk to each other, we're at a junction point where

we need to bring us together. And, so, this is considered a public subcommittee, so we will be meeting in public meetings so the outside as well as other commissioners can participate.

We brought up -- you know, the initial idea was to have four subcommittees -- a representation from the four subcommittees that are open to anybody who wanted to participate. We did take names because we need to know who's in the subcommittee to know if we have a quorum, but anyone can attend the meetings.

So, again, all commissioners can attend the meetings, but those who signed up, meaning that we need to have five people to make a quorum, were Sinay, Taylor, Fernandez, Akutagawa, Yee, Fornaciari, Ahmad, and Andersen. And, so, the idea is so far there will be a meeting at our next meeting, and what we really were hoping for now is to get thoughts on what information or what questions people have that are -- that need to be answered by each other.

We -- the other piece that has come up was that question of hosting external -- no, hosting -- CRC hosted public sessions where anyone can come, and we would have it agendized, and people would know when we're having it.

And, so, that will be one of the first projects for this committee to kind of look at because there's pieces of everything that were doing, that each of these

subcommittees is doing. But we are collecting cost analysis and things like that, so that when the committee comes together they can make decisions on what is the opportunity costs or does this fall into what we had in mind before, and what not. Neal, did we lose you? COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, you have to excuse me for a minute. COMMISSIONER SINAY: So, Commissioner Fernandez, you had some questions. CHAIR ANDERSEN: Actually, can we jump into -so, the four committees are? Are you going to tell us? COMMISSIONER SINAY: My apologies. No, he had already said it. Am I still on mute? I'm sorry. So, it is language access, the line drawing, outreach and engagement and VRA. CHAIR ANDERSEN: And data management? COMMISSIONER SINAY: And data management, so we have -- we have representation from all of them. CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah. I believe -- was Commissioner Taylor on that for representing the Gantt chart?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

24

25

anybody else could come and be involved, because we didn't

want to make it too big of a committee because then we need

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, we left it at eight with

to make sure that -- for quorum it gets harder and harder for quorum.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. So, then, the item that -- Commissioner Fernandez. I will let you go ahead and describe this.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So, I did -- in the finalists I did have Commissioner Taylor, so I guess my -- well, my main concern was out of the eight -- the list that I had, out of the eight commissioners there's five Republicans. So, I really do feel that it needs to be more of a bipartisan.

So, maybe we need to relook and rethink of who the committee members should be so that it's more balanced than it is right now. So, that was the main issue that I had when I went back to look at who was on the committee.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: That's a great point because we didn't really look at that. We just kind of went by who wants. And I did have Taylor. I don't know why I skipped it, but I do have eight -- Sinay, Taylor, Fernandez, Akutagawa, Yee, Fornaciari, Ahmad and Andersen. So, sorry, Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And, so, what I had thought of, and, of course, I may be way off, was to have the subcommittees from the language access, the outreach and engagement and also data management because I feel that

initially these are the ones that will provide more input, and we can obviously bring more in as we go further down the line.

And by doing that it brings us up to a more equal balanced committee where it's no political preference, two Democrats and two Republicans.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. So, it's a public input meeting and obviously one of the crucial people is -- I think we should define what are these meetings?

Certainly if the line drawers are there, you'd have the line drawing subcommittee involved. I don't see -- and in terms of what types of meetings, you have the public input.

There's one question in my mind is where is the education crossover here between when are we educating, when are we doing COI tool education or input, and what public input are we talking about, because there are several types of public input meetings, so --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think because a lot of that has been fuzzy, that was the reason why we -- we wanted to bring together this group, and so that will be one of the areas we'll be discussing.

Also, my understanding, and I could be wrong, that the line drawing committee was to hire the line drawer that we don't have, that it was always kind of outreach and engagement, and it had been up in the air for a long time,

and then Neal joined the Outreach and Engagement
Subcommittee, and said, okay, we can continue doing with
the engagement, and that's where we came up to this deal to
bring more people together.

2.2.

So, my understanding, and I saw Commissioner
Sadhwani nod like an accepting nod was that the line
drawing committee was brought together, and I could be
wrong, but we had asked it several times, so who's taking
on that piece, and so, what we said was let's bring in all
the people we need finally and let's move forward on the
different types of input and public education, because
you're absolutely right. Public education is broader than
just what is redistricting.

I agree completely with Ms. Renee who said, hey, when are you going to talk about the communities of interest and let people know more about communities of interest. And I haven't wanted to bring that up because we just finished getting our public education materials together for redistricting, but we do need that piece now, too, because some will want -- and that was always in the marketing plan -- I mean in the outreach plan was always that there's different -- and so that's what this group will be coming together to get a lot of that different work together -- then together.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Any other suggestions

there? In terms of -- you know, I appreciate that the line drawing, that is, indeed, we originally were going to be hiring. The hiring process isn't quite finished yet, and then the -- I guess is there -- there needs to be a follow through on that in terms of technically, you know, I guess for legal affairs like the VRA counsel, that has sort of morphed into then a legal affairs group so that that charge is moved over.

I guess what I'm looking for, so what mechanism will we have for the continuation of assisting the line drawer, the connection here throughout the contract of it. And that's certainly integral with the line drawing -- the input process.

So, I would certainly like to be -- in terms of I would believe I -- the membership, I think, the purpose of the committee is to understand the process as opposed to just in terms of appearance of who's on the committee for political reasons. I think we need to make sure that we have the people involved in terms of making it operate effectively, whoever those people are.

But I'd really appreciate more input from the Commission and the committee involved.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. I don't have a strong preference one way or another, and I think this is a

great topic for the full Commission to weigh in on. You know, I think -- my impression when we formed the line drawing subcommittee was that it was simply around that hiring, and the creating of the RFP, and walking us through that process. We're nearly complete with that. Of course, we're still waiting on that contract to be finalized.

I think that the line drawer probably does need to have a point of contact, but I don't know that it needs to be any specific subcommittee. I think that's something that the -- that we should discuss as a full Commission. I certainly don't think that the line drawing subcommittee needs to necessarily scope out, you know, the path forward in terms of community of interest input in meetings. We received that plan from Q2 and Haystaq which I think was really excellent.

There's lots of fodder in there for great conversation, and it seems to me that this new public facing subcommittee would take on that plan and kind of think through like, well okay, what from here do we want to use, what do we not want to use. So, that all makes perfect sense to me.

And I think if the point of contact is a staff member, and my understanding is that's what it was in 2010, I think that's one option. It could be someone from, you know, this new committee. I think there's a lot of options

there and its worth having a discussion, you know, with the full Commission on that.

I don't even know if we can answer that right now. We might want to figure out what they would want in terms of how to best communicate with the Commission, and certainly we'll want to think about that from a Bagley-Keene perspective. In that sense it might make sense for there to be a staff member involved in those communications.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Sorry. Along those lines, there is a -- the contract does require both. It does require staff member contact that is Raul, or Mr. Villanueva, as far as the administration of it all. It does actually require several contacts. It's strongly suggesting several contacts, which is in the entire plan, and it is actually appropriate that the Commission needs to decide how -- we are presented with a plan. What kind of plan do we want to agree to? That's exactly entirely appropriate, and how we go forward with that.

And, so, this is an area where even on an organizational chart where we had to be missing a piece. You know, how does this fit together? How does it -- how does the VRA fit in, how does the management fit in, you know, how is this going to flow with the Commission and with the staff, because there's the administration part of

it, and then there's the functional part of it.

So, this is certainly a -- it's a timely committee, and it's sort of brought upon by actually looking at the whole timeline. Because, you know, what can get strength, what can't get strength, what are we using with our extra two months, what goes where, and that is where we are which is certainly why the Outreach Committee, who was impacted first by, you know, so what are we doing and when are we doing it has certainly been handling this. Certainly, I think the whole Commission appreciates this.

So, moving forward it's just a question of where we go from here and which we sort of brought up this subcommittee.

So, I actually would advocate we just leave it as the group of eight knowing that, therefore -- Marian, I believe is that five we need to have a quorum then?

MS. JOHNSTON: If you're membership is eight, you need five, yes.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: That way we can get full input and possibly pare it down as the meeting goes on. We have Commissioner Fernandez and Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Of course, I disagree with it only because it's so heavily Republican, but regardless of that piece of it, ideally I would like to see like two separate committee membership of both the legal

and this one so that we can actually hold meetings at the same time instead of having to do the legal committee first or us first, so that's another concern maybe is if we have overlapping commissioners, then we have to spread out the meeting time further. So, that's just something we need to think about also.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Akutagawa and then Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I guess I do want to just ask the question. I think Commissioner Fernandez does bring up a good point, especially given some of the earlier conversations we had about appearing, or at least being somewhat impartial. You know, it may seem like it shouldn't matter in the public input design, but I think I'll just say that based on public input that the public comment that we get, I mean sometimes members of the public do see things maybe we may not be currently seeing, and I am curious as to whether or not there is a concern that all five of the Republicans that are on the Commission are currently on this particular committee.

I think, if I'm correct, I think there is -- I think Commissioner Fernandez pointed out that there is only one Democrat on this committee and two independents or no party preference, so I'm just kind of putting this out for, you know, perhaps comment from the others on the Commission

around this topic.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Commissioner Kennedy.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. If we could see on screen either now or at some point a list of these eight and which subcommittees they represent. Right now it's a bit of a blur. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah, that's a very good point.

One of the --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I can do that while we continue to take questions and comments.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Any questions, comments? Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Is there a desired number of representations, so for where there is concern, what would we like to see as far as party representation? What is the goal of the conversation?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: The goal of the conversation is to quit talking within our silos and say, oh, that's a really good question for that committee, or that's a really good question for that committee so we can start formulating plans that have a little bit more meat on it, and we can bring forward to have everybody kind of bring it up. There might be questions that come up that you'll need to back to your subcommittee and bring it back.

