

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

2020 CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION (CRC)

In the matter of:

PUBLIC MEETING

721 Capitol Mall, 2nd Floor
Sacramento, California 95814

Zoom Meeting

MONDAY, May 24, 2021

9:01 A.M.

Reported by:
Peter Petty

APPEARANCESCommissioners Present:

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

Staff Present:

Alvaro E. Hernandez, Executive Director
Ravindar Singh, Administrative Assistant
Anthony Pane, Chief Counsel
Marian Johnston, Legal Counsel
Fredy Ceja, Communications Director
Marcy Kaplan, Director of Outreach
Sulma Hernandez, Outreach Coordinator
Kimberly Briggs, Field Lead
Jose Eduardo Chavez Garcia, Field Lead

Technical Contractors:

Public Comment Moderator
Kristian Manoff, AV Technical Director

Also Present

Panelists:

Karin MacDonald, Statewide Database, and Q2 Data and Research, LLC
Jaime Clark, Q2 Data and Research, LLC

APPEARANCES (CONT.)Public Comment:

Alejandra Ponce de Leon, Advancement Project California
Helen Hutchison, League of Women Voters, California
Sandra Barreiro, California School Employees Association
Toni Trigueiro, California Teachers Association
Sky Allen, Inland Empire United
Rosalind Gold, NALEO Educational Fund
Renee West-Lusk
Lori Shellenberger, Common Cause

INDEX

	<u>PAGE</u>
1. Call to Order and Roll Call	7
2. Public Comment	9
3. General Announcements/Commissioner Updates: Items of interest to the Commission	18
4. Chair Report	18
5. Executive Director's Report, including discussion and possible action on: Staffing and Personnel Budget, contracts, and/or procurement Other areas of discussion	19
6. Outreach Director's Report Update on Outreach Activities	25
7. Chief Counsel's Report	36
8. Communications Director's Report	21
9. Subcommittee Updates: Report of subcommittee recommendations on which action may be taken:	
A. Government Affairs/Census: Commissioners Sadhvani and Toledo Update and discussion regarding impact of Census delay on CRC Calendar and Electoral Cycle	---
B. Finance and Administration: Commissioners Fernandez and Fornaciari	---
C. GANTT Chart: Commissioner Kennedy and Taylor	134
D. VRA Compliance: Commissioners Sadhwani and Yee	134

INDEX (CONT.)

	<u>PAGE</u>
E. Outreach and Engagement: Commissioners Sinay and Fornaciari	---
F. Language Access: Commissioners Akutagawa and Fernandez	134
G. Materials Development: Commissioners Fernandez and Kennedy	135
H. Website: Commissioners Kennedy and Taylor	136
I. Data Management: Commissioners Ahmad and Turner Discussion of data management approach and review	137
J. Grants: Commissioners Akutagawa and Le Mons RFP Update	37
Public comment on motion	117
K. Community of Interest (COI) Tool: Commissioners Akutagawa and Kennedy	134
TIME CERTAIN: Monday, May 24, 2021, 2pm-3:15pm Redistricting Access Centers Update, Statewide Database, Karin MacDonald and Jaime Clark	139
L. Cybersecurity: Commissioners Fornaciari and Taylor	137
M. Incarcerated Populations - State and Local Facilities: Commissioners Fernandez and Sinay	138
N. Incarcerated Populations - Federal Facilities: Commissioners Kennedy and Turner	138

INDEX (CONT.)

	<u>PAGE</u>
O. Lessons Learned: Commissioners Ahmad and Kennedy	138
P. IT Recruitment: Commissioners Andersen and Fornaciari	138
10. Legal Affairs Committee Update - Commissioners Yee, Toledo and Sadhwani Status of Litigation Counsel Contracting	---
11. Public Input Design Committee: Commissioners Ahmad and Fornaciari Discussion of Committee issues Procedures with Public Input Proposed Agenda for June 10th COI Input Meeting	---
12. Line Drawer Updates/Training: Commissioners Andersen and Sadhwani	---
CLOSED SESSION	183
Pursuant to Sections 11126(c)(18), 11126(a), and 11126(e) of the Government Code, the Commission will meet in Closed Session to consider:	
A. Data and Cybersecurity issues	
B. Personnel-related issues	
C. Potential litigation	
RECONVENE IN OPEN SESSION	183
13. Report on actions, if any, taken in Closed Session	183
14. Discussion of future meeting dates & agenda items	183
Public Comment	187
Adjournment	191

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

P R O C E E D I N G S

Monday, May 24, 2021 9:01 a.m.

CHAIR AHMAD: Welcome everyone to today's meeting of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. The date is Monday, May 24th, 2021.

Can we please have roll call?

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Yes, Chair.
Commissioner Ahmad?

CHAIR AHMAD: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner
Akutagawa?

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner
Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner
Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner
Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner Le
Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here.

1 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner
2 Sadhwani?
3 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.
4 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner
5 Sinay?
6 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.
7 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner
8 Taylor?
9 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Present.
10 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner
11 Toledo?
12 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Here.
13 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner
14 Turner?
15 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.
16 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner
17 Vazquez?
18 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Here.
19 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Commissioner
20 Yee?
21 VICE CHAIR YEE: Here.
22 ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT SINGH: Chair, you have
23 a quorum.
24 CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you. And while we get ready
25 to call for public comment, I just wanted to briefly give

1 an overview of the agenda for today and tomorrow.

2 So, we have our general report outs from our
3 teams, so Executive Director will give his report out, our
4 Outreach Director, as well as Chief Counsel and
5 Communications Director.

6 Then, we'll move forward with our subcommittee
7 report outs. I would like to highlight that we will start
8 out subcommittee report outs with Item 9-J, so that we have
9 folks present for that conversation.

10 Item 9-K has a time certain presentation from the
11 Statewide Database, so that will be occurring today at 2
12 p.m., when we return from lunch.

13 And then, we'll continue to go through our
14 subcommittee report out.

15 Tomorrow, we start at 1 p.m. And at 1:30 we will
16 have our dry run for the COI, the Communities of Interest
17 Public Input meeting, along with, hopefully, a robust
18 discussion of all of the different moving parts related to
19 the first session of that COI input meeting to be held on
20 June 10th.

21 We will be going into Closed Session tomorrow,
22 briefly, to discuss some of the data and cybersecurity
23 issues. And once we jump back out of closed session we
24 will close off the day with our usual discussion of future
25 meeting dates and agenda items.

1 Does that sound okay for everyone? Am I missing
2 anything, Commissioner Yee? No, okay. Great.

3 VICE CHAIR YEE: That sounds good, all good.

4 CHAIR AHMAD: Awesome. And I should also mention
5 that Commissioner Yee and I are taking the lead on these
6 series of meetings. So, throwing that out there.

7 Are we ready for public comment?

8 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We are, Chair.

9 CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you.

10 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: In order to maximize
11 transparency and public participation in our process, the
12 Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To
13 call in, dial the telephone number provided on the
14 livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted, enter
15 the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed. It
16 is 92638886526 for this meeting. When prompted to enter a
17 participant ID, simply press the pound key.

18 Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a
19 queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press *9.
20 This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it is
21 your turn to speak you will hear a message that says, the
22 host would like you to talk, and to press *6 to speak. If
23 you would like to give your name, please state and spell it
24 for the record. You are not required to provide your name
25 to give public comment.

1 Please make sure to mute your computer or
2 livestream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion
3 during your call. Once you are waiting in the queue, be
4 alert for when it is your turn to speak, and again please
5 turn down the livestream volume.

6 And we do have several callers in the queue with
7 their hands raised. And we will be doing a two-minute time
8 clock.

9 Thank you. Go ahead, the floor is yours.

10 MS. PONCE DE LEON: Hi, good morning
11 Commissioners. My name is Alejandra Ponce de Leon, spelled
12 A-L-E-J-A-N-D-R-A P-O-N-C-E D-E L-E-O-N, with Advancement
13 Project California. And also calling on behalf of the IVE
14 Redistricting Alliance.

15 I just wanted to call and want to appreciate,
16 again, all the work that you continue to do in trying to
17 figure out if this is possible. And even trying to figure
18 out, you know, as the Commission what time it is that you
19 need or how much time you need to carry forward the
20 redistricting process in a transparent and a very public
21 way.

22 Now, I'm calling because we want to make sure
23 that, you know, that you all received our letter that we
24 sent, submitted yesterday evening to you, just uplifting,
25 you know, first and foremost that you, as the Commission,

1 you have the authority to set a timeline that lives into
2 the spirit of the Voters FIRST Act in order to ensure that
3 the public has the time necessary to fully participate in
4 the redistricting process.

5 In our letter, you know, we definitely want to
6 encourage all of you to feel that you have -- you have the
7 authority based on the decision from the Supreme Court
8 where they made two things very clear in granting the
9 extension to the redistricting deadline given the delays,
10 and the further delays for the release of Census data.

11 So that the Voters FIRST Act is a priority for
12 the Commission.

13 AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: 30 seconds.

14 MS. PONCE DE LEON: And, therefore, you have the
15 right to ensure there's enough time for the public to fully
16 participate.

17 And the other thing is that we want to just
18 uplift that, you know, the Commission, you know, even
19 though you have the right to go all the way through --

20 AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: 15 Seconds.

21 MS. PONCE DE LEON: -- February 14th to consider,
22 you know, having a plan deadline for January 28th. This
23 balances the interests of the meaningful, and robust, and
24 engaged public participation process against the need to
25 finalize maps to facilitate a timely primary process.

1 AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: 2 minutes.

2 MS. PONCE DE LEON: So, thank you for your time.
3 We hope the letter is helpful to you. And let us know if
4 anything -- any additional information that we can help
5 with and provide. Thank you.

6 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And thank you. On to
7 our next caller. And I would like to remind those in the
8 queue to press *9 to raise their hand, indicating they wish
9 to comment.

10 And go ahead, the floor is yours.

11 MS. HUTCHISON: Good morning, Commissioners.
12 This is Helen Hutchison with the League of Women Voters of
13 California. The last name is Hutchison, H-U-T-C-H-I-S-O-N.
14 Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We have -- there
15 are two comments on your webpage for this meeting. The
16 first is a slightly delayed posting and reflects some
17 previous comments that we made.

18 The second letter, which is listed as the League
19 of Women Voters of California letter, is about attempts to
20 influence your work. You've already received a lot of
21 advice and you're going to receive a huge amount more. We
22 urge you to use your good sense, your "Spidey-senses", if
23 you will, as you decide how to respond to all of this
24 input.

25 Most of what you will hear will be straight

1 forward input about your process and California
2 communities, and will come with the best intentions
3 attached. However, some will come from those with ulterior
4 motives, those who want to influence your work for some
5 reason other than ensuring good district maps that fairly
6 represent California communities. These people aren't
7 going to explicitly tell you their motives for their
8 ultimate goals, but you were given a big responsibility and
9 we trust you to use all of your resources, especially your
10 good sense in making all of these important decisions for
11 California over the coming months.

12 AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: 30 seconds.

13 MS. HUTCHISON: Thank you very much.

14 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And thank you. And on
15 to our next caller. And thank you everyone for raising
16 your hands.

17 Go ahead, the floor is yours.

18 MS. BARREIRO: Sandra Barreiro with the
19 California School Employees Association. My name is
20 spelled S-A-N-D-R-A B-A-R-R-E-I-R-O.

21 First, I'd like to thank the Government Affairs
22 Committee for including a potential January 7th deadline
23 among options for discussion. As I said during previous
24 public comment, there are options to provide some relief
25 from the holidays, while still preserving the traditional

1 primary date.

2 However, there appears to be a false narrative
3 being offered to the Committee. This narrative assumes
4 that a year to prepare for the release of Census data is
5 not enough time and that productive work cannot be done
6 over the holidays. It also falsely assumes the election
7 calendar can be squeezed and changed without consequence.
8 And it seems that within this narrative any nonconforming
9 voices are ignored or considered suspect.

10 In reality, balance between preserving the
11 redistricting process and the election calendar to maximize
12 voter participation can be achieved.

13 So, I'd like to again thank the Committee for
14 challenging this narrative by considering a potential
15 January 7th deadline. Thank you.

16 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And thank you. On to
17 our next caller.

18 Go ahead, the floor is yours.

19 MS. TRIGUEIRO: Commissioners, my name is Toni
20 Trigueiro with the California Teachers Association. T-O-N-
21 I T-R-I-G-U-E-I-R-O.

22 I called last month to provide statistics on
23 turnout among historically underrepresented communities.
24 For example, three out of four registered Latinos did not
25 vote in the last gubernatorial primary. However, when

1 talking about turnout it's easy to lose track of the scale
2 of the problem.

3 According to the Statewide Database, in the last
4 gubernatorial primary 3,693,701 registered Latinos did not
5 vote, 1,158,486 registered Asians did not vote, and
6 4,395,045 voters under the age of 35 did not vote.

7 This Commission and your redistricting-focused
8 community partners obviously face significant challenges
9 reaching the goal of engaging less than one percent of the
10 population, or 39,500 Californians. I don't want to
11 minimize that.

12 But it's also important to weight that against
13 the scale of the challenge and also maximizing the number
14 of people who will take advantage of your hard work when
15 they vote, especially when even seemingly miniscule changes
16 can impact hundreds of thousands of voters.

17 AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: 30 seconds.

18 MS. TRIGUEIRO: I hope this continues to be a
19 factor you consider in your deliberations. And thank you
20 very much for your hard work.

21 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And thank you. We'll
22 go on to our last caller at this time.

23 And go ahead, the floor is yours.

24 MS. ALLEN: Thank you. Good morning
25 Commissioners, this is Sky Allen for Inland Empire United.

1 My comment's going to be a little bit different
2 today, please bear with me. Over the past few weeks I've
3 been noticing a growing narrative that positions community
4 groups like my quote/unquote special interests, with some
5 scary hidden agenda and, therefore, we can't be trusted.
6 Certainly, we can't really be speaking on behalf of a
7 community official organized, so you all should be wary of
8 us.