But it's just we were finding that our -- that in 2010 they did a lot of subcommittees and they all met like in the morning before the meeting started. They all -- the subcommittees were broken into three different rooms, and people would go to those rooms, and then they would come back together for public -- for the business session. can't do that as well right now because we're all virtual. So, you did have to choose where you wanted to go, and the public also had to choose which meeting they wanted to attend. But you get to a point where two people isn't enough to really go forward. And, so, we were really feeling stuck, and I think, you know, we kept running and talking to one person from another subcommittee, and it felt like a lot of us were stuck, and sort of like, you know, Commissioner Sadhwani said to us, you know, the Legal Affairs Committee has worked pretty well with three people. You guys might want to look into the public session, and that's how we thought about doing a public facing. So, I don't know if that answered your question, sorry, Commissioner Turner.

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

COMMISSIONER TURNER: It was helpful. Thank you. What I'm asking specifically is there are concerns about the political representation being heavily Republican. I'm asking before we start making changes, is there a suggestion, because I understand that the subcommittee was

formed through our, you know, trying to pull together representatives from different subcommittees. But now, in addition to that as another layer, what would we be comfortable with?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Fernandez and Commissioner Kennedy.

Turner, I'll respond directly to you, well, to everyone, not to just to you. When I mentioned it earlier, I want to provide more of a partisan balance for the Commission, and I did recommend having the membership of this public meeting to be the Language Access Subcommittee members, the Outreach and Engagement and the Data Management. And if those six, total of six, that would give you a two, two, and two, so that would — in my eyes is pretty balanced.

So, again, the more commissioners you have on a committee, we also have to be cognizant of at what point do we just make it a regular agenda item on our regular meeting if it's too many, right.

So, it's like you don't want to make it too large, but you also want to make sure you include the appropriate parties that should be included. So, hopefully, that helps.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Kennedy and then Commissioner Sadhwani.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. My only question on the two, two, and two is which is the subcommittee that gets left out? I mean two, two and two is obviously balanced. Another option is basically something that would reflect the partisan balance of the first eight commissioners which would be three, three and two. Just an idea.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I apologize because I must have missed that part of the suggestion previously, Commissioner Fernandez. I think that's an excellent idea. I mean I think it kind of solves this issue of, you know, the partisan mismatch. So, I'm fully in support of that if all of those commissioners are willing to serve. So, it looks like it would be Fernandez, Akutagawa, Ahmad, Turner, Sinay and Fornaciari.

So, I guess, to me, it's a question if you all are willing to do that. And then, of course, we can all watch, we can all participate -- you know, we can all chime in. And at the end of the day it's advisory that you would be bringing recommendations to the full Commission in any case. Just like Legal Affairs, we have no power to actually do anything or make any final choices, but simply to bring back to the full Commission. I think this is a very reasonable, you know, suggestion, and I would

certainly support that, if those involved are comfortable. 1 2 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Le Mons. 3 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: The members that 4 Commissioner Fernandez is recommending, are they a subset 5 of the eight that are already there? 6 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Not quite. I guess Commissioner 7 Turner is added in, and --8 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Oh, okay. 9 CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- I'm gone and then Commissioner 10 Taylor is gone. 11 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay. I'd support 12 Commissioner Fernandez's recommendation as well with the 13 same caveat as Commissioner Sadhwani suggested. People who 14 -- the reason I asked the subset question is I wasn't sure 15 who was added who wasn't a part of it initially, so, with 16 that caveat, of course. 17 COMMISSIONER YEE: I'd be on, too. This is fine. 18 Oh, I'm sorry, I --19 CHAIR ANDERSEN: So, one item is -- what I'd like 20 to know is which public input meetings are we designing? I 21 mean all the way through the line drawing process? Those 22 are public -- so, okay. I mean --23 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: The idea would be to 24 start moving forward on all of them and getting some inputs 25 and thoughts and seeing what the best practice is out

there.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. And, so, how are we getting the line drawing -- the line drawers, themselves, there? Do we have a mechanism? Did you think about that yet?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: The line drawer would be part of the subcommittee. I mean they would -- staff is part of this, and line drawers are part of it, and would bring in people as we need them, but the main reason we created this was with the idea that the line drawer was coming and we needed to be more strategic now on how we were going to design both our public education and our public input sessions.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, I see. And, so, okay, yeah, so you're saying now we need to put together the contact team for the line drawer as well, and this is the people involved.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sorry, I should not have volunteered to do this list for Commissioner Kennedy. It's hard to do that, so I apologize.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I have a question and a comment. The question would be with the six what would the new quorum be? Four? Okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: Four would be a quorum, yes.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay. And then the comment is it's pretty apparent that Chair Andersen would like to be a part of this committee, so maybe there's a Republican that would like to yield their seat to her. That might be a way to solve this. That's an option, too.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. I kind of like the idea of bringing initially a couple other people and then pairing down the committee, maybe modifying the committee list after that. You know, I certainly don't want to bump anyone who wants to be on this or has ideas about how things should proceed. I certainly would like to be on the committee, yes. I've been working with you on how these meetings should go together in my mind quite a bit, but, you know, I quess I can attend.

In terms of -- I don't want us to lose because to make sure we look partisan. I don't want us to lose the functionality and not include people who have been working on the whole process just because it's for appearance sake. You know, I think functionality here is vital instead of just strictly what it looks like. But, again, it's a full Commission. Commissioner Fernandez and Sinay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It's a committee, but we will obviously take input from all of the commissioners. I think all of us have been thinking about how we, you know, are looking forward in terms of the public input meeting.

It's similar to how the Legal Affairs did it. If we had any concerns or questions we forwarded it to -- they forwarded to that committee. So, I would assume it would function the same way. Again, we're an advisory committee. We're not making decisions, and we obviously would ask for input from everyone in terms of how they envision these public meetings would be held.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: So, this will -- I'm sorry, go ahead because it was Sinay and then Turner.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: For me it's just I think I have it. I have it all typed up. I don't -- probably it's not perfect, but I can share it whenever you're ready.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Just because I did not respond verbally, but I am totally in agreement with the recommendation and, yes, I am willing to serve on the subcommittee.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Commissioner Ahmad COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. Just a quick clarifying question. Is the purpose to set up a subcommittee to alter the number of people needed to meet because quorum would be less? Is that the specific difference between -- because I'm hearing that any commissioner can participate, and to me that makes it blurry from a regular Commission meeting and having an

agenda item versus a separate subcommittee. I think I might have triggered a legal perspective for Marian.

MS. JOHNSTON: If I may, the members who are not on the subcommittee can participate as members of the public.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Got it.

MS. JOHNSTON: They cannot participate as commissioners.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yeah, I believe that was why at first it was a volunteer in terms of putting the whole group together, and then paring it down from there in terms of -- because originally it was just going to be part of the full commission, and then it was getting smaller and smaller. Now we're just reducing it again.

I have Commissioner Toledo and then it's -- I'm sorry, Commissioner Akutagawa. Sorry, Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sorry, I thought I was waiting for Commissioner Toledo.

I think perhaps -- I have a clarification question, and I feel like it was discussed, but I think my brain is not registering it.

So, question about -- if I heard correctly,

question about the Line Drawer RFP Subcommittee because I

think the word "RFP" is the question that I have is that now that the line drawer has been hired and, you know, short of ushering the line drawer through the final contract stages, my understanding is that then the work of the Line Drawer RFP Committee is going to conclude, and that then, if there is going to be additional work with the line drawer or required need for -- or need for a subcommittee to work with the line drawer, that a new subcommittee would need to be formed. Is that correct? Is that the process? Did I understand that correctly?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I believe that's sort of a roundabout way of exactly, yeah, what's happening here.

Yes, the Line Drawing RFP Subcommittee, which is myself and Commissioner Sadhwani, it was formed to get the line drawer on board and make the smooth transition to whatever it's going to.

And what the Commission basically is deciding right now is that basically what that venue is going to be is this new subcommittee. I don't know if that was the original plan of the subcommittee, but that's what it's turning into.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, and I guess maybe that's why I'm a little -- I'm asking this clarification question because I guess, for me, that's not how I'm seeing it. I'm seeing this as a completely separate function that

is bringing together the various I guess interconnected committees -- subcommittees because I think in the last few meetings we've had these conversations where we've talked about the intersections of different subcommittees because of what it's addressing.

But with that said, as we go forward I guess — and I don't know if this is — if this would resolve maybe where we are at right now, but would it be a problem, then, to just add Commissioner Andersen, make it a committee of seven instead of six, and add her onto this subcommittee I guess as maybe the kind of representative, you know, representing the transition from the Line Drawer RFP to, you know, whatever that will morph into. Perhaps that may also alleviate things.

I'm not sure if Commissioner Sadhwani wants to volunteer for an additional subcommittee; she's on several already, and she didn't initially, you know, express a desire for this particular one. So, you know, perhaps we just go with a subcommittee of seven. It will mean that we'll have four out of the five Republicans on the Commission, you know, and I don't know if that -- it's better than all five, I guess. I don't know if four is any better or any worse.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: That would only be three, Commissioner Akutagawa, three Republicans.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, okay, okay. So, just another suggestion, another option.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: There we go. We have the group here. Okay. So, here we have sort of a bit of everything here as we're looking at it.

Back to the -- well, we can just go ahead and look at it this way. And, so here we're talking about who the people are.

The Outreach is basically Sinay and Fornaciari.

It was originally Vasquez, but now Commissioner Fornaciari.

They switched. So, that's the Outreach.

Language Access, as you can see, is Akutagawa and Fernandez, which is the -- there we have an Independent, Republican, on the first one. Now we have a Democrat and Republican, was two Democrats.

And then we have the Data Management which is Ahmad and Turner. So, we have a Democrat and Independent.

Then we had representing the VRA and the Legal, again, the idea being -- this was to get all the different committees together because the VRA has in terms of line drawing how the VRA portion will affect the line drawing meetings, not the sort of input, though. And that's Republican.

And Security, Taylor also represents the Gantt Chart in terms of the entire -- sorry, I'm missing a few

words here -- the timeline, the timeline.

So, that's how the original is put together. So, losing -- I guess if we do the three we would have essentially two, two and two would be how it would work. We would lose -- well, you do lose input if you're not on that meeting, itself. You'd just have to call in.

And one thing I would think, rather than reducing it at this point, since the meeting is next week, why don't we just talk about the plan, because -- well, the line drawer's plan did actually sort of make strong suggestions about how they envisioned working kind of with the Commission, and it did kind of have, you know, little connections all the way along for specific items. I don't know, we didn't necessarily go over that, and I don't know if we were planning on when we want to do that. Obviously, we're kind of probably waiting until the line drawer came on board to actually go through the plan and compare the two.

But I believe what Commissioner Akutagawa said about this seems like one portion and not -- it's like all of a sudden we're using this subcommittee to do two different things, or take on two different roles when originally I think it was just the whole input. But, anyway, that's how we have it, so what would people like to -- where do we want to go with this?

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Should I stop sharing or 2 keep it? 3 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, Commissioner Kennedy, you 4 were the one who did request it. Would you like to say, 5 you know, we're fine with looking at it? Does anyone else 6 want to keep on looking at it? 7 COMMISSIONER TURNER: I'd like it to stay. 8 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. So, at this point, I 9 would so love to be on the committee just in terms of the 10 functionality of it. I think that would be very valuable. 11 That would be then you'd have three Republicans, two and 12 two. 13 COMMISSIONER SINAY: You have Fernandez and 14 Sadhwani raising their hands. 15 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, I'm sorry. Thank you, 16 because I can't see the board now. 17 COMMISSIONER SINAY: And Le Mons. 18 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. So, who do we have? We 19 have --20 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Fernandez, Sadhwani and Le 21 Mons. 22 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay. 23 So, Commissioner Fernandez, please. 24 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I would prefer to start 25 out smaller, and then if we need to add people, additional

commissioners, we could. I just feel like we really need to get a head start, come up with some options and then move forward if we're missing some pieces to it.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner

Fernandez. Then we have Commissioner -- I'm sorry, was it

Akutagawa and then Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think it was me.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: It was Sadhwani.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I just wanted to

-- that's fine, Commissioner Akutagawa. You know, it

wasn't that I'm not interested in community input sessions.

I'm interested in all of the aspects of the Commission. I

think we all are.

You know, for me, and this is something that I use with my students also. I'm blessed at Pomona with students that have a lot to say and lots of input, and it's okay, right, to have moments when you step up and other moments when you step back. And, so, that's just like a principle that I truly believe in, and so, it's not that I wasn't interested in community input, but I just felt like, you know, I've given my time and talent and it's okay for me to step back and let others kind of take this on.

So, you know, I fully support the recommendation that's on the table, however, you know the majority want to

proceed.

And again, I just feel like, you know, these are advisory committees. We'll all get to provide input. I think community input and outreach is important and is a shared goal for all of us, you know, so I look forward to continuing to be a part of that broader discussion, and I look forward to receiving the recommendations of the committee.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. And we have Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes. I want to echo again Commissioner Sadhwani's comments. I think in the original request I did raise my hand, and same thing. I can step back. I don't need to be on that committee.

I think Commissioner Andersen would really like to be on the committee, and so, I feel like we're -- I personally feel like we're spending a whole lot of time rather than just getting right to it. I thought I got to it a few minutes ago. I'd like to just get to it. If we don't have any objection to her being on the committee let's just -- if we do, then let's address that. We're like, okay, three Republicans is too much. Fine. But if it's not, then can we just say okay and let her be on the committee and move on? I mean I've been trying to spin it as, you know -- all of this stuff we're trying to do to get

to really where we're trying to get to one specific thing, and I think she is very passionate about it. She has made it very clear from the beginning, going back to July, that this is something that's really important to her and she really wants to be a part of that.

And, so, I either say one of the Republicans step up and yield the seat to her, or the Commission say let's make it seven and let there be three Republicans. That's my recommendation.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. I suppose I really should have just held the vote and did something. Yes, I do feel not so much in terms of the -- it's the overall frame and make sure, you know, which types of meetings we're having and how they'll lay out. I do feel that I've been following the line drawer through this. But I can take a different role, too, so at this point I will just -- we do -- actually, would someone like to make a proposal?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I'll make a proposal. I'm sorry, go ahead.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I can't --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Vasquez is trying to say something.

23 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes.

24 COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: It's my -- I'm sure 25 counsel will step in and correct me if I'm wrong, but since our advisory committees are appointed by the Chair, do we need a vote on this, or can the Chair just decide what the committee is right here and now?

MS. JOHNSTON: The Chair can decide.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Could we stop sharing, please?

 $$\operatorname{MS.}$ JOHNSTON: But now I have four Republicans on there if I saw it correctly.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: No, I believe it would be -- the Outreach is Fornaciari, in terms of Republicans. Language has Fernandez, which is a Republican. And then Data Management, which is a Democrat and an Independent. And we have Sinay and -- wait --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Turner.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- and Turner are the Democrats. That's the six. Actually, you know, I might ask, where is Commissioner Toledo? He did appoint this committee as chair last time, so what we are proposing now is changing that, and I don't see Commissioner Toledo. He might have stepped out for a few minutes.

So, Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I was thinking the same thing, but there have been changes in subcommittees all the way through, and whoever the chair is makes the changes. So I think we're fine either way.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: We have Commissioner Ahmad and

Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I expressed interest in this subcommittee from the get-go. My name has carried through. I welcome you, Commissioner Andersen -- Chair Andersen to join us. This is an advisory committee. We won't be making any decisions. I, personally, am okay with the distribution of representation as the committee will be bringing forth any and all material to the full Commission for consideration and future action.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I want to echo
Commissioner Ahmad's position. I'm comfortable with their
being whatever the configuration is with you joining the
commission. And as the chair, I feel it's important to say
this because we're going to put you in the position of
because you have the power to appoint yourself to the
subcommittee, I wouldn't want to put you in that position
to have you do that. So, I'll go on record as saying I'm
completely comfortable with it and would love for you to
join that committee also.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. That is, indeed, the issue. I do feel a little awkward appointing myself if the Commission does not want it to be a six person, wants to change it.

Commissioner Toledo, I see you with us again. As the previous chair do you want to change the original, or do you have an opinion about this?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think -- I mean my only opinion is that it's really up to you as the current chair to -- if there are any changes to it. I'm not married to the composition of it either way.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Then I will -Commissioner Taylor and Commissioner Yee, the three of us
were essentially removed from this committee. Do either of
you have strong feelings about the work on this portion of
the committee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I have strong feelings to support your strong feelings to want to serve.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah, I think we all would,
you know, welcome the opportunity to serve, but again, you
show a passion for it, so I would yield to your desire to
be on that committee.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: In looking at it, I purposely put everything in there when I shared it with you all, and I did put it in the order -- I went from south to north since everything else we're supposed to do is north to south. I wanted to give the south some love. But we

are pretty representative along the state as well as politically.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: With which combination?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: With the new combination.

I'm just saying that you've all made, you know, good -- it works with the seven that -- in the latest seven.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Then I propose there is the seven and we move on. Well, actually, I'm sorry, so that portion is done. Does the subcommittee have any other items that they want to discuss?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, but we would ask -- we are trying to get the legal interpretation of what has to take place in input sessions, because that was one of our frustrations when speaking with staff in the past. It would be like this is how, and it's like is that how it has to be, or is that what the legal is.

So, we're collecting information to help us all have it all in one place to be able to have a conversation around legal costs and we will have the line drawers' recommendations, as well as, let's not forget, we've gotten a lot of community input. The first session panel that we had kind of saying, hey, think about community input in a whole new way.

So, we will be putting all that together so that everybody has it, and we can build from there.

Our idea of the first meeting, it's a shorter meeting, would be to get input from everybody on -- to build consensus among all of us on what it will look like and -- not what it will look like, what information do we need, what type of experts do we maybe want to come and speak to us, what additional -- so, it will build the agenda collectively when we're all together.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. And then that meeting is scheduled right now for Thursday, the 18th, just for the public's general information. That's correct, right?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. And I think you said it was 4:00 to 6:00 did you say that one was?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, thank you very much. Yes, this meeting has been -- it's from 4:00 o'clock to 8:00, actually, I believe. I think it was a four-hour window. I don't know if that will take that long, but it is agendized for a four-hour window. That was one of the things that got a little bit off in the original posting is the first sheet had some wrong days and wrong times on it. And so for that meeting, the 16, 17, is at our usual 9:30 in the morning. That's full commission 16, 17. It is a Tuesday and a Wednesday. And then this new subcommittee, its subcommittee meeting, it is actually on the 18th from 4:00 in the afternoon until 8:00 in the evening. So, that's to

accommodate any people who are just getting off work and can't wait to participate.

Commissioner Vasquez.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Yeah, thanks. Congrats to the committee. I just wanted as you're heading into that sort of agenda setting meeting, just did want to encourage you folks to think and be mindful about sort of digital and in-person hybrid models, especially given, you know, ever changing guidance from the CDC.