9 And that's really been bothering me. It's not
10 only a disingenuous argument, but it's a dangerous one and
11 I urge you all not to fall into that trap. If we have
12 power, our groups wouldn't exist. My organization would
13 not need to exist if the black and brown folks in my
14 community had an equitable voice. If the warehouse
15 workers, and the farmworkers, and the people impacted by
16 the warehouses, and by our injustice system would
17 considered by our policymakers I wouldn't need to be in
18 this job. But I'm here because too often democracy doesn't
19 work for all of us unless we make it. That's why all of
20 our community groups are here.

21 The people we're here to represent can't attend
22 these meetings. They have jobs to work, they have kids to
23 feed, they have to keep a roof over their heads. They
24 don't have the mental capacity to follow along this
25 technical esoteric process. We're all here to offer their

1 perspective to you and to translate these processes for
2 them. We're organizers. Our job is to educate each other.
3 It's a mobilize run if you're going to impact our
4 communities.

5 And redistricting is absolutely an issue that
6 impacts us all. Please don't allow back bay skeptics to
7 turn their nose up to us because we're organizers.

8 AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: 30 seconds.

9 MS. ALLEN: I've been sitting here the past few
10 weeks trying to figure out how I can mobilize the people in
11 my own community to engage with you all in a way that isn't
12 quote/unquote too organized, in the fear that all of our
13 work might be thrown back in our face because of this
14 narrative that we are -- if we're too organized, we're
15 untrustworthy. That can't be the answer here.

16 AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: 15 seconds.

17 MS. ALLEN: I don't expect and I'm not asking for
18 you to do everything that we ask for. You know, we voted
19 for an independent Commission, we advocate for this
20 Commission, we show up to engage with this Commission
21 because we believe in your model and your purpose --

22 AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: 2 minutes.

23 MS. ALLEN: -- and all 14 of you. All I'm asking
24 is that you don't hold out organizing against us and that
25 you extend your own process as one that welcomes the input

1 of grassroots groups and coalitions like mine. Thank you so
2 much for listening.

3 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.
4 And that is all of our callers at this time.

5 CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you, Katy. And thank you
6 everyone who called in. And we will be taking public
7 comment once again before we recess for the day.

8 So, moving right along are there any general
9 announcements from Commissioners at this time?

10 All right seeing none, the next is the Chair
11 report. I don't have anything new to report that won't be
12 reported in subcommittee report outs. I would just like to
13 highlight that our first Community of Interest Input
14 meeting will be held on June 10th. And this is a statewide
15 input meeting that will be held virtually.

16 If you are so excited to submit your input you
17 can do so now at drawmyCAcommunity.org.

18 And now, I'll hand it over to Executive Director
19 for his report out.

20 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair
21 and good morning Commissioners. Regarding staff and
22 personnel issues, I wanted to let you know that I will be
23 submitting a candidate to the subcommittee for the Outreach
24 Manager. More to come on that.

25 Data Manager, also wanted to let you know that we

1 haven't had a lot of applicants, yet. I believe there's
2 been one application received so far. So, again, please
3 let folks know that it's out there and we're looking for
4 folks.

5 Moving on to the contracts, we do have a new
6 contract with our ASL. And we'll be talking about contract
7 issues later on through the subcommittee reports.

8 Regarding the budget, we've been informed by the
9 Department of Finance this week that we will hear this week
10 on the release of funds that we've submitted a request, the
11 \$1.3 million.

12 Our Fiscal Director, our Chief Counsel and I met
13 with members of the Joint Legislative Budget Committee to
14 discuss the proposed budget language as it relates to our
15 requested augmentation. And that's in the budget that was
16 posted on March 29th.

17 We're providing additional and supporting
18 information to them. Our augmentation was approved by
19 Department of Finance and now it has to go through the
20 legislative budget process to put things in the appropriate
21 context.

22 That's the extent of my report this week. Thank
23 you.

24 CHAIR AHMAD: Are there any questions from my
25 colleagues? Yes, Commissioner Sinay?

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. Which staffing
2 position are we having trouble -- I mean we're not
3 receiving a lot of applications for?

4 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Data Manager.

5 CHAIR AHMAD: Any other questions at this time?
6 All right, if you think of something in the meantime, feel
7 free to just jump in the queue. But for the sake of time
8 we'll just continue moving along.

9 Next is the Outreach Director's report and I'll
10 pass it to you, Fredy.

11 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR CEJA: Thank you so much.
12 I will keep this short. So, just wanted to announce and
13 thank you Chair for announcing that Twitter is now opening
14 their processes for verification, so we will be seeking
15 that over the next few days. I talked to them this
16 morning, so thank you for the heads up. We're going to be
17 getting verified for our Twitter account. We already did
18 that for other accounts on social media.

19 We're still putting together our Ad Buy Program,
20 so we'll get that plan to you all. I know that we do have
21 a budget for that, so we're identifying the areas of
22 greater need around California and then we'll share that
23 with you as soon as possible.

24 Look out for an invitation to the PSA Brainstorm,
25 we're still planning on having that. And I'll send details

1 shortly on that.

2 This Thursday we have a Latino media briefing.
3 We're partnering with the Latino Community Foundation to
4 work with our Latino media partners around the state to let
5 them know what redistricting is and how they can help us
6 get the word out. Commissioner Sinay will be presenting to
7 them in Spanglish. So, we'll be adjusting the presentation
8 to both English and Spanish so that we can educate them on
9 how to say (speaking Spanish) and other words that are very
10 popular in our field.

11 And lastly, I just wanted to announce that we've
12 made a fix to the website and have updated some of our
13 documents. And I don't want to steal their thunder, but
14 I'm sure our subcommittees will report on that.

15 And lastly, just want to uplift that many of us
16 have been working on that June 10th public input meeting,
17 but no one has been working harder than Marcy Kaplan. So,
18 I just wanted to uplift her and thank her for all her work
19 during the past week.

20 CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you, Freddy. And I said
21 Outreach Director and I passed it to you. So, thank you,
22 Freddy, for that update from the Communications Director.

23 Just one more question for you, Freddy, in
24 regards to that documentary, do we have any updates on that
25 item?

1 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR CEJA: Oh, yes. So, I
2 did ask the documentarian to provide me an updated proposal
3 for his work. As you all recall, at the last meeting I
4 posted a proposal. There's a documentarian that wants to
5 put out a documentary on the Commission's work. Wants to
6 mostly cover when we do line drawing with the community,
7 but also wants to do one-on-ones with each Commissioner.

8 I do have an updated proposal. I was going to
9 funnel it through the committee process. But he did
10 indicate that he has no ties to any political group. I
11 actually did a search on the federal and the state
12 donations pages for the Secretary of State, and the FPPC,
13 and I did not find anything. So, that correlates with his
14 announcement that he has no political affiliation, and he
15 indicated that in his proposal.

16 So, we hope to ease those concerns for
17 Commissioners, among others, but we will take it through
18 the committee process to vet it a little more.

19 CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you, Fredy. And just to be
20 clear, which committee does the documentary land in?

21 COMMUNICATIONS DIRECTOR CEJA: That's a good
22 question. I was going to take it through -- it's either
23 Outreach or the Material Subcommittee.

24 CHAIR AHMAD: Do we have volunteers from either
25 of those two subcommittees?

1 Yes, Commissioner Sinay and then Fernandez.

2 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I was just going to say that
3 we can take it. We started the review process. But I
4 think both committees actually started the review process,
5 so I'm not sure.

6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Ditto.

7 CHAIR AHMAD: All right. Can I -- yes, go ahead,
8 Commissioner Sinay?

9 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can I make a recommendation,
10 maybe just Alicia and I, one from each committee, or is
11 that not allowed?

12 CHAIR AHMAD: It is certainly -- can be allowed.
13 I would just establish a new subcommittee so that you all
14 have the authority to work together outside of open
15 meetings. And is that a route that we want to take as a
16 group? Maybe? Yes? Yes, Commissioner Kennedy?

17 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I would just say, you
18 know, materials development is for materials that we
19 produce, not for materials that somebody else is producing.
20 So, I mean I would support the Outreach Subcommittee taking
21 it on.

22 CHAIR AHMAD: All right, great. Commissioner
23 Fernandez, are you good with the Outreach Subcommittee
24 taking this item on?

25 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sure.

1 CHAIR AHMAD: Okay, great. So, the Outreach
2 Subcommittee, who's Commissioners Sinay and Fornaciari,
3 will be responsible for communicating with you, Fredy,
4 regarding that documentary.

5 All right. And now, I will pass it back to the
6 Outreach Director, Marcy Kaplan, for her report out.

7 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Great. Thank you so
8 much, everyone. Good morning, Commissioners. And thank
9 you, Fredy, for your -- I know we've definitely been
10 working as a team a lot lately. So, thank you everyone.

11 I just want to also acknowledge all the work that
12 Commissioners have been doing, presenting across the state.
13 We've been doing a ton of presentations. To date we've
14 completed 116 presentations, and there's 42 upcoming
15 scheduled, and about 15 more that we're processing.

16 I have noted in the past that we're now
17 scheduling into the summer, a few trickling into July. And
18 I will defer to the Outreach and engagement Subcommittee,
19 who will discuss the educational presentations more later.

20 I'm really excited to share that our Outreach
21 Coordinator has joined last week, and our Field Leads, two
22 of them have started today. I'm so thrilled to be building
23 our teams. And really, the expertise and knowledge that
24 each of our new staff bring. And even we had a little bit
25 of time to meet in person, some of the staff last week, and

1 really get together and think more strategically around
2 planning. So, I really enjoyed how thoughtful and
3 collaborative our team has been, and working with the
4 Communications Team and others, on staff as well, as well
5 as with the Commissioners.

6 So, I wanted to introduce Sulma Hernandez, who is
7 our new Outreach Coordinator. She started last week and
8 she really jumped right into the work. She will play a
9 pivotal role in the Outreach Team, working with our Field
10 Leads to engage Californians in the redistricting process.

11 Sulma most recently managed her own community
12 relations firm for nonprofits, businesses, and developed
13 communication programs, outreach, and strategic planning
14 for community projects. And I've also just seen, in the
15 short time that she's been with us, the wealth of knowledge
16 and expertise that she will bring to this role.

17 So, I will go ahead and let Sulma introduce
18 herself and say a few words.

19 OUTREACH COORDINATOR HERNANDEZ: Hello. Good
20 morning. Thank you, Commissioners for allowing me some
21 space and time to speak, and share my story.

22 My name is Sulma Hernandez. My gender pronouns
23 are she, her, hers, *ella*. I am a first generation
24 professional. I am from the Los Angeles area, of firmly
25 Tongva Land. And so, I just want to take a few minutes

1 just to acknowledge indigenous people in the State of
2 California.

3 I grew up in Boyle Heights. I was inspired by my
4 parents who did a lot of community organizing with Father
5 Greg Boyle, of Homeboy Industries. Really involved in
6 juvenile justice reform. And so, that really pivoted the
7 way I've carried myself and what I wanted to reach to my
8 community.

9 So, over the past decade I've dedicated my time
10 to public service, working in the local municipality of Los
11 Angeles to try to foster public and private relationships.

12 I'm most excited about helping to promote
13 transparency, inclusivity, and participatory governance
14 here in the Commission. And so, I just want to thank you
15 again for the time of allowing me to be able to organize at
16 a statewide level.

17 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Thank you so much,
18 Sulma.

19 Next, I want to introduce Kimberly Briggs, our
20 Field Lead for the L.A. and OC regions. She has started
21 today as well. Kimberly is based in Los Angeles and comes
22 to us after working with Mayor Garcetti's Census 2020
23 effort. I'm just thrilled by her enthusiasm and her
24 expertise, and so really excited to introduce her to all of
25 you, now.

1 Kimberley, go ahead.

2 FIELD LEAD BRIGGS: Hi, good morning
3 Commissioners. It's a pleasure to meet you all virtually.
4 My name's Kimberly Briggs. Yes, most recently I worked
5 Mayor Garcetti's office spearheading public facing
6 materials for the Census. It was the most challenging and
7 rewarding job in my career. So, I'm really proud of the
8 work I did.

9 I signed on to this opportunity because I want to
10 continue the work. Representation and equity is really
11 important for me, so I'm ready to put the fight in and get
12 what's ours.

13 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Thank you so much,
14 Kimberly. And I just want to acknowledge, also, her
15 expertise of the L.A. area, and OC, as well as communities
16 and local governments that she worked with.

17 And next, I wanted to introduce Jose Eduardo
18 Chavez Garcia, who is our Central California Field Lead,
19 covering Zones E, F, G, and Z. Most recently, Jose was a
20 district representative with the California State Assembly.
21 And really, also want to emphasize his expertise with local
22 communities, including indigenous populations, and other
23 diverse communities across the Central Valley and other
24 parts of Central California.

25 So, go ahead, Jose.

1 FIELD LEAD CHAVEZ GARCIA: Good morning
2 Commissioners, it's a pleasure to be here. And I am
3 excited to be part of this amazing team and just salute you
4 for all the work that you've already been doing.

5 I appreciate the space of sharing my story as
6 well. I am not even a first generation, I immigrated to
7 this country at the age of 10. And so, it's just an honor
8 to be forming what California now looks like, a state that
9 welcomes everybody, and a state that is diverse such as
10 this. And I'm just fascinated to be a part of this amazing
11 team.

12 And the reason why I signed up on this position
13 is I am passionate about equity and the work that I've been
14 doing in the past seven years of my professional career is
15 trying to forge that sense of belonging through -- a sense
16 of belonging when it comes to representation. And so, I
17 believe that this is a pivotal role that you're all playing
18 and I wanted to be part of this amazing team. Thank you.

19 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Thank you so much.
20 I'm not sure if you guys had questions for them or -- I'm
21 really excited for everyone to be on board.

22 And then, I will just continue. I have been
23 working closely with the Outreach and Engagement
24 Subcommittee, who I mentioned will be talking more as well
25 about the public education sessions, the Public Input

1 Design Subcommittee who will be discussing the agenda and
2 logistics for the June 10th meeting.

3 And thank you, Fredy, we all -- it was a big
4 staff effort working together to help the subcommittee
5 prepare for this discussion.

6 And I am thrilled that we were able to post the
7 draft RFP to the Commission and the public to review, that
8 the Grant Subcommittee will be going over. This has been a
9 long process that I've been working on since day one, and
10 so I'm really excited for this discussion today. Thank
11 you.

12 CHAIR AHMAD: Great. Marcy, how would you like
13 us to field the questions? Do you want my assistance in
14 that or would you like to take the lead on it?

15 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Sure.

16 CHAIR AHMAD: Sure, okay. I see Commissioner
17 Sinay and then Fernandez.

18 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Director Kaplan, I just
19 wanted to know how -- you know, how we're going to
20 transition in the team, the Outreach Team, and how you
21 would like -- how you would like Commissioners to share the
22 data that they have already collected, you know, the
23 relationships that you've made, all the -- you know, will
24 we have a plan and you'll present it later or, you know,
25 what's the scoop? Just kind of what is everybody's role

1 here?

2 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Yeah. I know many of
3 you have shared different organizations that you've been in
4 touch with in your zone. So, if you haven't already,
5 please go ahead and share that with me. And Sulma and I
6 are working together on -- we'll be diving a little bit
7 more deeply into how we'll ensure the field team is
8 reaching diverse communities across their zone,
9 incorporating the strategies and demographics that are
10 document in the outreach strategic plan, as well as
11 identifying reporting, and ensuring that we're monitoring
12 and identifying gaps across the state of communities that
13 have not been engaged as well. So, I will follow up with
14 more information as well on that.

15 CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Fernandez, and then I
16 saw your hand earlier Commissioner Taylor, if you still
17 want to just in the queue.

18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.
19 Director Kaplan, just a few questions. I mean first of all
20 I do want to welcome Sulma, Kimberly and Jose. I'm very
21 excited to have you on board, and I just love the energy,
22 so I'm really looking forward to working with all of you.

23 I'm going to lead into my other question of how's
24 the recruitment for the northern part of California
25 working?

1 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Thank you. I'm so
2 glad that you brought that up because we would also
3 encourage you all to help spread the word. It is a very
4 large region. And so, I will make sure you all have the
5 posting that's still on our website. But we are still
6 looking for a Northern California Field Lead.

7 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, and then just my
8 other quick question. My one document I had forwarded to
9 you and the prior coordinator for Zone D, do you want me
10 just to forward that to Sulma also, or how would you want
11 me to handle that?

12 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: I have it. Yeah,
13 thank you.

14 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you so much.

15 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Thank you for flagging
16 that. Thank you.

17 CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Taylor?

18 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you. Good morning
19 everyone. I can't say I don't smile whenever I hear
20 resources are in L.A. County.

21 So, I know, Kimberly, Marcy said specifically
22 Kimberly was going to be an L.A. County lead. And I hard
23 Sulma had some roots in L.A. County. Is she in L.A. County
24 as well or is she taking on other regions? I just didn't
25 catch that.

1 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: So, Sulma is based in
2 L.A. But as the Outreach Coordinator, she'll be working
3 with the Field Leads statewide, and so she'll also be
4 focusing on statewide. But because she's from L.A. and has
5 relationships, I will definitely be working with her on how
6 to leverage that. And just her, you know, experience and
7 background in certain communities as well have definitely
8 -- even though she's not focused on L.A., she will have
9 some additional, you know, suggestions and recommendations
10 of communities to engage with as well.

11 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Got it, thank you. I know,
12 so it doesn't matter so --

13 CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Yee?

14 VICE CHAIR YEE: Thank you, Chair, and thank you
15 Director Kaplan, and welcome to our new staff.

16 I had a question about the input meetings. And
17 so, I assume June 10th is going to be virtual. I'm
18 wondering what your current thinking is going forward from
19 there? How aggressively to try to start having in-person
20 input meetings?

21 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Yes. And Alvaro and I
22 were talking last week about connecting this week to start
23 that research and planning. I think he could discuss more
24 on the timeline. But that is definitely a big role that
25 the Field Staff and Outreach Coordinator will help to

1 ensure identifying locations and logistics.

2 CHAIR AHMAD: Go ahead, Alvaro.

3 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair.
4 I just wanted to mention that as we move forward, and we're
5 still waiting for word from the Governor's Office as to
6 when and how. And as I mentioned before, each county may
7 be a little bit different. But the goal would be to start
8 looking at sites and locations, and prepping for that
9 transition to the in-person input meetings. So, that's
10 kind of what we're doing right now.

11 But the fact that Kimberley, and Jose, and Sulma
12 have contacts in those particular areas, we're going to
13 leverage what they bring to the Commission and use that to
14 start at least looking at sites and understanding where we
15 might go within those specific areas or regions.

16 CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Sinay?

17 COMMISSIONER SINAY: On that note, it might be
18 helpful if you all can create kind of a one-pager on what
19 the requirements are for those regions, since also
20 Commissioners know the regions really well and can maybe
21 help identify sites, and contacts, and things like that.

22 CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Sinay, just
23 clarifying, is that a direct request of staff to take
24 action on the item at this point or is that to have further
25 discussion on that item?

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: It's up to the Chair.
2 That's the Chair's prerogative. But I would encourage
3 action just so that we can help out.

4 CHAIR AHMAD: Okay. I think we can bring that
5 forward. If you don't mind, can you please bring that up
6 again during the Public Input Design report out, because I
7 believe we're going to have a lengthy conversation about
8 that first meeting and every meeting following. So, I
9 think that's an important point to raise moving forward.

10 Commissioner Fernandez?

11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And I'm hoping I know
12 the answer to this, Director Kaplan, but seeing that there
13 currently is not a lead for Northern California and there
14 are going to be COI input meetings in Northern California
15 would I have a correct assumption that the Leads you have
16 now, plus the Coordinator, will assist with that northern
17 -- the northern site-specific COI input meetings?

18 CHAIR AHMAD: Yes.

19 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

20 CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you.

21 Any other questions for Marcy at this time?

22 All right, I know we're going to have a great
23 conversation once we get to Item 11, with that dry run and
24 all of the items that the team has put together for us to
25 review. So, we'll have a more in-depth conversation at

1 that time.

2 So, moving right along, our Chief Counsel's
3 Report.

4 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Thank you, Chair.

5 CHAIR AHMAD: Marcy?

6 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Oh.

7 CHAIR AHMAD: Sorry, I just saw Marcy's hand up.

8 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Oh, go ahead. Go ahead,
9 Marcy.

10 CHAIR AHMAD: No. Okay.

11 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Good morning everyone. Just
12 two items I wanted to inform and brief you all on. Please
13 be on the lookout on June 9th, as part of the Chief
14 Counsel's Report I plan on providing a Bagley-Keene Open
15 Meetings Act refresher for everyone. Again, it will be
16 part of the Chief Counsel's Report.

17 And second, I just want to let you know that
18 Marian and I are working very collaboratively, and we were
19 working to sort of iron out division of labor for the Legal
20 Affairs Division. And so, plan on getting you more
21 information as we sort of iron out those details. But we
22 are looking at that right now.

23 And with that, if anyone has any questions?
24 Commissioner Kennedy?

25 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Just to inquire if the

1 Legal Team has anything to update us on as far as
2 litigation surrounding the Census and other states.
3 Specifically, I guess the Ohio case and what's happening
4 with the Alabama case. Thank you.

5 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Sure. So, I don't have
6 anything at this moment, but I'm happy to report back to
7 you for that.

8 CHAIR AHMAD: Any other questions for our Chief
9 Counsel and/or Legal Team? Great. Great, moving along.
10 Thank you, Anthony, for that.

11 Moving along to subcommittee updates. So, I had
12 a request come in to start with Item 9-J. So, if it's
13 okay, I would like to honor that request and start with 9-
14 J, and then we can jump back to 9-A and continue through
15 that list. Aside from that time certain report out that we
16 have on the agenda.

17 So, with that, Commissioners Akutagawa and Le
18 Mons.

19 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, thank you. And I'm
20 going to go ahead and I'm going to start this off, and then
21 just so that you all know I've also asked Director
22 Hernandez to also give -- to give an update. And then,
23 that will be followed by Commissioner Le Mons, who is going
24 to walk us through the meat of the RFP.

25 So, I do want to just acknowledge the

1 conversation that we had at the last meeting. We did have
2 a lot of input from everybody and definitely point taken.
3 I also want to just say that at that time we were just
4 waiting for the final approval from the Office of Legal
5 Services. And so, shortly after that we did get the okay
6 to move forward, as I had mentioned that there were some
7 specific kinds of things that we needed to ensure that the
8 way in which we would move forward with this funding
9 mechanism would be done using the RFP. And that it would
10 be also open to any entity or any qualified bidder in the
11 State of California.

12 So, what you have seen -- and I just want to just
13 say thank you and kudos to both Director Hernandez and
14 Director Kaplan. We have been working, and they
15 specifically have been working tirelessly since we started
16 talking about all of the different options.

17 I know that last week we talked about, again, the
18 what ifs. I do want to just say that the Committee,
19 working together with Director Hernandez and Director
20 Kaplan, looked at every single possible iteration or
21 possibility that we can consider, in anticipation of the
22 kind of questions that came up last week.

23 But ultimately, again within the confines of what
24 is allowable within the statute of what the Commission can
25 do, this is the route that we can best follow.

1 I just want to also acknowledge that Director
2 Kaplan, with the help of Director Hernandez, really turned
3 this, you know, revision to the RFP to reflect the changes
4 that the Office of Legal Services was requiring. They
5 turned it around quickly and we're pleased that we were
6 able to then have something that we could submit to the
7 public, and also to the entire Commission for everyone to
8 review prior to today's meeting. And so, I do want to just
9 acknowledge them.

10 I know that there were some what if questions
11 that came up last week specific to personal services
12 contracts, and also about being able to perhaps utilize
13 some of the funds to then share with some state agencies,
14 specifically libraries, so that they can also help us with
15 outreach.

16 I want to turn to Director Hernandez to speak to
17 those particular points because there are some answers that
18 he was able to get. So, Director Hernandez.

19 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yes, thank you.
20 In regard to the personal service contracts, those are very
21 limited in what they can do. And for the purposes that
22 we're looking at, they don't apply in this particular
23 instance to do the personal service contracts for the work
24 that we're outlining.

25 As far as the interagency agreements, if the goal

1 is to speed up the process that is not going to speed up
2 the process, one.

3 Secondly, the interagency agreements, although
4 you don't have to do a bidding process, they still have to
5 follow contracting protocols and state guidelines. So
6 that, again, doesn't speed up the process either.

7 So, the interagency agreements, although, you
8 know, are a good idea and you avoid the RFP posting and all
9 that part of it, you still are required to follow the
10 contracting guidelines.

11 So, you know, working with another state agency,
12 if you're giving away -- trying to distance yourself from
13 having to make a decision on awarding that doesn't work
14 because the Commission ultimately has to approve and decide
15 on who the award goes to. So, it doesn't remove that or
16 distance you, as we had originally thought from that part
17 of it. You know, as far as making a decision, it still is
18 required.

19 And ultimately, I think the Commission would want
20 to have responsibility and oversight of how those funds are
21 being used, and directing how they should be used. So, in
22 that sense we're limited on what we can do, and definitely
23 within the time frames in which we can do them.

24 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you very much,
25 Director Hernandez. And I also want to just note that in

1 terms of distancing ourselves from awarding, I think, I
2 believe that we're all capable of being as impartial and as
3 objective as we can. It would be no different than what we
4 did in terms of any of the other contracts that we've
5 awarded. For example, to the line drawers, or also to our
6 counsels. So, I have no doubt in the 14 of us bringing in
7 all of our different lenses to ensure equal balance.

8 So, with that said, I'm so happy and really proud
9 to be able to say that we have something to submit to all
10 of you. I'm going to turn to Commissioner Le Mons to speak
11 about, really, the scope of work and the RFP, and what
12 we're proposing for the RFP. Commissioner Le Mons.

13 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner
14 Akutagawa.

15 And I, too, want to echo the gratitude to
16 Directors Kaplan and Hernandez, and all of the support
17 staff behind the scenes that have been working tirelessly
18 on this process. My hope is that most of the questions and
19 brainstorm from the last meeting, which unfortunately an
20 emergency prevented me from attending, that we're at a
21 place where we believe that we turned the stones that
22 needed to be turned, and really looked for every possible
23 pathway to try to meet the original vision that was
24 outlined very, very early in this process.

25 I know I'm very excited that we have a viable

1 path and I hope every Commissioner at this point has had an
2 opportunity to review the document, which I also want to
3 say is pretty clear and concise, which I think is
4 fantastic. There's not a lot of ambiguity. There's not a
5 lot of gray areas here. And that was one of the things
6 that was really important as well. So, I think that that
7 supports us in being able to feel very confident in our
8 outcome that we select. Contractors to represent the
9 outreach work that we are looking to have done, that we've
10 laid this out as the way that gives us a path to those
11 outcomes that we can feel very comfortable with.

12 So, you know, we talked about how to approach
13 this. I don't know if everyone -- I'm not one who likes to
14 read stuff to people in general, especially not adults.
15 So, my question becomes there's a way to tackle this, we
16 really wanted to focus on the activities and make sure that
17 the things that we are asking from the proposers have been
18 captured here.

19 So, we might want to start with the objectives
20 and feel -- sort of we feel comfortable that these are the
21 objectives. We also want to, I'd say, make sure that --
22 there's not a lot of room for a lot of substantive change
23 in the structure of this, et cetera. So, I just want to
24 caution that we keep our discussion focused because we have
25 gone back and forth with OLS for quite a few weeks now, and

1 this has been looked at by any number of eyes, and making
2 sure within the statutory authority if we lack or, you
3 know, who can do what. This is the framework.

4 So, I think at this point it's a question of are
5 there outliers here in that we feel there's a gap in what
6 it is that we wanted to accomplished or that there are
7 things that are an over-reach that might need to be dialed
8 back. So, I think if we can look at it through that lens,
9 and that's not the exclusive lens to look at it, but if we
10 can look at through that lens, I think we'll be able to
11 have a pretty focused discussion about it.

12 So, if that's okay with the group, and I'm open
13 to suggestions on how to approach it as well, so that's
14 just my thoughts.

15 Chair, I don't know if you have any specific
16 direction on how you'd like us to go about it?

17 CHAIR AHMAD: No, I believe you all have the
18 floor. So, however you want to frame that conversation,
19 you can just jump in.