I just wanted to acknowledge; we have an opportunity. We've shifted things so much with technology in the last year, and we have a huge opportunity to preserve the current level of access we have for folks who are not mobile, disabled, and just want to make sure that the committee is mindful that we don't lose access for folks who can't otherwise attend in person, even once we've reached herd immunity.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. That's a very, very good point, and I believe it is one that was sort of mentioned in the line drawers plan, and I certainly -- we've heard that from our reaching out to some of our farreaching zones in terms of our outreach zones. Some of them have realized that we can actually access more people. There is, of course, the digital issue about broadband, but on some people now we're getting -- they're getting much

more participation because of this, so we definitely want to keep that in mind. Thank you very much.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

Any other comments before we sort of tidy this one up? Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Just a clarification question. What is now the new quorum that is needed for a committee of seven?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I see number four being put up, and I'm getting a nod from our counsel. Yes, it is four. Thank you.

Okay. Well, I think we are -- looking at that, I believe we're going to jump to -- we're not having a closed session at this particular time. Thank you very much for everyone.

At this point let's talk about the discussion of future meeting dates and agenda items. Oh, actually, hang on. Let's do that now, and then I see we're running a little bit long. Kristian, how are we in terms of our timing?

20 MR. MANOFF: Our next break is at 3:00 o'clock, 21 Chair.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay, great. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay, then, let's jump to Item

25 Number 15, because that is an issue. Obviously, we're

trying to get things on the agenda.

And, Commissioner Fernandez, do you happen to have that which you could possibly share, or does anyone have a -- I'm sorry, go ahead. Commissioner Fernandez, could you --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Give me a second and I'll pull it up, okay. Sorry. You wanted the chart, right? Sorry, I should have thought of that ahead of time.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, please. Yes. So, while Commissioner Fernandez is doing that, if you could please, everyone, get out their calendars and let's talk about this. We've just talked about the meeting which is scheduled for -- our next meeting after this, today and tomorrow, is the 16th, 17th, with the -- actually, I'm sorry, I'll actually talk about absolutely all the meetings.

And the next one coming up is on Wednesday, the 10th -- ah, here we have the chart -- which is the Legal Committee. Then we see the two full days of our committee -- I'm sorry, the 18th is not legal. That's actually the -- we need to come up with a short name for this, Public Input Meeting Design Group. Just put public input, or, I don't know, P.I., something like that, is on the 18th.

And the 22nd to 24th is Legal, and then the ones that we currently have on our agenda are March 29 and April

1st as full meetings. The April 17th is also on there. It's considered like a training meeting.

At this point I'm going to turn this over to Commissioner Fernandez. She has collected everything and will walk us through this, please.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So, what I did put in the email that went out to everyone was I had just about everybody's availability. What I was trying to do was to have a two-week break so it would coincide with the week before Easter and the week after. I'm cognizant that there are some that we have children in school that have spring breaks, and I think we could all look forward to a two-week break at this point.

So, what I was thinking of for March because right now we have March 29th and the 1st. We could either decide to have a full meeting on the 25th and 26th. Again, that would be hard on our Legal Affairs team because that would be a week-long of meetings for them. Or another option is to schedule it on the 29th and 30th. If we schedule on the 30th, Commissioner Vasquez would not be able to attend, and actually, she wouldn't be able to attend any of those changes, right, because I think that whole week was blocked out. As far as I could tell, all the other commissioners were able to attend.

So, I don't know, Chair Andersen, if you want to

go just like one at a time or do you want me to go through the whole thing?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. What I would like to do is just talk about do we want -- that would be a change into what's up there right now. Let's address this issue right now and then look at filling and projecting forward.

So, could I have -- would anyone like to do the move to essentially -- I'm sorry. Commissioner Fernandez, are you saying it will eliminate the 29th and the 1st and move those full Commission days to the 25th, 26th?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. So, that would be one option, and then that would free up that week, the following week. If we did it on the 25th and 26th of March, it would clear up the next week and the following week.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. So -- go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: But as you know, as we go further in, I did put mostly on Tuesdays -- on the off week I did put in a one day just in case we needed it for something. But, if not, for April and May I just tried to do it every other week instead of every week type of meeting. And what I did, for April and May I did three days, assuming that two would be full Commission and then the third day would be our like Legal Affairs or the Public Input meetings.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. I'd like us to look at just the first -- you know, these ones that are posted here. And I'm going to say let's say option one is keep as is. Option two would be change the 29th, 1st, eliminate those, go to the 25th, 26th. Option three would be go 29, 30.

Commissioner Kennedy.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: If I could ask, you know,
Legal Affairs or Director Hernandez, I mean what do we
need? Does Legal Affairs need a meeting at any particular
point in time for us to do something? Does the executive
director have any point in time where he needs us to have a
meeting? Let's deal what's needed before we launch into
something that may not work for us.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: That's a good point. I do know there is -- let's see, I'm going to see if I can see. Who is on the Legal Affairs Committee that wants to say something, and go ahead because I can't actually see you?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I can jump in. I can't see everyone either, so I'm not if I should go first, but, you know, we will be interviewing and developing a recommendation during the 22nd to 24th. We actually might not need the 24th, you know. We kept that day in case we need additional deliberation. But by the end of the 24th, the idea is that we will present to the full Commission our

recommendation for hiring. So, we will need the full Commission to take action and make a hire, or an intent to contract during that time. Personally, I'm comfortable with having that be on the 25th and 26th. I would probably need to step away a little bit on the 25th, but I can make it work, if we want to have -- you know, keep those two weeks free. I think that sounds like a nice break.

COMMISSIONER YEE: That's right, the 22nd and 24th, as it happens I didn't realize that the 25th and 26th were still in play, and actually I will be away those days. But, you know, you wouldn't have to have me to report back. But, yeah, two weeks off would be nice.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Since we know what days we're talking about here could we go ahead and stop sharing the screen? Because we know we're talking about this particular week right now. Commissioner Fernandez. Oh, well.

Commissioner Vasquez.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Yeah. I'm not thrilled at option two, having me miss so many meetings. My schedule in March is not at all flexible. However, the April dates that I indicated I wasn't available, I'm just not available during business hours. So, again, I'm going to urge us in our collective thinking to think about moving some of our business meetings to the later evening hours or the late

afternoon to both accommodate some of our schedules that are left flexible during 9:00 to 5:00, but also, much of the public also has 9:00 to 5:00 restrictions and would probably like to at least listen into some of our business meetings.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Commissioner Kennedy.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Can I point out that between the first and the 17th we have more than two full weeks, so if we're looking for two weeks off, we already have two full weeks off in the calendar. The dates that we have have been out there for a while for everybody to have in their calendar, and I think that, you know, maybe we just stick with what we've got for as far out as we have, which is the 17th of April, unless there's a need to do something earlier and that we be talking about how do we schedule after the 17th of April.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: So, one option was like to -well, in terms of on the 29th, it's clear that we certainly
need to have a meeting, if not the 25th or the 26th,
certainly then the 29th, because we need to have a vote on
getting the VRA counsel on board.

Yeah, basically, we do have the 29th and the 1st, and, you know, who votes just to stick with that, the way it is right now? Just a show of hands, just a rough show

of hands. One, two, three --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

18

19

20

21

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Commissioner Andersen, did you say in that ask, though, that we already have the 29th through the 1st? Is that what you said?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, I'm sorry, no. Thank you very much, Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: The meetings that are scheduled right now are March 29 and then April 1st, not through, not all four days, just the two separate days.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Kennedy.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: My hand was still up to the count.

15 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, I'm sorry.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: But I don't know that you finished counting.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I did not. I stopped for a question. Thank you very much. Okay. Who -- well, actually I should say, I did put three options down.

Option one was keep it as is. Who's for option one? Okay.

22 It looks like -- I think was that 12 I counted roughly

23 there. It looks like we're just staying with that and

24 there's no point in continuing this. We can move onto the

25 next item which is -- so we will not be doing the 25th,

26th. Thank you very much for that idea, Commissioner Fernandez, and I appreciate that. It looks like there will be two days of meetings during the 29th and the 1st.

So, now I know that we only have then the 17th after that. I feel that we should go ahead and move things in, don't just wait until after that because certainly we'll have, hopefully, the line drawer on board, and then the VRA counsel, I believe. Actually, the Legal Advisory, do you have any timeframe in terms of should we say, yes, we're really excited and we want these guys on board? Do you have any idea how long before that could actually happen, the counsels, the VRA and the litigation counsel?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I mean we can certainly hope to have a clear, you know, singular recommendation after that's done, you know, possibly by the 23rd, but definitely

CHAIR ANDERSEN: No, my question is in terms of contracts, you know, the Commission says yes and we make a decision. In terms of contracts with the line drawer there is a time lag. Is there a time lag with the legal counsel?

COMMISSIONER YEE: We have not even thought about that yet.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: All right. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Sorry.

by the 24th, so any time after that.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: How does that bear on our

meeting dates?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: In terms of if we want to have input and have a quick meeting with them, have them present something, is there anything valid about that in terms of getting things going. I can tell by your looks here that, no, there is not.