20 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay. So, why don't we
21 start with Item B, the statement of work, which outlines
22 the objectives of what this RFP is all about. And just
23 ask, I guess, is there any questions from any of the
24 Commissioners? The contractor in each of the regions will
25 collaborate and work with community-based organizations,

1 local government agencies like counties, cities, schools
2 and local businesses to inform the general public of the
3 importance of participating in the redistricting process,
4 and activating and to participating in the redistrict
5 through the Commission's Community of Interest tool, and
6 other avenues the Commission has made available to the
7 public. For those to avoid duplication of efforts within a
8 region, identify outreach gaps and fill them accordingly,
9 and implement outreach to encourage full participation by
10 the public.

11 Is the Commission comfortable with that
12 objective? Commissioner Sinay?

13 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, everybody, for
14 the amazing work that was done to this. There is a lot of
15 work. And I'm sure we'll be getting calls from the
16 community when we have, you know, public comments.

17 And having created a lot of RFPs in my lifetime,
18 you know, no process is ever going to be perfect. And I
19 think we need to just trust -- we need to trust the work
20 that was done. And I want to thank you all.

21 Just one point, just on this. My understanding
22 is that this is a -- that, you know, the purpose and the
23 outcomes are twofold, but then there's four bullets
24 underneath that, A, B, C and D. And what I'm hearing is
25 that it's twofold about education and activating. And I

1 think with a lot of emphasis on the activating.

2 And then, the C and D ones are types of
3 activities that can take place. And so, we just might want
4 to make that -- you know, just make that match what's
5 twofold and what are the bullets underneath it.

6 And I would go back to saying we really want
7 proposals that are going to get us communities of interest
8 submissions, or whichever way. So, whatever we can do to
9 really emphasize that part.

10 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay, thank you.

11 Does anyone else have any feedback on the
12 objective? Commissioner Toledo?

13 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Well, thank you. I
14 think I'd be more comfortable if there was a focus on
15 nonpartisan. If the proposers were nonpartisan in nature.
16 So, if they weren't -- if we highlight that we are seeking
17 organizations that don't lobby. And this might be in the
18 qualification statement on this type of work. But
19 potentially there could be a statement that we don't --
20 that because that we're an impartial organization that's
21 seeking nonpartisan groups to help in this effort, that way
22 we can highlight the impartiality aspect of the work.
23 Thank you.

24 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you.

25 Any other comments on the objective?

1 Commissioner Fernandez?

2 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, I just want to echo
3 the thanks. I was reading this last night and I was, oh,
4 my goodness there's so much information in here, which is
5 really good information. So, thank you for capturing
6 everything that we need.

7 Just on that one -- I know this is a little bit
8 of minutia, but 1-C, when it says to -- towards the end it
9 says: And where possible to their counties and cities. I
10 would like to also add "and communities" because sometimes,
11 you know, their community doesn't encompass the whole city,
12 obviously, it encompasses a community. So, that was my
13 only comment in that area. Thank you so much for capturing
14 everything else, though. Great job.

15 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: You're welcome.

16 And I see Director Kaplan, you're taking notes,
17 right? Okay. I noticed you keep moving each time there's
18 a comment. I just wanted to make sure that someone was
19 capturing it. I know we're reporting this, but thank you
20 for that.

21 Any other questions or feedback on the
22 objectives?

23 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Chair, I had my hand
24 raised.

25 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay, I'm sorry. I hear

1 Commissioner Turner, I recognize that voice. But why don't
2 I see you? Anyway, Commissioner Turner.

3 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Just a point of
4 clarification. Under the objectives -- and thank you for
5 this work. You all have had quite the ride on this. The
6 objectives statement of work starts out: The contractors
7 for each region will, and then it ends with the goal to
8 avoid duplication of efforts with a region, to identify
9 outreach gaps and fill them.

10 I just wanted a point of clarification. Are we
11 looking for those that we ultimately select to identify
12 those gaps or is that's something that's internally to be
13 done? Are they expected to identify gaps and do the work?

14 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I think that's a really
15 good question, Commissioner Turner. I would imagine it
16 will be both, actually. So, any information that -- of
17 course, we've been doing work, meaning the Commission. And
18 I think that our Outreach Team, whatever could be provided
19 that identifies, and we could see what mechanism we could
20 actually use for that, where we know of gaps already. And
21 where we might incorporate that information.

22 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Uh-hum.

23 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Because I think that would
24 drive potential bidders -- I mean, excuse me, proposers'
25 scope of work. So, that's just sort of my thought, off the

1 top of my head. But, yeah, it's just a thought off the top
2 of my head. I think that's a really important question as
3 to who has the responsibility to identify those gaps. I
4 think it sounds like -- it looks like Commissioner Sinay
5 might have a response to that. Go ahead, Commissioner
6 Sinay.

7 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, what I liked about how
8 this is written and I know it's further along, but we are
9 making a contract where part of the contract is working
10 directly with our field staff.

11 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah.

12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: And so, the field staff will
13 have that information and, you know, as we're receiving
14 COIs and we have the maps, we will be able to identify
15 those spaces and the field staff will be able to go back,
16 you know, and work with the different contractors.

17 So, it's not a blind partnership, but it's really
18 working hand in hand.

19 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Great point, Commissioner
20 Sinay.

21 Does that answer your question, Commissioner
22 Turner?

23 COMMISSIONER TURNER: It does. And the way I
24 understood the response is that basically the field staff
25 will be predominantly watching out for gaps. It was only a

1 flag for me and point of clarification because receiving a
2 grant for an area that you know that you're able to work in
3 is different than lifting your head and looking out to see
4 what's missing. And so, I think to have the field staff be
5 predominantly responsible for that will ensure that it
6 happens and we are covering areas that we expect to. Thank
7 you.

8 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: You're welcome.
9 Commissioner Andersen? I'm sorry, Commissioner
10 Akutagawa, were you going to speak to that point?

11 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I just also wanted
12 to just point out, Commissioner Turner, and to everybody
13 else, if you look later in the RFP it does specifically
14 state that each of the successful bidders will be working
15 directly with an assigned field staff person as well, too.
16 So, yeah, we're not going to let them out on their own.

17 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen?

18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I also agree with the --
19 thank you very much for a great detailed document. And I
20 also liked the approach of going through certain chunks of
21 the sections at a time. I think that's very organized.

22 I have a very small comment on this section. And
23 it's under 2-B. To activate Californians how to provide
24 public input. I would prefer if you switch the bullets
25 using -- using the draw the lines community tool to be

1 first, then send the emails, writing. I mean, since we are
2 trying to emphasize because that -- by using the my
3 community, it's already processed into our line drawing
4 efforts, and our whole system. Thank you.

5 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you for that,
6 Commissioner Andersen.

7 Any other questions or comments on the
8 objectives? Okay, seeing none let's move on to the next
9 category, which would be the contractor responsibilities.

10 Now, their whole section between -- before I jump
11 there, we have what -- you know, as we talked about
12 objectives I know we focused on the broader bullets. And
13 then, of course, there's those Sections C and D. We didn't
14 get any feedback on that, so I'm assuming people are
15 comfortable with that at this point. And if that's
16 accurate, then I'd like to just move to Section 3, which
17 are the contractor responsibilities.

18 Okay, Commissioner Fernandez.

19 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Did you want comments on
20 that now?

21 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Sure. Yes, yes, yes.

22 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Just a quick
23 thing on the task 3, on page 7.

24 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Uh-hum.

25 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: The third bullet, and it

1 was a few times throughout the RFP language, it has state,
2 because it says: May be provided to the contractor by the
3 state. I think it's supposed to be by the Commission,
4 correct? And there's a few times throughout the RFP that
5 it mentions state versus the Commission.

6 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I think we should ask
7 Executive Director Hernandez on that clarification.

8 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. And the only
9 other question I had was when we're asking for like
10 feedback -- not feedback -- for the reporting I'm hoping, I
11 think it's in here, but I'm hoping that part of the
12 reporting will note like how many Californians they
13 actually reached, and if they actually have information on
14 how many actually submitted communities of interest input
15 that would be great information for us to have as well so
16 that --

17 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: So, when you -- to that
18 point, Commissioner Fernandez, when we look at -- because
19 the reporting is broken out. There's the monthly
20 reporting, there's the initial status report and then final
21 report. Do you feel like the point that you just made is
22 reflected in the bullets there?

23 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I wasn't sure if it was.
24 I wasn't sure if it's something that once you, you know,
25 start working out the details and once, you k now, our

1 outreach area starts working with the contractor maybe that
2 will be like the -- that will be additional information
3 that's given to them. But I didn't feel that it was
4 specifically spelled out, but I didn't know if it needs to
5 be spelled out. I didn't know if it was something that
6 Director Kaplan would then, you know, work out with the
7 contractor.

8 But for me, I just think that would be good
9 information for us to see the touch points of the counting.
10 Thank you.

11 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Director Kaplan, do you
12 have any feedback to Commissioner Fernandez's question?

13 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Yeah, I think that's
14 helpful to clarify. It's in there clearly in the
15 reporting, particularly around final reporting. It may not
16 be so -- I think for -- depending on the type of activity
17 that's done they may be able to track, you know, if they're
18 holding a workshop that has a component that then gets
19 people to submit a COI that's easier to track sometimes.
20 It's also looking at perhaps total impressions. There's
21 other ways to do that measurement, so depending on the
22 types of activities. But I think looking at some of that
23 wording to make sure that's in there as well. Thank you
24 for finding that.

25 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So, I think monthly -- yeah,
2 this is going to be you get the money and you run. Groups
3 aren't going to really have, you know, the time that we
4 would really like. You know groups, let's say you get
5 money and you'd like to be able to have a lot of time to
6 plan, and do all that. And so, it is going to be adjusting
7 as you go.

8 And I was looking at task number 2, the monthly
9 report seemed a little cumbersome, especially for, you
10 know, the amount of work that we're doing. And, you know,
11 who's going to review budgets every month and all that. I
12 would encourage, unless we have to do that, that we really
13 look at a sit-down meeting with the regional directors and,
14 you know, they talk about what the gaps are, what's
15 happening. So, that was one.

16 Two, on what COIs are actually being submitted,
17 with the Community of Interest tool the Statewide Database
18 did tell some of the groups that they could have like a tag
19 line, or something. I can't remember what it was, but it
20 was some type of tag that people could submit and they
21 would know, you know, their outreach resulted in this
22 number or this tag.

23 And so, what I would recommend is that we just
24 figure out if that can be done, that we just do that for
25 each contractor and we pull up that. You know, whatever we

1 can take -- you know, take on in the big pictures, just
2 because this is going to be a really tough contract to
3 manage with such a short timeline.

4 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you. We do need to
5 have those. But I think rather than either/or, it could be
6 an and in that. That might be a mechanism by which to help
7 the contractor gather the data. But they do need to be
8 able to provide that data to support fulfilling.

9 Commissioner Sinay?

10 COMMISSIONER SINAY: And this may be minutia, so
11 I apologize. Maybe we can just create a Google form that
12 they fill out every month and they just have to put a few
13 details in that and that's how we get the monthly report.
14 But however we can simplify it, the better.

15 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Absolutely.

16 Director Kaplan?

17 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Yes, we've discussed
18 the streamlining of the reporting, but I think the key
19 thing to emphasize with this multiple award or a fee is
20 that we are distributing funds based on work performed.
21 And so, the Commission needs to ensure that we are doing
22 due diligence to identify the work that has been done for
23 the month, the funds that were used in order to do that
24 reimbursement. So, there are ways that we can help with
25 streamlining and having, you know, the expectation set up

1 front on what that reporting will look like, but it will
2 need to be a written report that can also be complimented
3 by a phone conversation that's in here, as well, but
4 ensuring that due diligence.

5 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?
6 Commissioner Turner, I see you.

7 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I just realized, just
8 for clarification then, Director Kaplan, does that mean,
9 for the sake of all of us, too, so does that mean that each
10 month we will be, also the Commission, not just the staff,
11 the Commissioner will be reviewing each of the monthly
12 reports and then we will be -- because it's a disbursement
13 of funds we will need to vote each month to disburse the
14 money, the funds to each of the contractors?

15 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Fernandez?

16 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No, I don't believe we
17 do. I believe it's a -- I would call it a deliverable.
18 And it would be similar to any other sort of invoice
19 processing that's done internally, where the invoice would
20 go to the specific area, which I think would go to Director
21 Kaplan's area. And then, she would be responsible for
22 determining whether or not they had met that milestone for
23 the payment. And then, she could report back to the
24 Commission. But I don't believe it would be the
25 responsibility of the Commission to approve that. But I

1 could be wrong. I have been wrong a few times.

2 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Turner?

3 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Le
4 Mons. I wanted to support Commissioner Sinay, some of her
5 comments. I'm really grateful for the report template that
6 it looks like that will be provided, and the attempts to
7 streamline that. And in understanding that this particular
8 -- this will be paid out in -- I guess in arrears, as
9 opposed to up front. So, I guess maybe that's why the
10 monthly. I wanted to go back to I think monthly reporting
11 is particularly cumbersome, even with a report -- a
12 template that's provided.

13 But then, if it's going to be based on actual
14 work, I'm wondering is there already a formula set up,
15 payment per widget, or is it just a division of the total
16 grant amount and then you receive those funds at the end of
17 the month if the report looks satisfactory?

18 I'm trying to figure out what does that look like
19 to pay them because I don't see any costs, you know, per
20 activity, or is there a dollar amount assigned per meeting,
21 per training, per COI? What does monthly payments look
22 like based on a report without a financial structure tied
23 to it, I guess is what I'm trying to wonder about?

24 Because if there's a way to -- particularly
25 because there's monthly meetings going on as well. But it

1 seems to me that if we've accepted someone as a viable
2 candidate to receive funds, and have confidence in their
3 ability, if they're meeting on a monthly basis there
4 probably could be some funds released up front, and then
5 paid out on a monthly basis if that's satisfactory.

6 Now, the reporting, if it's going to be based on
7 actual work, do we have that already determined what's that
8 going to look like? Payment per what type of work?

9 I mean yes, Director Kaplan.

10 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: So this would be part
11 of the timeline and budget that they would submit that
12 Commissioner Le Mons will go into, in a further section,
13 and that will have the breakdown of activities and cost
14 associated.

15 I know we had explored utilizing a potential
16 template with that budget, so that it's the timeline is
17 associated with the dollar. So, this would be an entity in
18 their application identifying these are the activities
19 they're going to be implemented and the costs associated.
20 And so, with that monthly reporting would then -- you know,
21 this would be the proposed and then they would report on
22 the actual. And so, that would be part of the overseeing
23 of these reports would ensure that, you know, those
24 activities actually occurred and that those working
25 relationships with the field lead that would be overseeing,

1 as well as, you know, that costing being realistic in terms
2 of, you know, what they're charging to do particular
3 activities.

4 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Yee?

5 VICE CHAIR YEE: Thank you. I had a question
6 about number of contracts. So, it looks like it's set out
7 for six contract, you know, divided regionally. So, is
8 that absolutely set? Like if a smaller firm wanted to be
9 in on one of the regions would that be possible? Or, is it
10 really all or nothing for each of these regions and each of
11 the six contracts?

12 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Well, the way it's
13 structured is there's an assumption that subcontracting may
14 be necessary to reach the scopes and objectives, so that
15 would be on the lead proposer to determine what would be
16 needed to accomplish the activities for the region.

17 VICE CHAIR YEE: I see, thanks.

18 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy, then
19 Commissioner Fernandez.

20 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. Looking under
21 reports, I'm reading the description of the initial status
22 report and it's saying that it provides the first month's
23 update regarding the status of the key milestones. I'm
24 wondering if it would be possible to perhaps rephrase that
25 a bit, have something called a baseline report and have the

1 baseline report be a deliverable that could be paid
2 against. And that baseline report could be submitted, you
3 know, much closer to the start of the contracts. You know,
4 one week after the start of the contract there's a baseline
5 report. The baseline report gets reviewed and a payment is
6 made against that baseline report, rather than waiting for
7 a full month. Thank you.

8 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I guess that's something
9 that we would have to -- go ahead, Director Kaplan.

10 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: So, this is --

11 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Fernandez --
12 I'm sorry, Director Kaplan, I just wanted to check in with
13 Commissioner Fernandez. Is it okay if Director Kaplan
14 answers? Okay, thank you.

15 Director Kaplan.

16 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: This was in some of
17 the feedback from OLS that it has to be on work performed.
18 And so, we had originally framed it as like a finalized
19 strategic plan, but it really has to be the work
20 implemented and so that's why it's going to the monthly.
21 Not just the proposed of how the work would be implemented,
22 even though that is work to create the strategy of the
23 implementation of it.

24 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: And you seem -- you don't
25 -- you seem perplexed on that, Commissioner Kennedy.

1 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah, I mean a baseline
2 report involves work that is done. That's why I'm saying
3 it's not going to be something that's submitted, you know,
4 the day that the contract is signed. It's going to take,
5 you know, a week or so. But, you know, it is work and it
6 is something that could be paid against.

7 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay. Commissioner
8 Fernandez, then Commissioner Akutagawa.

9 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I just wanted to
10 caution a little bit -- caution the Commission about trying
11 to transfer any of these responsibilities to our staff. I
12 mean, one, our staff's going to be busy. They're already
13 behind. I mean right? I'm sure if I ask Director Kaplan
14 she would be like so overwhelmed, so glad that she has
15 staff.

16 But at the end of the day for any sort of RFP or
17 any type of invoicing, it needs to be the contractor that's
18 providing their information. I can't be -- it should not
19 be the Commission providing numbers, and anything else to
20 support why they should get paid. Because at the end of
21 the day all of this information, you know, is discoverable.
22 If somebody wants to audit it or review it after the fact,
23 we need to make sure that it's the contractor that is
24 submitting this information and it's their data.

25 And it is -- you've done a wonderful job of

1 outlining all of the responsibilities. So, it's not like
2 if somebody submits a bid they're not unaware of what their
3 responsibilities are. So, I appreciate you lining that
4 out. And that is how state contracting is, it's paid after
5 the fact and that's, unfortunately, how it is. We don't do
6 the ten percent, give you a ten percent up front so you can
7 get started. Unfortunately, that's how it works. And I
8 know that Commissioners Le Mons and Akutagawa have probably
9 been researching this more than we will ever know. But
10 those that are familiar or have contracted with the state
11 are familiar with this requirement. And again, it is
12 detailed out in the document so that prospective bidders
13 can decide whether or not they want to do it.

14 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa.

15 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I just wanted to
16 just reiterate what Director Kaplan said. This part about
17 the baseline report, I understand what, you know, your
18 intent is Commissioner Kennedy, and I know what you say
19 about, you know, work is being done. Yes, there is a
20 degree of work that is being done. However, as
21 Commissioner Fernandez just also said, too, there is very,
22 very specific rules and regulations that we do have to
23 follow that we've learned in this process. And the intent
24 of what is going to be done is not considered a work
25 product.

1 And so, therefore, even just to say a baseline
2 report, you know, we did this work because we're going to
3 tell you how we're going to do our work is essentially not
4 going to be an acceptable kind of actionable work product.
5 And so, that was made very clear to us at the very, very
6 beginning, when we started asking all these questions.

7 We had hoped that we would be able to disburse
8 some funds, even just on the basis of the plan, but we were
9 told very clearly that that's not going to be something
10 that is going to be allowable within the state contracting
11 rules. So, we just want to just say that, you know, that
12 is something that was considered.

13 And as Commissioner Fernandez also just said, I
14 think we also realized that this does make things -- it
15 changes who will probably be able to apply. Commissioner
16 Yee, you know, any smaller organization can, but they
17 really have to have the capabilities of doing it.
18 Subcontracting is an option and so this is going to be up
19 to, you know, entities to perhaps partner with others.

20 And again, as Commissioner Fernandez says, people
21 will know what they're getting into because the
22 requirements are very clearly laid out in terms of what
23 they are going to be asking to be done, and what they are
24 going to be applying to do.

25 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner

1 Akutagawa. And I'll just echo that. And having been a
2 recipient of state contracts, to Commissioner Fernandez's
3 point when you contract with the state, if you have
4 experienced contracting with the state you absolutely
5 understand what you have to do and what's required of you.

6 Hopefully, those organizations who apply are
7 committed to our objectives in the broadest of sense, and
8 will be creative at their level in being able to partner
9 with and ensure that certain things happen. And we didn't
10 go so far as to make partnership requirements, like some
11 contracts do. Some RFPs do, they force you to contract in
12 certain ways. But I think what we -- we're going to
13 probably have very passionate people who want to get this
14 job done and, hopefully, they'll work within the confines
15 of the contract to reach the objective.

16 Are there any more -- I think I got everyone who
17 had their hand up. Is there any more comments on this
18 particular section, the reporting? Okay, thank you.

19 So, jumping down to the -- let's see here,
20 minimum requirements -- it should be minimum qualifications
21 for proposers. Any feedback on that area?

22 Commissioner Vazquez, then Commissioner Sinay,
23 then Andersen.

24 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I think actually
25 this is helpful to know, to understand that the vision for

1 this work is one where subcontracting takes place. Because
2 in just overall looking at the qualifications and then the
3 requirements in the later section seems -- it seems pretty
4 challenging for most grassroots organizations to be able to
5 meet. So, I guess that was my overall feedback. But being
6 educated on sort of the framing for this contract, I think
7 that is helpful.

8 I would say maybe then my overall feedback, if
9 there is some -- I'm not sure how much more this ties our
10 hands, so maybe it's just us communicating sort of through
11 our meetings like this that the vision is that there will
12 be subcontracting, without requiring subcontracting,
13 necessarily, I think would -- would be helpful for folks
14 who maybe aren't watching these meetings, but get this in
15 their inbox. Someone says, hey, you guys could absolutely
16 do this, apply for it. So, we have to also be able to feel
17 like this whole document could go to a grassroots
18 organization and have it be clear that they could -- that
19 they could enhance their application through partnerships.

20 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Very good point.

21 Commissioner Sinay.

22 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So, the one question I have,
23 since we've done a lot of statewide outreach, I know that
24 some statewide organizations were waiting for our RFP to
25 come out. The Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, or the United

1 Ways and, you know, United Way of California, Boys and
2 Girls Club. And so, how would they -- is this open for a
3 statewide group to submit a proposal to be very -- you
4 know, be very specific they're going to be working across
5 the whole state with their members, because I think that
6 will come up as one of the questions.

7 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Sure. Also, that I think
8 we can apply, and I think you can apply for a maximum of
9 three regions. So, there's an opportunity to -- you do
10 have to put forward, though, three separate applications.
11 So, it isn't you put forward one application to cover three
12 regions. For each of the six that are identified you can
13 submit, but the maximum is three. That would be an
14 opportunity to have a broader swath of the state, if you
15 will.

16 Commissioner Sinay, did you want to have a follow
17 up?

18 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I know you said this and it
19 came in and it came out of my head, so I apologize. Are we
20 planning to do just one grant per region, or it may be
21 multiple grants up to the amount that we put in the box?

22 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: The six that have been
23 identified, they're one per plan.

24 Director Kaplan, then Commissioner Andersen and
25 Commissioner Kennedy.

1 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Just one note to just
2 reframe, make sure that we're reframing to contracts.

3 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Oh, right. Yeah, these
4 aren't plans, that's right. Contracts, yes. I was coached
5 on that prior to this. Thank you, Director Kaplan.

6 Commissioner Andersen, then Commissioner Kennedy.

7 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. This is very
8 interesting, there's a lot of -- I have a few, a couple --
9 an answer to a question, and then a couple of redlines, and
10 then another request.

11 So, the first, it's very obvious in the
12 qualifications and experience that these are --
13 subcontractors are essentially required because it says you
14 have to have five years or more experience in managing and
15 tracking budgets for three or more subcontractors. So,
16 that's very explicit. Once they start looking at, you
17 know, what are the minimum requirements.

18 That does mean this is for bigger groups to
19 subcontract to those grassroots, is the way I'm
20 interpreting this.

21 This is a couple of redlines. In Table 3, the
22 strategic outreach plan, the narrative response should be
23 -- it's including sub-requirements. It should just be 1
24 through 12. There are no section 1.1. It's just section 1
25 through 12, not 1.1 through 1.2.

1 And then a similar redline comment is on page 16.
2 That is still under Item 4, actually D, strategic partners.
3 That's also one of the subcategories, the strategic
4 partners should be underlined. I would make two different
5 changes to make it a little bit more clear, the difference
6 between 4 and 5, but that's a personal preference.

7 Then, going back to the subcontracting, I would
8 like to put a line in specifically on Northern California 2
9 and then Central California 2 areas to distinguish.
10 Northern California 2 is basically our Zone A, B and D.
11 And I would like to make sure that A, B has consideration,
12 as well as D, because that's all too easy to put the
13 Sacramento area in and skip over A and B.

14 And similar, I would like on Central California
15 2, a distinction between F and G, with making sure that --
16 and in terms of the amount of budget that would obviously
17 -- you know, very easy to distinguish based on population,
18 but I don't want A, and B, and G to get missed just because
19 of the amount of contracting. So, I'd like to put that in,
20 in terms of our -- because I was looking for a place to put
21 that in, which I haven't found that exactly yet. So, I
22 will come up and propose that as soon as do find a good,
23 nice easy spot to put that in. thank you.

24 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay, thank you.

25 Director Kaplan?

1 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: With the comment on
2 the table, can you just tell me the page? I have a
3 printout and my stapler is broken, so my papers are very --
4 the page with the Table 1, the 12.1, just where that was?

5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, it's Table 3 and that
6 is on page 11. It's under -- it's the Section 3.A.2, Table
7 3.

8 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Oh, okay.

9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It should be numbered 1,
10 2, 3, it's just they go through the whole document.

11 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Okay.

12 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: On page 11.

13 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you Commissioner
14 Andersen.

15 Commissioner Kennedy?

16 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I just wanted to point out
17 under the six regions, we are missing four counties. So,
18 we're missing Lassen, San Benito, San Luis Obispo, and
19 Santa Cruz.

20 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you for that.
21 Director Kaplan?

22 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Commissioner
23 Fornaciari had emailed me, also. So, thank you, I'm
24 flagging that. Thank you.

25 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay. Did I miss any

1 Commissioners who had -- oh, Commissioner Fornaciari.

2 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I want to start
3 by thanking the subcommittee and the staff for all your
4 hard work on this. This has been a real, real, big, big
5 amount of work and thank you so much.

6 I just had a question about the Table 1, about
7 the distribution of funding. Is that proportionate to the
8 population? Is that how you came to those numbers? Or
9 proportional.

10 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

11 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, okay. Thank you.

12 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: And I could add, and then
13 Commissioner Ahmad, Chair Ahmad, and then Commissioner
14 Toledo.

15 When the proposal -- I mean I think that part of
16 how a proposal gets evaluated is going to be some of those
17 points that you raised, Commissioner Andersen as well, is
18 that that organization really having an understanding of
19 how to reach the counties that are within that particular
20 region. Meaning these, not the A, the lettering formation,
21 but how it's outlined here. And for the reviewers to
22 really be looking to make sure that that kind of coverage
23 is being identified in the activities and plans.

24 So, you know, we would caution submitters that,
25 you know, don't submit for a region and only focus on

1 Sacramento. It's not going to get very far in terms of
2 getting approved. So, I just wanted to make that comment.

3 Chair Ahmad?

4 CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons.
5 And we are at break. So, we will come back at 11:15 and
6 continue this conversation, thank you.

7 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: We'll pick up with
8 Commissioner Toledo.

9 (Off the record at 11:00 a.m.)

10 (On the record at 11:14 a.m.)

11 CHAIR AHMAD: Welcome back from break. Let's
12 continue the conversation where we left off and I will hand
13 it back to Commissioner Akutagawa and Le Mons.

14 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you, Chair. I
15 believe we left off with Commissioner Toledo wanting to
16 give comment.

17 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Well, thank you. Thank you
18 Commissioner Le Mons and Akutagawa.