So, I'm trying to see, as Commissioner Kennedy sort of suggested, look, we have those two weeks. Do you want to just start with the 17th and move forward from there and leave those blank? And I'm gauging is there a need to have a meeting in that week of the 13th to the 15th of April.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Not for Legal Affairs, no.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Then, with that in mind, let's look at the calendar again. Oh, I'm sorry, Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: You know, the only contract I'm thinking of, but I don't know if it has to come -- Director Hernandez, would the videographer contract need to come forward for approval?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Is that about the time -- well, you know what, we're going to meet on that later, so, okay, we'll come back with that information.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I'm just seeing -- got a bit carried away with the whole idea here. Could we all have a look at this calendar now, because I know some of us, we've given our information but haven't really taken it in. So, could we go ahead and look at this calendar, and we actually have two options. We can, at this point, adjourn for today, and, you know, we actually wouldn't adjourn. We would recess for today and then continue tomorrow, or do we want to come back after a 15-minute break to discuss and set the time -- the future meeting dates? Do we have an opinion here? We have Commissioner Akutagawa.

OPINION. I'll be frank. I mean if we can finish it up with the remainder of the time today instead of ending early, it just means that we have that much more time tomorrow rather than trying to work through this tomorrow after the panel presentation. So, I would rather have a larger block of time tomorrow than to get, you know, just an extra hour or so today. So, my preference is to go to break.

I would like to, if we can, set our dates for April. I also want to just add in, and I'm going to also ask Director Hernandez to help on this, but from a Grants Committee at some point we are going to need the condition to review the RFA or RFP, depending on where we'll be, and

I think ideally we were hoping that everything would be ready for an initial review by mid-April. We would give everybody, you know, time to review, soak it in, the public to make comments before we do a formal vote, which would be estimated to be around the end of April, and then at which point then, you know, we would make it available for the intermediaries -- potential intermediaries to apply. So, that's just from that perspective that's something that I'm thinking of.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Just right now, because we need to break. So, it sounds like there is request for, let's take a 15-minute break, come back, resolve this, so then tomorrow we could actually just -- and we need to take public comment as well at the end of the day, so with that in mind let's break now for 15 minutes. I have 3:07, and we'll come back 3:22)

(Off the record 3:07 p.m.)

(On the record 3:22 p.m.)

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Welcome back to the 2020 California Citizens Redistricting Commission meeting. And at this point we are actually going over -- we have really zoomed through the agenda, and while we still have the item for our Education Outreach Panel tomorrow at 10:00 a.m. Our meeting will be at 9:30 tomorrow morning.

At this point we're actually discussing Item

Number 15. It's the discussion of future meeting dates and agenda items, and so that's where we are.

And at this point what we are discussing is our March 29, 1st, in terms of where we go, our meetings in April, and the question that has been brought forth is what are the actual needs in terms of when we having meetings and when we do not have meetings.

And as I see it, there are a couple of -- I might ask Director Hernandez. There are a couple of contracts that we certainly have to won and approve and scope of work. Could you please walk us through because I'm just looking at that? I see the VRA and the litigation, obviously, after they make a proposal to the full commission. The other items are the data management. Are they doing a kind of their scope of work or anything, does that need to come forward, and also the grants? Those are the ones that I see. Are there any other subcommittees that also feel there's an item being -- Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: With that, too, I would ask Director Hernandez to see if there are any staffing that would need to come forward for approval as well, and then also for the -- let me see if I got this correct -- Public Input Design Committee, if on the 22nd, 23rd, 24th do we want to meet on one of those days as our second

meeting as we go forward? So, just take a look at that just looking forward, because as of then we would only have one meeting on the 18th, so I'm just throwing that out there just to mix things up.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: For Public Input Design, if you do want to go forward with that, you need to get the agenda out today. So, I just note.

As we think about scheduling, I have a possible proposal. If there -- if we don't think we have more than an afternoon's worth of Commission where if the Legal Affairs had a good clear recommendation to make by then, by the end of the morning of the 24th, what if the Commission met the afternoon of the 24th to act on Legal Affairs Committee's recommendation, act on these other things, and then we possibly wouldn't have to meet at all the 29th and the 1st. Just a thought.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner -- I'm sorry,

Director Hernandez, I've sort of thrown that on you a

couple of times in terms of things that you see coming

forth that we definitely will need to address. Could you

bring some of those forward, or could you discuss those,

please? Director Hernandez.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: I just wanted to chime in here. As far as staffing needs, we may have some

staffing either considerations at that point for field staff if we get the duty statement out in this short period between this meeting and next meeting. As far as the data manager, we're still waiting on that one. The RFP for the videographer, that's one that definitely we need to get that one taken care of within that time frame.

So, those are the things that are on my list of potential items that can come up after the next meeting.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: So, for people who already have their schedules planned, it looks like we're trying to talk about you. Do we need the 29th and the 1st? We certainly do need a meeting since we have several things we need to go through.

There is a proposal to have it possibly on the 24th. Could everyone make that kind of a change? Does anyone see right away that they could not make one of those changes? Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Are we talking about it would be in the late afternoon?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. So, Legal Affairs will meet through the morning, come up with a recommendation, and then you can act on it in the afternoon.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think for me I just have a dentist appointment, and sometimes you know how hard those appointments are to get, so --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I think we still have the need of the -- if we did not have the 29th and the 1st, would the proposal be then -- I guess the issue is the April dates that have been proposed are essentially three days during the week of the 12th, one day the week of the 19th, and then three days the week of the 26th.

2.2.

If we skip the 29th and the 1st, which are the ones that were currently scheduled, that seems to make sense. If we leave the 29th and the 1st, would we then actually want to just have a one-day meeting the week of April 12th in case and have the three-day essentially be when we look at our calendars of what was sort of proposed. If we stagger those, instead of the one and three, switch it. That would have to mean a rejiggering of everyone's calendar, and I know Commissioner Fernandez sort of has that information where we don't.

But I'm not comfortable, given the things we have and the things that are coming up with essentially creating three weeks of nothing, except maybe one day on the 20th, which is how it would look if we just move everything to the 29th, because there are things that do come up. Any ideas on that?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Can we put the schedule back up?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, certainly, certainly. And

then Commissioner Ahmad, Commissioner Sadhwani.

you.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I just wanted to make a request if we can refer to the dates as March 29th or April 29th. Now I'm getting confused which month we're talking about.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: No, no, no worries. Thank

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I jumped quickly into that.

Okay, now that we have this up, we're talking about the

March 29th, do we want to make some sort of switch? We're

still talking about now switching between March 29th, April

1st, maybe switching those dates to say the 24th, and then

I guess maybe not having the 1st. We could leave the 1st

as a tentative, if we're thinking and then go with the

proposal sort of as is, or address the -- if we skip that

essentially the week of March 29th, April 1st, then that

would be essentially almost three weeks open, which I'm not

comfortable with.

I'm sorry. Maybe I'm misinterpreting that. I see Commissioner Fernandez. That would be two, okay. Oh, I see. I see. Okay. And Commissioner Sadhwani, you had something to say.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Just a clarifying question. When we've scheduled the 29th and the 1st, are

those two separating meetings in which --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, pretty much.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So, we're going to go through all of the subcommittee reports two times in the same week?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Ah, that's a good question.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Or is it one meeting and we recess for two days and come back on the 1st?

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: As rotating chair for that set, I will tell you it's the latter, not the former. I have no appetite to go through everything twice if we don't have to.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Very good. Thank you. That's helpful to know.

So, I mean I'm open to whatever the whole group wants, but I'm perfectly fine with Commissioner Yee's suggestion of leaving the 24th afternoon to take action on advancing the contract for the VRA and litigation hires. I think that would allow us to move that process forward more quickly. I mean, honestly, I could get behind whatever suggestions we want.

For April I'll just note that we'll probably -- hopefully we'll have interviews of chief counsel applicants at some point in time, which might take a little longer.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. We also need to be

coming around to that discussion of switching the 29th to the 24th. That would be proposing the afternoon of that, so I might make a -- let's see a show of hands -- lets go back to -- because we're still working on that last week of March, so if we could take this calendar down again so I can see the whole group, and let's just do a sort of show of hands, who would like to move the meetings of the 29th and the 1st, essentially move that to is it the afternoon of March 24th, have that be an afternoon meeting. All in favor of that?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sorry, clarification again. I apologize. I thought that we were talking about a meeting in which we would just meet to take action, or are we talking about a full meeting with all of our subcommittee reports and all of everything on the 24th?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. I see Commissioner Fernandez wildly waving her hand. Thank you, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thinking of the shorter meeting my recommendation would be it would be purely those items that require action, so if there's a staffing issue or there's a contract or RFP, it would just be for that.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: And Commissioner Yee,

23 Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER YEE: That was my thinking, too.

We're not required to have all subcommittees report every

meeting, right. Also, we do have -- let's say we have several contracts to act on, it could go later into the evening perhaps, possibly. I think that would be worth it for folks to get the next week off probably. So, if it is.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Commissioner Turner and then Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Just in case a super majority was needed, I will not be in a meeting on the 24th. I'm unable to join a meeting on the 24th.

10 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Who would not be able to meet on the 24th?

12 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: What time are we talking
13 about? That's a little unclear to me. I'm sorry if I
14 missed it.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, we weren't all that specific. We just said afternoon. So I'm assuming it would be, say, 1:30 on, something like that.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I would not be available then.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: That would be two people. And on the 29th, who is not there on that day? Okay,

Commissioner Vasquez. Any other commissioners who is not there on the 29th? Okay.

I think the strong feeling, and it would fit well with our proposed ideas for April and May calendar if we

try to move things off that 29th, 1st and move it back to that 24th week, and then we can do something the week of the 12th to the 14th of April.