19 I'm curious if the outreach and education
20 contracts would be similar to the legal affairs contract,
21 where the individuals working under the contract would each
22 need to be approved by the Commission or if these contracts
23 are different? I'm just curious in terms of process, and
24 just vetting. And so, I'm not sure if that question is for
25 the committee or for our legal team, but I'm just curious

1 to see if we have any requirements that we would have to
2 meet in terms of just vetting and approving the staff
3 working under these contracts. Thank you.

4 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Does staff have a response
5 to that question? Director Hernandez?

6 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: We're going to
7 have to look into that. I don't know at this point. Good
8 question though, thank you.

9 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: And Commissioner Andersen?

10 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It is in the page 16 it
11 actually says: The top bidders are required to identify all
12 subcontractors utilized in the contract. And then under
13 independents conflict of interest, which is on page 17, it
14 does say, 7-B: Bidders must disclose -- a continuous duty
15 to disclose any financial business or other relationship
16 with the contractor/subcontractor, or individual employee.
17 So, that is intended to cover these issues.

18 And then C says: The Commission shall have the
19 right to disqualify or terminate if they believe the
20 interests are disqualified. So, I think it does indeed
21 cover it.

22 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Do you feel like that gets
23 to your question, Commissioner Toledo?

24 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No, I understand about the
25 subcontractor versus contractor. I think it's the

1 individual people doing work under these contracts whether
2 they have to be approved, which is a slightly different
3 question. Although, related because if we are having to
4 approve each person under this contract then, of course,
5 there's conflict of interest disclosure requirements for
6 each person under each contract and potentially other --

7 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right, individuals.

8 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- requirements as stated
9 by Commissioner Andersen.

10 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sorry, it does also say,
11 I would continue, under 7-B, on page 17 it also says:
12 Other relation to the contractor, subcontractor, or
13 individual employee. So, they have to require -- they do
14 have to disclose that.

15 And then, under C: The Commission has the right
16 to terminate them.

17 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy?

18 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah, thanks. I would
19 also point out that on page 9, under minimum
20 qualifications, it talks about bidder and the personnel
21 proposed to perform professional services must have
22 qualifications and experience identified below.

23 So, there is a requirement and this is going to
24 -- I mean if they're required to have this, then somebody
25 obviously has to review the proposal to make sure that they

1 have it.

2 The one thing that I would suggest is that there
3 may be a possibility of breaking out the qualifications and
4 experience required from the bidding firm or organization
5 versus qualifications and experience for the personnel
6 proposed. It might be useful to split be useful to split
7 those two out. Thank you.

8 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?

9 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Do you want to stick to this
10 section or -- no, because I have a question -- I've found
11 that I missed one question earlier, but I can send that
12 later, so I'm just --

13 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: No. No, go ahead. What's
14 your question?

15 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. So, on this question,
16 since we're in this section and I don't want to confuse --
17 for Marcy having to go back and forth. So, I have found
18 that it's really important when creating these large
19 contracts and you have subcontractors to actually ask for
20 the contact information of the subcontractors. Because
21 I'll be honest, a lot of times big groups will put in names
22 of smaller groups without asking them or them knowing. And
23 I have also been known, when I was creating contracts, to
24 send the contracts to the subcontractor so they could see
25 it as well, and they would call me and say, oh, I didn't

1 even know we were in that proposal.

2 And so, whatever we can do to make sure that the
3 subcontractors are an authentic partner and will be getting
4 some funding for the work they're doing, you know, and some
5 recognition. Not just that they give -- you know, it gives
6 the contractor points. If that makes any sense? So, that
7 was the one piece on this one I just wanted to make sure.

8 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you for that,
9 Commissioner Sinay.

10 Any other comments on this section? Commissioner
11 Sinay?

12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Not on this section. I'm
13 being --

14 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: On the previous section.
15 What was your comment on the previous section, seriously?

16 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, we kind of jumped the
17 whole budget and went straight over to kind of the
18 subcontractors and that, unless it's in more than one
19 place. So, can I just clarify where we are?

20 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Sure. Well, we did
21 because one of our Commissioners asked the question about
22 an area that we hadn't gotten to. So, you know, we just
23 jumped around. But it's okay, go ahead and ask your
24 question.

25 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. So, a couple things.

1 And please tell me which of these comments I can just email
2 to Director Kaplan because they're minutiae and they just
3 need to be --

4 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Use your discretion.

5 COMMISSIONER SINAY: We say COI Tool, training on
6 the COI Tool, and what we talked about in the Public Input
7 Design Subcommittee was that it's really community mapping.
8 So, the bigger picture, understanding how to talk about
9 communities and stuff, and not just use the tool.

10 And so, in one of the activities we kind of talk
11 about just the tool. So, if we can just pull back a little
12 and say either communities of interest -- I always say
13 communities of interest/community mapping so people
14 understand the bigger picture and not just the tool.

15 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Could you point us to
16 where you're referring?

17 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, I'll find that exactly
18 where I found it.

19 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay.

20 COMMISSIONER SINAY: And get it to Director
21 Kaplan.

22 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: All right.

23 COMMISSIONER SINAY: The other one, on the
24 contract I like that we looked at this as, you know, a way
25 to look at it is equal, but not equitable was to look at

1 the population. But the one piece that's in -- that
2 wasn't, I think, taken into account is that there has been
3 \$3 million that has been awarded to certain areas already,
4 very specific areas. And so, and those tend to be the
5 areas that we are also giving a lot of larger grants to.
6 And there are some areas that have been completely not
7 received any funding yet for redistricting. And I just
8 wanted to lift that up because I think it's important for
9 us not to say that this was the most equitable way to do
10 it, it was a more equal way of doing. And if anybody had
11 thoughts on that equity question.

12 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Fernandez?

13 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, since Commissioner
14 Fornaciari and Sinay brought up the budget issue, I'll just
15 bring up the one concern that I have with Northern
16 California. It's 22 counties that are included in that
17 county and I realize -- I mean, I guess the easiest way to
18 divide the funds is by population, but also there's some
19 challenges with, you know, a third of the state, trying to
20 reach out to that area. It's more -- the people are more
21 disbursed, there's more area to cover. They may not have
22 as many community-based organizations. So, I just need to
23 continue to try to push for more resources for those areas
24 because they are remote and just as some other areas in
25 California. but disbursing funds out by population

1 sometimes may not be the best for every Californian. So, I
2 just wanted to make sure I stated that. Thank you.

3 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah, we did give a lot of
4 thought to that, by the way, and there's any number of
5 formulas that could be used. But this is a population-
6 based project. Actually, what we're doing is based on
7 population. So, we actually felt like with all of the
8 myriad of ways you could go about dividing the money, but
9 then also being able to legitimately substantiate these
10 issues requires a lot of research, a lot of support
11 documentation so it couldn't just be theoretical that this
12 particular area doesn't have, or this. You really get into
13 a much more intricate process to support that kind of
14 thinking. So, the subcommittee landed on the population-
15 based, not just out of ease, but also I think primarily
16 because that is what this whole -- what we're doing is
17 about population. So, if we made sure that the resources
18 were put into -- throughout California based on population,
19 then the onus are really going to be on our -- those that
20 submit to really be aware of the zones that they are
21 focusing on and how to maximize those resources that are
22 available to get the best outcome for that zone, or for
23 that region. So, that was the thinking, just to go on
24 record as to what the thinking was.

25 Other Commissioners? Okay, if there's no --

1 well, are there other comments on the section that we were
2 on, which was the contractor responsibilities?

3 So, now we're going to move to Commissioner
4 responses. I'm sorry, we had done Commissioner responses,
5 and we did talk about the reporting. And then, the minimum
6 qualification per proposal is where we are, I apologize.

7 And so, now we're down at the proposal
8 requirement and information. Does anyone have any specific
9 feedback on this particular section? That's Item 3,
10 proposal requirement and information?

11 Commissioner Sinay?

12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm just saying to create an
13 authentic collaborative it takes -- some of them already
14 exist and they've been working on redistricting, and
15 talking about it, and this will help them gel which is
16 really exciting.

17 But for others it's going to be tough to do it in
18 two weeks. And I understand. So, I just wanted to allow
19 you all the space to explain to the public why we're doing
20 it so quickly.

21 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Director Kaplan?

22 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: We did do three weeks
23 for the proposal, not two weeks.

24 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?

25 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Commissioner

1 Sinay, I just want to acknowledge what you're saying and we
2 are very conscious of it. But we're also as much trying to
3 balance that with the urgency of where we are right now.
4 And I am just happy that we do not have to go to a plan B,
5 to be honest, that it is still within the time frame that
6 we could still get these funds out via contract to do some
7 of this work. And we do realize -- I mean, there's a lot
8 of things that, you know, we would have wanted differently
9 and when we first started out on this process we had
10 different kinds of hopes. We had hopes that this would be
11 able to go to much, much smaller organizations. That we
12 would be able to grant for, at the time, I'm using the word
13 intentionally, grant funds to, you know, many different
14 organizations so that we can get deeper into some of the
15 areas that -- you know, I want to acknowledge what
16 Commissioner Fernandez also said, too. We were very, very
17 conscious of that and we were aware of that.

18 But having to move to this more of a contracting
19 process, you know, it's not the perfect way in which we
20 would have wanted it to have been, but it is the way in
21 which given the speed by which we do want to get funds out
22 there this is what we've had to weight. And that any
23 further delay would, I think, create more challenges than
24 create. And so, I just wanted to say that, that these are
25 the considerations that we took part in.

1 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?

2 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you for that. And
3 now, I want to look at the back side of this, on the back
4 end part. We don't know how many RFPs -- I mean, how many
5 proposals, or whatever the right, contract, request,
6 whatever the right word is we'll be receiving. Three days
7 to review all of it and check references, and budgets, and
8 all that really seems tight. And, unfortunately, that
9 could give us space to make mistakes.

10 So, I just wanted to check if we really thought
11 that was realistic?

12 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy, you
13 have a separate point? Okay. Do you might if we get a
14 response to Commissioner Sinay's question?

15 Commissioner Akutagawa?

16 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I do want to note
17 that the timeline was one that was provided to us by the
18 staff. And I trust that this is something that they took
19 into account. And I want to, you know, give them the
20 benefit that this is something that they feel is doable.
21 We do, I think, understand and they're also very conscious
22 of the timeline that we're under. But I would invite, you
23 know, either Director Kaplan or Director Hernandez to speak
24 otherwise. But I do want to just say that this is part of
25 what I appreciate what the staff is doing, too.

1 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Director Hernandez?

2 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yeah, I believe we
3 should be able to meet that time frame. I don't anticipate
4 all of the proposals coming in at the end, so they'll be
5 staggered. So, we'll be, you know, kind of looking at them
6 as they come in and taking them into account.

7 Now, you know, if there's over a hundred that we
8 don't anticipate, then that will be a challenge. But both
9 Marcy and I have been working long hours, so this is par
10 for the course.

11 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy and
12 then Commissioner Toledo.

13 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. Thank you, I'm
14 just wondering if there's something about conflict between
15 the language on page 1, saying that the term of the
16 contracts will be one year, with an estimated start date of
17 July 18th, and the language I think on page 11, in the
18 calendar that says contracts will run until 30 days after
19 the submission of the final maps. Might it make sense to
20 have the language on page 1 say six months given that we
21 reserve the option to extend the term of the contract under
22 the same terms and conditions.

23 So if there were a need to extend it beyond six
24 months, we have that ability. But that would put it more
25 in line with the timing that's set out in the table.

1 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thanks for that,
2 Commissioner Kennedy.

3 Commissioner Taylor, then Sinay.

4 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes, thank you.
5 Commissioner Kennedy just caught the same thing that I was
6 concerned about. And then, secondly, do we have, even
7 though it can't be placed, do we have a rough idea of how
8 long it would take the Department of Legal Services to
9 approve this for the implementation, or is that another 30
10 days before they would actually be able to get to work? Do
11 we have an idea, a guesstimate?

12 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Director Hernandez?

13 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Given that they've
14 already seen this iteration, with the minor edits that
15 we're going to make to it, it should flow rather quickly.
16 I'd say two weeks, not 30 days.

17 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?

18 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to go back to
19 the evaluation period and ask staff to consider making the
20 evaluation period June 29th through July 2nd, with a
21 posting on July 5th just in case you need extra time, and
22 that three-day weekend that you have. Because I'd rather
23 you all not need it and get to celebrate Fourth of July and
24 be excited, than do a quick run.

25 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you.

1 Commissioner Andersen? Excuse me, before you go
2 Commissioner Andersen, Commissioner Turner did you have
3 your hand up? Okay, Commissioner Andersen.

4 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Actually, the
5 opening proposal is set at a particular time, so it really
6 is you can't open them as they come in. You must wait and
7 open them all at the same time.

8 So, the only issue with the changing of the
9 notice of intent to award, you need to have that full
10 period in case someone protests the bid, which they can do.
11 And that's -- so, those are -- basically, that's a week,
12 five days -- and it's actually five calendar days. Those
13 are -- not just calendar days, those are business days.
14 So, that's going to affect if you change that date in
15 there.

16 But then, also, in terms of the staff evaluating,
17 in previous RFPs some Commissioners have also been
18 involved, who are on the appropriate subcommittee. So, I
19 would recommend that we also add some Commissioners in
20 there, understanding that this is for conflict of interest
21 information. So, it's not -- it doesn't have to do with
22 impartiality. It isn't like another issue of impartiality.
23 It's looking at helping to look particularly through the
24 conflicts of interest. I would make that recommendation.

25 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy?

1 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. If the
2 proposals are due at 9:00 a.m. on the 25th, could they be
3 opened at 10:00 a.m. on the 25th?

4 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: That's a good question.
5 Director Kaplan, is there a specific reason why there's a
6 three-day gap there?

7 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: No, I can note that to
8 follow up with.

9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, it's the weekend.
10 Oh, I just jumped in. Yeah, it's the weekend. And usually
11 these --

12 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: They can't be opened on
13 the weekend?

14 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No, you have to do that
15 in public.

16 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Ah.

17 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It has to be done in
18 public.

19 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: At 10:00 a.m. on Friday,
20 an hour after they're due. I mean I don't see the point in
21 sitting on them.