I would like to see a show of hands of who would like to move, essentially not have the meetings on the 29th or the 1st and just have an action meeting only on the 24th? Who is in favor of that one? Sorry. Could you raise your hands so I can do a hand count? One, two, three, four, five, six. Okay, that could be six or possibly seven. Who is not in favor of that?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Can I just ask another question? I mean can we just do the same thing on the 29th since I think most of us already have it calendared? And we don't have to meet on the 1st. We just meet for a short time, if we need to, on the 29th and then just — because otherwise I think we're trying to shoehorn in the 24th, and you don't even have the majority of the Commission at this point.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: All right, done. So, I'm just going to say we're doing as is on the 29th and the 1st, if necessary, and if we finish everything on the 29th it will be up to the chair at the time, Commissioner Kennedy, to say -- to wave that off.

In which case I'd like to go back to the shared screen, and let's talk about the two weeks of April, the

beginning of -- as we can see now, the proposed is the week of April -- we're talking Mondays here so it's the 12th through the 14th.

One thing I did notice on this, is you're doing
-- each one that gets proposed is essentially the Monday to
Wednesday, Monday to Wednesday, and we had been staggering
that.

And then I do notice the single days that are always needed have all been Tuesdays, which that could be an issue.

Commissioner Fernandez, could you sort of -
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I tried to pick the days
that we would have the most attendance, because even though
if I try to stagger it, we may not have as many, if that
makes sense.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. All right.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I tried to stagger it when I could, and then I tried to just based on availability.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. All right. Then does anyone have any issues with the way it is proposed as we're looking at it in terms of now -- I'm sort of jumping.

Would you rather I just do the entire -- just April, or do you want me to do all of it? I see Commissioner Kennedy.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Just a reminder that at this

point we're holding dates. We're not doing anything else. When we get to the point of seeing whether we have items that need to be addressed, we can decide to proceed with the meeting or not. But at this point we're holding dates.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Akutagawa.

it's easier for me to hold the date and remove a date than it is to try to, you know, put in a date later on. And I think some other commissioners have said something some more in the past before. It doesn't cost us anything to just put the note on the calendar so --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. At this point I'm inclined to just say let's -- oh, I'm sorry, Commissioner Vasquez.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Yeah. Again, I'm not wild about missing one, two, three potentially meetings intentionally, so I mean I guess the 28th is -- I don't know. Okay. Really trying to push us to think about late afternoon or evening meetings. It's just more (indiscernible).

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I'm sorry, I should have said I'm just talking about the days themselves. We have, indeed, talked about shifting timeframe.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Right, but my availability is fully dependent upon the time in which we hold the

meetings.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. So, question. Since you brought it up, thank you. I'm going to put you on the spot. Are you available on like -- I'm just looking at the 12th and 14th. So, you are not on the 14th regardless.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: That's Commissioner Turner.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: T-T is Commissioner

Turner. But I did look for Commissioner Vasquez for the

28th. I was thinking maybe on the 28th we could have a

committee meeting, and so the actual meeting for the full

Commission would be the 26th and 27th so that you could

attend, and then the same thing for the 14th when

Commissioner Turner could not attend, I was thinking we

could have -- oh, no, she's on that committee. Never mind.

I'm going to take that back.

So, I was trying to work it out so there would be an attendance, but I mean it's hard. A 14 people schedule is a little challenging, but I completely understand wanting to be at every meeting, which I truly appreciate and definitely want to try to work it (audio skips).

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. I see Commissioner Akutagawa's hand.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I know that the

last meeting we had begun a conversation about trying to shift the meeting times and kind of mixing up the times a little bit more so that every single business meeting is not 9:30 to what's essentially has become 5:00 o'clock versus 4:30. We've talked about trying to do later start We tried it for I think one of the March meetings and then that wasn't going to work because people's schedule, but I want to also echo what Commissioner Vasquez is saying. If we could also determine, you know, do we want to make perhaps all of the meetings in April evening meetings, or late afternoon meetings, or which ones we would try for, that would, I think help all of us maybe give a more definitive answer as to what other dates might be available because I hear what Commissioner Vasquez is saying because, you know, my availability would also differ and we may be able to stagger a little bit more easily, you know. But I know that when I responded it was based on the 9:30 start versus a late afternoon start, so --

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

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. I know that we do, indeed, intend to do that. My one issue with -- I don't know in terms of presentations what has already been scheduled, which is my only issue in terms we can already have conflicts with anything scheduled in the evenings on these dates. That would be another puzzle piece here.

But at this point I'm thinking if we work on --

I'm sort of -- I'm inclined -- I see the whole issue with, you know, we don't want one person missing them, and there are few days that I see we could, indeed, as Commissioner Fernandez was envisioning here have committee meetings on It could be different committee meetings. those days. still sort of inclined to say let's try this and then work on timing as we go. Which if we want to talk about, let's pick a time right now, say for the 12th or 14th meet week the 26th, what -- if I propose let's just accept it as is with the time of the meetings to be determined, how is that? Or does the group actually want to go week by week? So, option one is let's talk about a mass group and then working on timing. Option two is we actually print it out week by week? So, who's for option one? can't see this. Looks like everybody wants us to just go week to week. Okay. So, April 6th is our in case day, yes? Okay. And in case days, do we just want to have those -- those, I'm assuming, would be action days, so we say those are just regular 9:30 in the morning days. Can we go ahead and -- well, let's see. Does anybody have the dates kind of

COMMISSIONER TURNER: No.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2.

23

written down?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. It's hard to see the group and do this at the same time.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Chair Andersen, if you already have the dates, you could just expand your screen so you can see everything, so you can see everyone in the Zoom and not see the share.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, that's interesting, oh.

Thank you very much. I haven't had much luck doing that.

Okay, I'm just going to make sure I have everything on mine and not -- okay. It's not working. All right. Well, I have part of the group, most of the group.

Okay. So, the single day -- actually, okay, the single days we want to keep those the regular timeframe. Let's go April 6th, regular timeframe, late timeframe? Option one, option two. Option one is regular timeframe. Option two is say what, 4:00 to 8:00, something like that.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Yeah, especially for action items, again, we've heard from a few public comments that folks want -- I'm hearing more from the public about wanting to participate more meaningful in action items and give public comment. So, I propose, especially if that one is going to be -- if we need it for action items I propose we schedule it from 4:00 to 8:00.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay.

What would be a -- Commissioner Vasquez?

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: And not have it be committee reports, et cetera, that it is just for action

items and discussion.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. I think that is actually a very valid point. That would be -- the proposal on the table right now is, the single days are April 6th, April 20th, May 5th and May 18. They're three Tuesdays and a Wednesday.

The proposal is let's make those in case meetings. All the timeframe would be from 4:00 in the afternoon until 8:00 in the evening. Who is in favor? I have one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Okay that's eight and --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Question.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Question, Commissioner Kennedy.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Is that 4:00 to 5:30, take an hour dinner break and come back for another hour-and-a-half from 6:30 to 8:00?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, that's a good question.

Do we all have to eat before 4:00? We would need a break.

We would have to think. Let's see. Logistic wise, so how about 4:00 to 8:30. We do a like a two hour -- we can only do 90 minutes. How about dinner time will be 5:30 to 6:30, and then it would be a three-hour meeting essentially. So, it would be a three-hour meeting with the fourth hour -- so, essentially, the meeting would be 4:00 to 5:30, dinner 5:30 to 6:30, and then 6:30 to 8:00. So, we'd have -- it

would be essentially three hours' worth of meetings, two 90-minute sections with an hour of dinner in the middle.

So that would be the proposal for the 5th, the 18th -- I'm sorry. April 6th, April 20, May 5th, May 18. With that clarification, all in favor raise your hands. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine. I have nine.

Now, does anyone have a very hard time with that or a particular day of that?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: No.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. All right. So, that's what we're doing for those single days.

Now, let's talk about the week of the 12th to the 14th. It's a three day. It is a Monday to Wednesday. Do we want to -- since we're doing an evening on the 6th, do we want to do like a couple of the days regular time, the third day late? Is that sort of an acceptable model or -- Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think that makes sense since you said that the third day may be for subcommittee meetings versus the regular meetings, so if we do the subcommittee meeting late, that makes sense.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: It does. Do we like the 4:00 to 8:00 time slot? Otherwise, it would be 5:00 to 9:00 and dinner would be 6:30 to 7:30. I think on that one why

don't we wait. We'll pencil this in and when we get some public comment, let's see if the public really has something to say, particularly about the input meetings.

So, the proposal on the table right now is for the April 12th through 14th meeting the 12th and 13th would be our regularly scheduled time. The 14th would be from 4:00 in the evening until 8:00 in the evening. All in favor? Oh, I'm sorry, do I have questions first.

Questions before. Anyone have any questions or clarification? Linda -- I'm sorry, Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Just a question. So, is then our practice going to be only when we're taking action or I guess a committee meeting will be done in the late afternoon into the evening versus any business meetings will always be a start time of 9:30? Or are we going to look to vary also the business meeting times, like I think there was conversation about maybe starting at like 1:30 or 2:00 for the business meetings.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. Right now we're just taking it week by week.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Okay.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well not exactly week by week.
We're taking it the weeks of three days at a time. And,
so, for this particular one the proposal is we have regular
business meeting times from 9:30 in the morning on the 12th

or the 13th, and then the third day is the 4:00 to 8:00 for this set, for the April 12th to 14th.

And Commissioner Fernandez, question?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No, I'm just thinking if the subcommittee on whatever, the 14th, like let's say Legal can only meet during the day so for them to meet during the day and then maybe the public input design would be in the evening. I don't think necessarily they both have to be at the same time, but I'm just throwing that out there, too, so that it's not -- we're not obligated to meet in the evening if they're not available.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Does Legal have any input on that yet? Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I'll just say I cannot meet Wednesday nights in general. I teach Wednesday nights. But, yeah, I agree, I think once we have this set up for, you know, ASL and the videographer, et cetera, it could -- you know, we could do earlier in the day and then, if not, the other subcommittee could use the same setup later on in the day. So, that works for me.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I know that -- I think that Commissioner Fernandez said that Commissioner Turner was not available on the 14th. Maybe -- sorry to mix this up, but perhaps it might help to have the committee

meetings on the 12th and then have the business meetings on the 13th and 14th. That's one idea.

And then the other idea is could we have one day of the business meetings start at 9:30 and then maybe a second day start at 1:30, just to mix that part up as well, too?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Just a quick question. I'll ask it right now before I take Commissioner Turner. If the regular business meeting starts at 1:30, what time does it finish? Would that be just --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Nine o'clock.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: So, nine at night. Just to put everyone's --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Or we could even start at 1:00, or we could even just make it a point that we're going to finish by 8:00 o'clock.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I'd have to have a quick look at that. That is an idea. Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I was just going to say with the changed time on the 14th beginning at 4:00 p.m. I definitely will be there on the 14th.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, okay. So, then, for this particular set. Oh, well, we lose Commissioner Sadhwani on Wednesday evenings, but if that is a committee meeting for the input, we don't lose her. Okay.

So, does anyone else have a -- Commissioner Vasquez.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Yeah. Are people open to trying for these meetings then, maybe starting at 1:00 and concluding at 8:00?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, I'm sorry, you're going back to the --

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: On April 12th and April 13th are people open to starting at 1:00 and going until 8:00?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Having all of them. I'm seeing some head nods. I'm seeing yes. Who would, rather than doing the 9:30 on the -- for the start time on the 12th and 13th, who would like to go to the 1:00 or 1:30? We're actually going to work out the specifics with the 90 minutes in there. Who would prefer doing the -- going to the switching of the later time? We have, one, two, three -- wait, okay. I have one, two, three, four, five, six.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I don't prefer, but I'm open to it, yeah.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. That's me. I have to work this out with the family. Okay, so, we can certainly try that this -- raise your hands one more time for going to the later time on that. Okay. So, the no's -- we have three commissioners who are not interested in doing that.

So, we'll give that a try. We will try for that.

Now the current thing is let's go on the 12, 13th we will start a 1:00 or 1:30. The actual exact time of that, let's work out the logistics in terms of, you know, the 90-minute breaks and talk with the videographer here. And then on the 14th would be the 4:00 to 8:00 for that particular set of meetings. That's an agreement. Anyone who oppose, speak now or we're moving on. Okay. That is the plan for those sets of meetings.

Now, we're going to do April 26th to the 28th.

Do we want to do the same -- no, this one we want to so we don't lose Commissioner Sadhwani, do we want to do the Monday as the 4:00 to 8:00 and do the Tuesday, Wednesday as the -- oh, Commissioner Sadhwani, on Wednesdays what is your cutoff time?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Six-thirty.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Six-thirty, okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think it's okay to

19 proceed. I don't think I have to, you know --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, we don't want to exclude someone if we don't have to, so, I was just saying, let's, you know, mix up the Mondays as the late day. But we could try the 28th as the late day.

All right. So, what are we trying to do? The 26th to the 28th is the same timeframe as the 12th through

the 14th. So, that would be the one 1:30 time, going until 9:00. Why don't we see how that goes and see how awake all of us are? But let's pencil that in and then we might — it would be too late at that point. We locked in the timeframe. But let's try it. Try the 1:00, 1:30 on the Monday, Tuesday, and the 4:00 to 8:00 on the Wednesday, the 28th. All in favor, raise your hand. I see one, two, three, four — who is not in favor of doing it that way? One, two. I'd rather not. I think we're — Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I appreciate wanting to do this, but I also know that once we get into our public input meetings they will be evening meetings, so I would prefer to have the day meetings now and then once we get into the public input in our other meetings, because I know that eventually it's going to be all evenings -- not all evenings. It will be mainly evenings and late (inaudible).

CHAIR ANDERSEN: That is true. We will be having sort of business a lot during the day and then all the input in the evening. That is true.

Well, why don't we try, just to try it, these two -- the April. Let's do the April and try it on this schedule, see how that works, and then the May, that's going to give us enough time to switch back if it turns out it's not working for the business part. Because in May we

switch to Wednesday to Friday situation, so we would have time if we're finding that that is not working.

So, at this point I'm proposing that the April 26th - 28th be on the same timeframe as we discussed and accepted for April 12th through the 14th. Anyone object to that? Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Would it get too complicated if we made one day 9:30 and the other day 1:00 o'clock?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: At this point it's easy.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: It's okay. I thought I'd do that, just trying to find a compromise for everybody, so that's all. But it's okay. I'm totally fine with the 1:00 o'clock meetings. That's totally fine.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Any opinions on this one?

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I was kind of thinking the same thing as Commissioner Akutagawa. I was thinking the first day we can do a morning meeting, and that second day is later afternoon so it gives those of us wanting a morning free. So, I don't know, that's just another because we don't have anything else to talk about right now. No other options.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, yes. All right. It's a valid idea. Let's -- April will be our attempt. We left

the -- we have the 12th through the 14th set. So, how about on the 26th and 28th -- actually do we want to switch it? Do we want to do rather than Monday morning first thing at 9:30 in the morning, do we want to go on 1:00 on Mondays and then go late, early, late? I'm sort of kidding on that, you know. Actually I'm -- well, at this point let's go the 9:30 -- well, okay.

Two options, here we go. Option one, 9:30 on Monday, the 26th, 1:00 or 1:30 on the 27th, 4:00 on the 28th. That's option one.

Option two, the 26th and the 27th are the same. They're the one or 1:00 or 1:30 in the afternoon, and the 28th is the same in both options.

So, who is for option one, the staggered mornings? We have one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Oh, okay. Looks like we're going to do staggered mornings.

Is anyone for the option of just everything going to 1:30? We do have one, two. Okay. It looks like we're going to go with the staggered on the 26th.

Commissioner Ahmad, did you have a question or was that a vote?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: That was a vote for both because I'm flexible.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. All right. So, for the

12th to the 14th we have that 1:00 o'clock, 1:00 o'clock, 4:00 o'clock, or 1:00, 1:30.

On the 26th to 28th it's the 9:30, 1:00 or 1:30 and then the 4:00.

Okay. We've decided on May 5th. That is the 4:00 to 8:00. So, now we're talking about -- ah, the 12th to the 14th. Now Ramadan begins on the 13th. I don't know if that -- it starts in the evening. Yeah, that's an evening, and that will be the first day, so there are usually some celebrations involved in that.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Jane, I think -- sorry, Chair Andersen, I think Ramadan ends on May 13th. I have it noted.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Ends, sorry. Actually, wait a sec., so that actually is a big celebration then at sundown, yes. So, that would have to be a morning meeting on the 13th.

So, for that one we want to do the -- actually, do we want to switch it because I don't think we want to be Friday evening. Do we want to do a switch on -- have our Wednesday be the 4:00 to 8:00 on the Wednesday? The 13th is the 9:30 in the morning, and -- actually we could just do the 13th and the 14th. This is the only Friday that we actually have -- do we want to do Friday as just regular, 9:30 in the morning, so it ends, we have our weekend?

Yeah, I'm seeing thumbs up on that.

So, a switch for the May 12, 13, 14. The proposal is the Wednesday would be the 4:00 to 8:00, the Thursday and the Friday would be regular 9:30 morning start time.

So, who is not in favor of that? Seeing no hands, we'll move on. That's what we're doing. I'm sorry. I'm trying to sort of move us through this. I do not mean to not allow anyone to express their opinions, and please feel free to jump in. It's just I know we've been spending a lot of time on these, so -- and I appreciate everyone's patience on it. We're trying to accommodate everybody.

Okay, so we just have the 24th to the 26th.

Ideas here? Do we want to do the 1:30, 1:30, 4:00 on the

24th to 25th (sic.)? Getting thumbs up. Thumbs up. Or do

we want to do that stagger thing.

Okay, I know. We'll do option one the 24th and 25th is the 1:00 o'clock. We'll do the 26th as the 4:00 to 8:00.

Option two is the morning of the 24th at 9:30.

On Tuesday, the 25th, it's a 1:00, 1:30, and then the 4:00 to 8:00.

So, option one, both late, option two, staggered. Who is for option one? Oh, I'm sorry, Commissioner Turner, do you have a question?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. Isn't that a Wednesday evening again that conflicts with -- I thought we were trying to avoid the Wednesday evening.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: What we're doing -- yes, you're right, but I believe what we're doing here is doing that as the Wednesday evening one is the 4:00 to 8:00, and it's a

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Committee.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: It's a committee, correct, thank you, a committee meeting.

Now, as we progress through this and something changes and we actually need the full day for the full committee meeting, we will know ahead of time, you know, like we get a bunch of contracts or something, think, uh oh, we need those three days, we can have -- right now we're trying to hold dates.

Well, I guess if we go in the evening that does eliminate that. Anyone, I think this is the idea of the Commission, right. Do we want to have these three working days, or is it two working days and a possible -- we can always do an action. I'm trying to give us a bit more flexibility here.

So, the proposal would still be the two days, 24th, 25th, and the 26th is the meetings -- I'm sorry, the 26th is a subcommittee.

So, who now is for -- option one was the vote for 1:00, 1:30. Option two is the staggered. So, who's for option one? One, two. Who is for the staggered? One two, three, four. Okay. Who is just not voting and sick of it all? Ah, here we go. Just checking to see if anyone was paying attention here.

Okay. At this point I say let's do the staggered because the staggered was wildly successful on that last one, right. So, let's do the staggered. On the 24th is the 9:30, the 25th is the 1:00, and the 26th is the 4:00 to 8:00.