22 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: The reason is it's
23 usually -- you say it's due at this time, and but most
24 people consider it's the end of the day. And if you say
25 9:00 a.m., then there have been issues of it didn't arrive

1 in time, it was delayed, that sort of thing. So, there's
2 usually just a just-in-case on that. But we could, indeed,
3 do it that way. But that's why it's usually done like
4 that.

5 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I mean if you're going to
6 wait until Monday, I would make the deadline 5:00 p.m. on
7 Friday, and then open them at 10:00 on Monday.

8 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah. I don't know about
9 that comment, Commissioner Andersen. I know any state
10 proposal that I -- if it's due at 5:00 o'clock, or 10:00
11 o'clock, at 10:01 you're late, period. And there's no --
12 you know how many people who have sweated months putting
13 together proposals and had that dreaded moment. I have
14 never heard of that leniency, but I could be wrong.

15 Commissioner Fernandez?

16 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I concur with your
17 comment, Commissioner Le Mons. Also with the -- when we
18 went through the videographer, we actually did it that way
19 where it was due like at 5:00 o'clock that Friday and we
20 moved it to like noon so that we could open it up that
21 afternoon. For that specific reason of gaining -- granted
22 it's Friday and you've got the weekend, but that's still
23 two extra days that you can potentially be doing your
24 reference checks and evaluations.

25 So, if it's due at noon, it has to be in the

1 office by noon. It doesn't matter what was postmarked, it
2 needs to be in the office, or e-mail, or however it's going
3 to be accepted.

4 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you. Other comments
5 on this?

6 Okay, I think that, Director Kaplan you got all
7 of the -- oh, excuse me, Director Hernandez?

8 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: I just want to
9 circle back. I just checked with Raul, just to make sure
10 that we can adjust those time frames that we have listed
11 there. And you are correct that we have to open all the
12 proposals at the same time, so we can't stagger them as
13 they come in. Just wanted to clarify that, thank you.

14 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you. So, it sounds
15 like -- I'll let the Chair address whether we move today,
16 or however we go about making that decision. That sounds
17 like a decision that needs to be made that's a little bit
18 different than some of the minor edits to language, et
19 cetera. So, Chair, I'll just put that on your radar.

20 So, moving to the -- any other questions on the
21 proposal requirements, and information, and the key dates?

22 Okay, required proposal forms and exhibits.
23 Commissioner Andersen?

24 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sorry, before we jump --
25 leave that section, I did want to put in regarding the --

1 making sure Zone A, B and G get notified under -- on page
2 12, under our outreach approach, I thought we could add in,
3 just under the third bulletin, where it says: Targeted
4 population identified within the region. And you do
5 examples. But we should also add in as an example
6 geographic diversity, which is one of our criteria
7 previously, but just to emphasize it in that location.

8 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay.

9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So, sorry, and then
10 continue to the next section. Thank you.

11 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: You're welcome.

12 So, questions on the next section? Comments?

13 Okay, so moving to strategic outreach plan
14 requirements section, are there questions or comments on
15 this section? We're on page 11, by the way, Item 4.

16 Commissioner Vazquez?

17 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes, this actually extends
18 into the components, if you're ready for feedback for the
19 components.

20 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

21 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I'm again still getting my
22 brain to understand that this is sort of one contract per
23 region and the idea is that theoretically partners will be
24 brought in under subcontracts. I still feel like many of
25 the pieces, particularly around language and communication

1 access plan, and social media plan feel still somewhat
2 onerous to me for a community organization, even
3 theoretically large, regionally-based community
4 organizations who will then subcontract with partners to
5 achieve some of these goals.

6 So, I'm wondering particularly like there's a
7 component in the communications access plan, identification
8 of the top six non-English languages spoken. Could it be
9 something like up to the top six? Again, I'm not sure how
10 much capacity even large organizations have to be able to
11 do that kind of landscape analysis in three weeks. If it's
12 not already -- I feel like there are two sort of sets of
13 groups, either they already have a finger on the pulse of
14 all of the language in that region or they work with a very
15 specific subpopulation in that community and may -- again,
16 within three weeks may not have the resources to do that
17 kind of landscape analysis.

18 And then, again some of these feel like things
19 that I think the Commission should have more of a hand in.
20 So, things like could the social media and non traditional
21 communications methods portion be optional? I'm guessing
22 how much of this can be optional and how much of this needs
23 to be a requirement. And sort of if you put pieces in that
24 are optional, obviously that like elevates your application
25 to the top of the pile. But I'm concerned by requiring all

1 of these, and detail within all of these we are -- we're
2 going to get a smaller pool of potential applicants who may
3 not be overall the best fit to lead outreach in that
4 region. I mean, we're basically identifying organizations
5 who are going to be leading the outreach in these regions
6 and like do they need to be leading social media outreach
7 in that region? Maybe that region is not -- again,
8 thinking in Northern California, is that going to be the
9 best use of our contractor's time to be developing a social
10 media campaign? I don't know.

11 So, that's my overall feedback. To the extent
12 that -- again, I don't know what's allowed and what's not,
13 but to the extent the plan may include -- may include as
14 opposed to shall include for me makes more sense for some
15 of these components.

16 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?

17 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I think -- thank
18 you, Commissioner Vazquez for that. I think on some of
19 these points, particularly like I guess the language
20 access, and even the social media part I don't think we're
21 looking necessarily -- I think this is when it comes to
22 evaluating. I think, you know, we want to know that
23 whoever is going to be bidding on this is going to have
24 some understanding of all of this. We may -- you know, I
25 think what's being worked out is like how much are we going

1 to weigh, you know, social media, some kind social media,
2 like ability or communication use, but we want to know are
3 they even thinking about that, too.

4 I think on the language part, I guess I -- this
5 is for me personally, so I just want to make that clear
6 this is just my thoughts. My thought is that since whoever
7 is going to successfully win this bid is going to have to
8 be able to cover a broad swath of a region. It's got to be
9 someone who's going to at least have a broad general pulse
10 of some of the languages in that region. So, therefore, if
11 someone is very specifically working with just one
12 community, you know they may be great if they also have
13 very, you know, existing relationships with potential
14 subcontractors who can cover the other languages. And they
15 should already know that, I think, if they're already
16 working with other partners.

17 If there are ones that are broad and they're
18 going to bring in other partners, I expect that they'll
19 probably have a broad general sense of, you know, some of
20 the top languages in their areas.

21 I do agree that it could be up to because there
22 may be just some very, you know, particularly dominant
23 languages in certain areas and it may not be six. But I do
24 expect that they're going to have a real good pulse of the
25 non-English languages and the needs in the areas. And I

1 think that's what's reflected in the RFP here.

2 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: And I would just add that
3 they can explain why they're not addressing a particular
4 thing. And so, for example on the up to six, if that's not
5 pertinent for that area that also will give you some
6 insight into their knowledge of the area, or any of the
7 other categories. If this is a non-tech-wire environment
8 you would say, you know, social media doesn't make sense in
9 this environment because the infrastructure isn't there, et
10 cetera, but this is how we approach whatever the case may
11 be.

12 Commissioner Kennedy and I'll come back to you,
13 Commissioner Vazquez.

14 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. I just wanted
15 to share that I did attend the Statewide VAC, Voting
16 Accessibility Advisory Committee meeting last week. And
17 one of the takeaways from that meeting was that we need to
18 be putting more emphasis on producing plain language
19 material.

20 And I can share some examples of plain language
21 explanation of election-related issues. But I did take the
22 point and I wanted to share that. Thank you.

23 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you.

24 Commissioner Vazquez?

25 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I think it could be

1 made much more clear in, then, these qualifications that
2 there is an opportunity to explain why you're not
3 addressing certain portions of the plan components.
4 Because definitely, in every single component bidder shall
5 describe, bidder shall describe, and then it lays into
6 detail what they shall describe. And if you don't -- if
7 you're not going to do said thing, it's not clear that that
8 is also an acceptable response to your outreach plan
9 component. So, I think that needs to be made more clear.
10 Thank you.

11 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner
12 Vazquez.

13 Any other comments on this section?

14 Okay, moving along to -- I think background is
15 pretty straight forward. Are there any comments on that
16 section?

17 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Background was on
18 language access and I think the next section is on the
19 project budget.

20 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you. Did we fix
21 that? Let's see here. So, we have language access and
22 communications, and then we have the project budget. I
23 mean I'm not quite sure why that part's bold, but I won't
24 worry about it.

25 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think the bold kind of

1 throws it off, yes.

2 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah.

3 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I took a moment to look
4 at that too, yes.

5 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay. Project budget.
6 Commissioner Sinay?

7 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I saw Director Kaplan raise
8 her hand and I don't know if she wanted to address
9 something first.

10 I'm sorry, can you just flag the bolding, the
11 question about the bolding so I can circle --

12 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: The word "background".
13 It's under A.

14 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Oh, okay.

15 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah.

16 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Thank you.

17 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?

18 COMMISSIONER SINAY: On the project budget it
19 says, the fourth bullet down says: At least 10 percent of
20 the funds should be specified for local community-based
21 organizations and small businesses to provide accessibility
22 tools. And then, below are examples of unallowable costs
23 and it says: Equipment, including computers. And that
24 seems to contradict each other.

25 And I would also -- so that seems to contradict

1 each other. And then, my second question would be why
2 would we say no equipment, since technology and equipment
3 are so critical in this whole process? And, you know, it
4 seems not to make sense. It doesn't make sense to me that
5 we would say no equipment.

6 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: So, the distinction
7 between those two one said access to, which is not the same
8 thing as computers. So, the 10 percent that you're
9 referring to is not saying you can purchase computers, it's
10 to facilitate access.

11 And the other is not capital purchases,
12 basically, is really what no computers are. So, do we --
13 is that what we really want is for these resources to be
14 spent to purchase equipment? No. Especially not a short-
15 term project like this. Because the computers would belong
16 to the state. So, I mean that's a whole 'nother -- that's
17 just sort of my reaction to that but -- Commissioner Sinay?

18 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So, I guess I need clarity
19 on would they belong to the state. And second I know --

20 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Uh-hum.

21 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay, so they would belong
22 to the state. So, they could go that they're donated to
23 libraries and such that are state libraries.

24 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Is that what we want to do
25 with the resources is facilitate libraries getting

1 computers?

2 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, what I wanted to just
3 bring up is that in my conversations that there are certain
4 technology pieces like, you know, in talking to libraries
5 some of them have projectors and are able to show the
6 communities -- you know, our meetings, and others wouldn't,
7 and that would be one expense that they would have.

8 Others, you know, we heard from Statewide
9 Database that if someone were going to be at a spot, you
10 know, that some places do need a special computer for the
11 COI.

12 So, I just, I guess I would feel better, and this
13 is just me, if we said no more than X could be spent on
14 equipment. Because it could be i-Pads are being bought to
15 be able to do the -- tablets are being bought to do stuff,
16 if they're thinking creatively.

17 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Vazquez, then
18 Andersen.

19 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I want to echo these
20 sentiments. I'm thinking if you're hiring organizers, even
21 part-time, temporary, six-month staff organizers, you know,
22 you may be needing to equip them with cell phones to do
23 phone banking. Again, if you're thinking creatively, you
24 get organizers to take an i-Pad door to door and walk
25 someone through the COI Tool, because that is the way to

1 reach them. And you help them submit a map right there on
2 the doorstep.

3 Like I think there's -- I think technology, we
4 have seen in this pandemic that access to technology is a
5 huge, huge gap for underserved communities. And we don't -
6 for us to not empower our subcontractors to meet this need,
7 which is a technology need clearly across the state, I
8 think -- I think we haven't thought about how technology
9 access gaps are going to limit participation in our
10 process. So, I feel the same as Commissioner Sinay that I
11 think we need to think critically about how to achieve
12 this, given the constraints of the state.

13 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen?

14 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. This is an
15 issue, absolutely. But I think there are other
16 requirements. Remember, the Legislature is actually tasked
17 with providing access for the public to the Commission, to
18 provide input in mapping. And that's part of what the
19 Statewide Database was, I believe, getting -- being asked
20 to provide public access areas and centers, which could
21 indeed house a lot of this information.

22 I understand there is the issue of, you know,
23 that quick, like Commissioner Vazquez was just mentioned,
24 you know, the -- which was used in the Census, was the i-
25 Pad getting access. That was very successful with the

1 Census.

2 I'm just wondering if there are rules about
3 equipment in the money that was actually targeted for these
4 granting purposes that may allow for a portion of that or
5 may actually restrict it, which I think we need to look
6 into that before we can actually -- although, we understand
7 there's a need for it, we may be restricted about that.

8 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah, I'd like to offer a
9 comment there, too. I don't disagree with Commissioner
10 Sinay or Vazquez. However, I feel like these resources
11 should not be utilized for equipment. I think what we've
12 talked about a lot, month over month, has been technology
13 analog really being one of the biggest differentiators.
14 That technology -- we've moved to a technology-based
15 communication in the last year. And lots of resources have
16 been deployed throughout the state to address this by
17 school districts, and others, to make sure that communities
18 who have suffered in the technology gap -- I'm not saying
19 they've reached a hundred percent saturation. They have
20 not. But there has been resources deployed because we
21 moved to having to do school online, and all kinds of
22 things online that communities have not been able to do
23 prior to 2020.

24 And at the same time, what we've argued here
25 repeatedly is everyone's focused on technology and the

1 areas that we really want to reach are areas oftentimes who
2 have no access to technology at all. And so, investing in
3 technology from a capital stand point seems contrary to
4 that.

5 And then, finally, I think the reality is that
6 where we are in this process and the timing, this is going
7 to -- these are not going to be people who apply for this
8 project who aren't ready. This is just the topic and the
9 subject matter alone, the ones who are going to have to
10 lead this are going to have to have a certain degree of
11 readiness. And I think even in their partnerships they're
12 going to choose organizations that they've been working
13 with, that they know are ready to deploy. There's not a
14 huge learning curve or long runway for these resources.
15 That's just the reality.

16 So, I think if we're looking at this through the
17 lens of organizations that are ready, if you have to build
18 infrastructure, if you're -- that's just, to me, not ready.
19 And every opportunity everyone's not ready for, and that's
20 okay, too. But we'll move another group closer to
21 readiness the next time.