Any other questions? Any objections? No, okay.

Then at that point, I don't even know what time

it actually is. Oh, those are the end of the dates that you had proposed for us, Commissioner Fernandez. Great.

Thank you. Could you stop sharing your screen? And that

17 should make us all come back -- oh, I'm sorry, Commissioner

18 Vasquez and Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Just wanted to say thank you to the Commission for trying new timings out. I very much appreciate that folks have families and other things in the evenings, and so, just wanted to express some gratitude. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Certainly. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can I just ask that staff

send us out what was finally approved, what times and all that so we're all on the same page, maybe even do a calendar invite and invite us so it's in our calendars.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. Great idea, Commissioner Sinay. However, I think we should reiterate it, because if we're confused, then staff might also be confused. So, I would want to give them a fair shot at getting us the information accurately.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Do you want me to do that at this time or shall I put this out and we'll sort of send out a quick, you know, this is the understanding. Is this what everyone agrees on? I can just do a quick walk through. We have some nods, quick walk through right now. Okay.

Going back to the -- so, let's start in April.

Open up your calendars for -- we've left the 29th and the

1st as is. Didn't touch anything.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Can we -- sorry to interrupt you. Can we actually start in March?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: From the meeting that is not already agendized.

24 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Got it.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: That would be helpful.

Thank you so much.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Certainly. Just to back up on that, the meeting that is agendized is the 16, 17 and a committee meeting on the 18th. That is what is agendized at this point.

What is not, that following week of the 22nd, we have Legal Affairs for the Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, the 22nd to the 24th, and that, I believe, an agenda will be posted by the end of the day as Commissioner Yee already indicated, because that's the timeframe of it.

The following week is the 29th. We have a full -- a full -- full-day meeting, regular 9:30 in the morning. We also have one of those on Thursday the 1st, 9:30 in the morning. However, those are not separate meetings, as Commissioner Kennedy is indicating. Those are essentially two days of one meeting with just two days staggered off in between. So, that's for March.

Moving to April -- well, I'm sorry, the 1st is April 1st, so then we're moving to the full calendar of April, and on Tuesday, the 6th, we have a 4:00 to 8:00 meeting, and that's -- those are all considered more like action meetings. It's full Commission, but it's basically action items.

Then the week of the 12th of April we have a meeting on the 12th, 13th, 14th, also on the 17th, the

Saturday. On the 12th we have a 1:00 or 1:30 start time. That will be determined. We have the same on the Tuesday, the 13th. Wednesday the 14th is a 4:00 to 8:00 committee meeting.

On Saturday the 17th we have that tentatively (indiscernible) workshop is from 10:00 in the morning until 6:00 in the evening on that, Saturday, the 17th.

The next week is April 19. We actually start on -- I'm sorry, we only have the one day on Tuesday, the 20th. It is a 4:00 to 8:00 in the evening. That is also an action meeting.

Then going to the week of April 26th, we have meetings on the 26th, 27th, 28th, which is a Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday. On the Monday we have a 9:30 in the morning start time. On the Tuesday we have the 1:00/1:30 start time. Those are full committee meetings. On the 28th we have a subcommittee meeting from 4:00 to 8:00.

Moving to May, on Wednesday the 5th, that is a 4:00 in the afternoon until 8:00 in the evening meeting, action, full committee meeting.

Then we have the following week is May 10th. We have from the -- the meeting is from the 12th, 13th and 14th. On the 12th actually a (audio skips) meeting starting from 4:00 until 8:00 in the evening. Both the Thursday, the 13th and Friday, the 14th, those are regular

full Commission meetings. They start at 9:30 in the morning.

Then the following week we have Tuesday, the 18th. That is a 4:00 in the afternoon until 8:00 in the evening. That's an action meeting.

And then finally for May, the week of the 24th we have meetings on the 24th, 25th, 26th. The 24th is a full day, 9:30 in the morning. The 25th is a full day, 1:00 or 1:30 in the afternoon, and then the 26th is, again, a 4:00 to 8:00 committee meeting.

That's what I have on the agenda. We're getting thumbs up everywhere. Okay.

There was just one thought here. We have May the 5th is an action meeting from 4:00 to 8:00 on a Wednesday evening. Commissioner Fernandez, that is definitely -- we do know that Commissioner Sadhwani cannot be there for that. Do we have evening availability on either the Tuesday or the Thursday if we know that's an action? I'm just thinking here in terms of -- originally all these dates were given out as though those were in the morning meetings when those exclusions came about. I'm just wondering if at this point if there's any reason to go ahead and try and move that to either the 4th or the 6th.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I think we could move it to the 4th. I'm looking at everybody's schedule right now

-- schedules. I think the 4th may work.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Also, Cinco de Mayo.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I know I'll be

4 celebrating at home.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Exactly.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It could be a working meeting. We can do chips and, you know, whatever.

Everybody will be home; they'll be safe.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I would propose that we move that action meeting 4:00 to 8:00 from the 5th to the 4th. All in favor? I'm seeing several hands up. Anyone seriously oppose that? No, okay.

So, a change. The May 5th meeting is off. It's moved to May 4th from 4:00 to 8:00 in the evening as an action meeting.

And with that, we are certainly at time. We've done way more on this and worked out things that I was not anticipating, but at least it's down on the books now.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I only wanted to reach out once more to the public -- what do we call it -- public input design meeting to see if we wanted -- like now we only have the one meeting in March, the 18th, so I wasn't sure if we wanted to tag onto one of them, like the March 22nd, 23rd, or 24th.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: My thought on that is the first meeting we're going to kind of figure out what information we need and we've got to go out there and get the panels and get the information, so we might be okay not having a second meeting, but I'd be eager to hear from others.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Only because there wouldn't be another opportunity until almost the month -- later on the 12th, April 12th through the 14th, so it would be a month later. That's the only reason I'm asking at this point.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, it is a -- it's a committee, so they could actually say at this point they could go ahead and put one on Wednesday the 31st. They still have time to agendize that.

So, Commissioner Fornaciari or Commissioner
Sinay, did you want to go ahead and jump in on the 24th or
do you want to think about it for a little bit? You would
have to schedule that before you actually have your 18th
meeting. I would recommend that you do. Wait, I'm on the
committee. I recommend the committee does because we do
lay out some of them at this point. But if you don't want
to jump on it the 24th, I think there will be things to

talk about. There will be a lot of items to come back with, but I believe you can always cancel the 24th. I would pencil it in now, and then look at penciling in more when you can -- you and Commissioner Fornaciari can get together on that. That would be my recommendation.

And if you want to do that, just let Director

Hernandez know before 5:00 o'clock -- oh, let him know now.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I hate to ask this, but we're being pressed to do the 24th, which is only a few days after the first meeting, which is the 18th. Does it not make more sense to go to the 31st?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: There's only seven of us, and we're probably going to do these in the evening, so it's probably going to be a bit easier to schedule them.

But, you know, I mean if we meet on the -- well, I mean we could do something on the 31st or on the 1st.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, the first is the meeting, unless it gets cancelled. That is a regular meeting.

Okay, so at this point you're not inclined to say anything,

Commissioner Fernandez, so -- but you have -- the Chairs of that committee have been sort of mentioned. Those are your possibilities as of today, and certainly it's up to you to come back.

Thank you very much, Commissioner Fernandez, for bringing that up. Any other items of business? Seeing none, at this point I would like to recess the meeting, and we will start again tomorrow morning --

MS. JOHNSTON: Public comment.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Oh, I'm sorry. Thank you. Public comment.

MR. MANOFF: Yes, Chair, I can take care of that for you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the commissioners will be taking public comment by phone.

To dial in, the telephone number is provided on the livestream feed. It is 1-877-853-5247. When prompted, enter the meeting I.D. number provided on the livestream feed. It is 98938125973 for this week's meeting. When prompted to enter a participant I.D., simply press pound.

Once you've dialed in you'll be placed in a queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press star nine. This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it is your turn to speak you'll hear a message that says, "The host would like you to talk. Press star six to speak."

If you'd like to give your name, please state and

spell it for the record. You are not required to provide your name to give public comment.

2.2.

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

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

And there are no callers in the queue at this time.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Kristian. We will wait a couple of minutes because it temporary to have some public comment.

Thank you very much, Commissioners, for your participation today and for staying with us through that process of determining our future meetings. That is a bit arduous, but we have them on the table.

And tomorrow we will be having our brief meeting in the morning and then we'll have our education outreach panel, and I believe we will be ending the day -- unless something else comes up, we'll be ending the day certainly before lunch.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yay.

24 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Was that Marian that

said yay?

2 CHAIR ANDERSEN: No, it was Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Is today

International Women's Day? Yes?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: It is.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So, to all of us strong women, I commend all of us. I commend all women. Thank you for all you do.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Indeed. Yes, this is, actually, I realized this is Women's History Month. That's like last month was considered, you know, Black History Month. I can't remember what the official title is. I think those months should be all year, quite frankly. I mean history shouldn't be reserved for one particular time, one particular month, or for one particular period. History needs to be shared for everybody. But thank you very much Commissioner Fernandez, for bringing that up.

MR. MANOFF: It has been two minutes since we completed the instructions on the livestream and there are no callers in queue, Chair.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. Well, with that I will call the meeting into -- well, I don't call the meeting. I will recess the meeting until tomorrow morning. Thank you very much, Commissioners.

(Off the record at 4:30 p.m.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I do hereby certify that the testimony in

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 1st day of July, 2021.

PETER PETTY CER**D-493 Notary Public

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified transcriber and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

MARTHA L. NELSON, CERT**367

July 1, 2021