22 So, we're not going to solve every problem with
23 this small amount of money when we need to get the word
24 out. So, that's just what I wanted to add to that
25 conversation, as well.

1 Commissioner Kennedy and Vazquez.

2 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. Yeah, I'm
3 moved at least to some extent by Commissioner Vazquez's
4 earlier comment. I'm wondering if we could just move the
5 consideration of equipment purpose to the evaluation
6 process and look at it through a value-for-money lens. You
7 know, if we had two proposals and, you know, the main
8 different was one wanted to spend money on equipment and
9 one wanted to spend money on, you know, other ways of
10 generating outreach we could still look at, you know, which
11 one was going to give us better value for money. And make
12 that decision there, giving some more leeway to the groups,
13 rather than just from the get go saying, no, you can't buy
14 computer equipment. So, you know, I'm thinking maybe
15 there's another option here.

16 And second of all, in that line once we receive
17 these proposals are we able to negotiate, as we have with
18 some of our other contracts? Thank you.

19 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Vazquez, then
20 Turner.

21 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I just -- I don't
22 think the state has made nearly enough technology inroads
23 that one would think, or certainly hope. And again,
24 especially for we're talking about hard-to-reach
25 communities. This is where shoe leather and old-fashioned

1 organizing really, really matters. And again, that door-
2 to-door, that in-person -- that physically distanced, but
3 still in-person connection and communication that people
4 have, that organizers have with these hard-to-reach
5 communities can be, I believe -- I think a proposal could
6 absolutely be enhanced by the use of equipment.

7 They have traditionally -- the shoe leather is to
8 activate and get people to go, to leave their homes and go
9 vote, or go submit their ballot, you know, mail in their
10 ballot. And the outcome that we want to see is for people
11 to either show up at a meeting and/or submit their maps.

12 And I don't think the sort of access that is
13 currently being planned on for the community -- for the
14 mapping tool via libraries is sufficient in a country where
15 we're still emerging from a pandemic. And I think that we
16 have to acknowledge that people are going to be restricted
17 in their movements and, therefore, then this technology
18 piece has to be, I think, part of the in-person organizing
19 strategy.

20 And so, yes, agree that there's going to be a
21 certain level of readiness for some organizations and, at
22 the same time, many of these organizations have been doing
23 this sort of door knocking, physically distanced, in-person
24 engagement without -- with an ask that is not directly tied
25 to technology. And if our ask is submit a map, for me

1 hard-to-reach communities, if you have organizers, again,
2 armed with i-Pads, or what have you, to be able to walk
3 each household through a community mapping exercise in 20,
4 30 minutes for me that feels like -- I would like to hear
5 that proposal because that -- again, I could also envision
6 a proposal where they're then only realistically able to
7 like reach X number of households in this region, and that
8 might not -- like that might not work. But I want to hear
9 about those proposals where they're -- if given X amount of
10 money, and the ability to like purchase, you know, 20 i-
11 Pads for 20 organizers, we could actually move the needle
12 in this particular community, I'd like to hear that
13 proposal.

14 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Turner?

15 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I almost want to just
16 stand down and say yes to exactly what Commissioner Vazquez
17 said. I want to add, though, as -- because I think it's so
18 -- I'm wondering if there are opportunities still to lease
19 tablets and utilize them, if the purchase is what the
20 sticky point is, number one.

21 But as far as being able to lease tablets, being
22 able to purchase hot spots and things, I think it's really
23 important that there is the opportunity for people to
24 engage at that level.

25 And then, Commissioner Kennedy, when you talked

1 about being able to weigh at the end, again I would love
2 the opportunity for the proposals to be submitted so that
3 we can see if, indeed, trying to balance out language
4 access if -- into some of these areas we are able to go,
5 and utilize, spend money for tablets would allow us to
6 reach certain languages that could not be or was not
7 submitted in a different proposal might have us ultimately
8 make a different decision if it means we're going to reach
9 a particular segment of our community that we would not
10 reach without, you know, achieving their feedback as a
11 result of spending the money on tablets.

12 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah, I'd just add to that
13 that I don't disagree that tablets can facilitate a
14 particular process. I guess my lens still remains more
15 from a readiness stand point. The groups on the ground,
16 shoe leather, these people do this work, they've been doing
17 it, and they have the tools they need, usually, to do it.

18 And so, to assume that they aren't able to do
19 their work because they don't have a tablet, or they can't
20 distribute tablets to whomever it is they want to
21 distribute tablets to I think is a broad assumption in many
22 ways. Because the individuals who are ready to do this
23 work do it. Like they're doing it currently. And I don't
24 think whether it goes done or doesn't get done is whether
25 we pay for tablets and cells phones.

1 Commissioner Akutagawa and Commissioner Vazquez.

2 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Two things. One, I'd
3 like to ask, perhaps Director Hernandez, if there is -- and
4 I think this might have been asked earlier, but I don't
5 know if we need to find out if we are disallowed or not
6 allowed from including equipment purchases? I think, you
7 know, this may clarify whether or not this is a
8 conversation that we need to continue to entertain. I
9 think that's going to tell us one way or the other.

10 The other thing, too, I do want to just note,
11 Commissioner Vazquez, I'm with Commissioner Le Mons. I
12 agree with everything that you're saying in terms of
13 technology access. But I also want to note, you know,
14 having been part of the Zone G conversations with
15 Commissioner Andersen, there's some things that I think
16 technology is not going to solve. There are people in
17 certain hard-to-reach regions of California that do not
18 want to be contacted by technology, do not want somebody to
19 come knocking at their door. And in fact, you're probably
20 putting yourself in danger if you do, do that. They're out
21 in certain regions for a very distinct reason and they do
22 not want to engage.

23 However, I think those are then the kind of, you
24 know, things that we also need to understand that, yes,
25 broadband access in certain, and in a number of areas is

1 restricted, as well as access to technology is restricted.
2 But I'm a little hesitant to just say, well, you know, if
3 we just arm people with i-Pads and, you know, put them out
4 into, you know, the streets and walk between regions or
5 between, you know, homes to homes, I don't know if that's
6 going to be the sole purpose.

7 What I'm understanding, though, from what you're
8 saying is that you'd like to see at least the proposal for
9 those that may want to use technology, and I think that's
10 why I think it would just be helpful for us to know whether
11 or not that's even allowable. Because I know that there's
12 some very distinct rules, I think, around contracting and
13 use of state funds. And so that's why, you know, I would
14 just propose that perhaps we just table this part of the
15 conversation and allow the staff to find out whether or not
16 that's something that we can even do, because it could end
17 up becoming a moot point.

18 But I do also want to just remind people that in
19 certain regions, yeah, shoe leather may work, but in other
20 cases there may have to be other ways in which we want to
21 ensure that people are reached. And it may not only be
22 through technology, and again through face-to-face contact.
23 So, just want to acknowledge that, too. Thanks.

24 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen?
25 Oh, I thought I saw your hand a few moments ago. Anyone

1 else with comments on this particular aspect of the
2 conversation? Commissioner Sinay?

3 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'd just -- not on this, but
4 I mean I don't know if --

5 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay.

6 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I still feel, you know, I
7 still would like to see some money going to technology, but
8 I understand both sides. And I like that -- I appreciate
9 -- I don't like. But I appreciate that we are saying, hey,
10 we're going to fund organizations that are already ready,
11 and are larger and stuff, and that is a bias. And I think
12 it's important to acknowledge that we didn't go in with
13 that idea, but because of the urgency to get the funding
14 out that's where we are. And we all -- we'll take some
15 time, I hate to this, but to mourn kind of the project we
16 had in our mind to what the reality is now.

17 And so, Commissioner Akutagawa, and Commissioner
18 Le Mons, and staff I know you've gone through the hard
19 process of mourning -- you know, just it getting cut, and
20 cut, and cut, and you've been able to mourn it through the
21 last few months. While for a lot of us it's still fresh.
22 And so, thank you for giving us that space to be able to
23 discuss our frustrations, thank you.

24 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner
25 Sinay.

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I wanted us to stay on other
2 examples of unallowable costs, the third one where it says:
3 Expenses or staff time related to policy advocacy. I think
4 what we mean there, policy can be exactly what we're doing.
5 And so, I'm think that what was meant by policy advocates,
6 because we are asking people to advocate and advocacy is
7 okay for nonprofits. Lobbying is not.

8 I just wanted clarify if what was meant by policy
9 advocacy was things outside of redistricting, and if we
10 just wanted to be more clear in that way?

11 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Chair?

12 CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons. I
13 just wanted to circle back to see where we are with this
14 conversation and what else the subcommittee needs. Do you
15 all have intentions of bringing this back with recommended
16 edits, or would you like to have a motion on the floor to
17 make those edits and continue to move forward with the
18 contract? So, I think we just need clarity on what those
19 next steps look like for you.

20 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I think there's a couple
21 of them in my mind that do require a very specific motion.
22 That I think there was a couple germane points. And then,
23 we haven't had a chance to really talk about it,
24 Commissioner Akutagawa, to know what your thoughts are.

25 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I would say it's

1 more the latter so that we could keep this moving. Our
2 hope is that, as Commissioner Le Mons said at the very,
3 very beginning, major substantive changes is going to
4 require another review by OLS and that means that we're
5 looking at a further delay.

6 I think, you know, we definitely heard the
7 feedback from everybody and I think the smaller edits will
8 be easier to move forward on. But to Commissioner Le Mons'
9 point I think getting clarity on the couple points that he
10 mentioned, so --

11 It looks like Commissioner Toledo has his hand
12 up.

13 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I just had a question
14 for -- I think it's for legal at this point. You know, our
15 constitutional provisions and statutes state pretty clearly
16 that Commissioners and staff of the Commission are not able
17 to accept -- are not able to communicate on redistricting
18 matters, line drawing out side of public meetings. And so,
19 I'm just curious how that impacts our outreach and
20 education because what I've been hearing is Commissioners
21 talking about these outreach staff of the Commission, or
22 outreach workers, I'll just say that, helping individuals
23 submit their COI data, helping them through the process.
24 So, I'm just curious in terms of the distinction between
25 receiving and accepting that information, talking about

1 that as opposed to facilitating just the submission
2 process, and how we make it clear that these individuals
3 wouldn't be having conversation about redistricting matters
4 outside of a public -- a public meeting. Thank you.

5 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: Commissioner, is that
6 something you'd like me to opine on? Is that about the --

7 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes, yes. I was wondering
8 if you or Marian can opine on this issue in terms of these
9 -- whether these individuals are employees of the
10 Commission and whether they're submit to the requirements.
11 And as such, whether -- how do we modify the scope of work,
12 if we need to, to ensure compliance with those
13 constitutional provisions and state statutes pertaining to
14 this matter. Thank you.

15 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: So, my initial thoughts, and
16 I'm happy to let Marian also jump in, but I would want to
17 make sure that we're satisfying 8253 for this -- with this
18 contract. And so, to the extent we need to make sure we
19 have the right disclaimers or provisions for any of these
20 communications, they all have to be allowable
21 communications as provided under the law.

22 So, if we have to -- this entire contract is
23 centered around making sure that we're adhering to the
24 legal requirements, so we would be doing that as applied.

25 For example, if we have to have a -- if, for

1 example, we have a public hearing for a particular outreach
2 regarding redistricting matters, then we would pursue that,
3 we would have that, and we would make sure that any
4 communications that are made from these consultants or the
5 contractors are still -- don't violate -- don't violate our
6 Commission statutes.

7 It looks like Marian has her hand up, as well.

8 LEGAL COUNSEL JOHNSTON: If I could just add one
9 point, contractors are not employees. So, contractors who
10 assist people in, for instance, filling out the COI Tool,
11 the COI Tool submission becomes public when it is
12 transferred to the Commission. Any other documents
13 submitted by email, or regular mail, or however is also
14 made public. So, the fact that a contractor is assisting a
15 member of the public with doing that I don't think violates
16 your statutes in any way.

17 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you both. That
18 addresses my concern, thank you.

19 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Turner?

20 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I'll pass,
21 thank you.

22 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Chair, how would you like
23 us to proceed?

24 CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you for this very robust
25 conversation. A lot of moving pieces, you all put a lot of

1 work into this contract. I think at this point it would be
2 helpful if we can get some motions on the floor for those
3 changes that you heard for that -- for the RFP. And then,
4 also looking at the timeline that you all had drafted
5 within the draft, having June 4th as the date the RFP goes
6 live puts us in a little bit of bind of getting this RFP
7 contract language approved by the Commission to move
8 forward. Being that we have today and tomorrow, and then
9 we have an as-needed meeting scheduled for next Wednesday.
10 And we can certainly meet on that day if we need to, but
11 that would be a day and a half prior to the launch of the
12 RFP.

13 So, what does the subcommittee need in order to
14 move this forward at this point?

15 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: So, I think we need, at
16 the bare minimum, a motion to consider the feedback that
17 was given, vet -- some feedback still needs to be vetted
18 with the OLS, to vet those items with OLS to adjust
19 according -- this isn't this motion. This is not eloquent
20 at all. But to adjust accordingly and move forward,
21 keeping with respect to the timeline that we currently
22 have.

23 Unless Commissioners have any -- let me back up.
24 I think I would do a round robin with Commissioners to see
25 if they have -- which items they feel are germane at this

1 point. Because I think that there are some that certain
2 Commissioners are really passionate about. And then, I
3 think those would be the ones that would probably need to
4 maybe make a motion as to how we move forward, if we're
5 split.

6 So, if you're okay with that, Chair, that's what
7 I would recommend. And then that way I don't have to try
8 to do it from my memory, nor do we have to comb through all
9 the notes that Director Kaplan has taken throughout the
10 day. So, does that work for you?

11 CHAIR AHMAD: Yeah, that works for me. Go ahead
12 and start your round robin, I guess.

13 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay, I just literally
14 will go through and go. Commissioner Yee, are there items
15 that are germane that you think we need to make sure are
16 included, beyond the -- you know, beyond the minor edits?

17 VICE CHAIR YEE: Nothing that hasn't already been
18 mentioned.

19 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?

20 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think the two that I just
21 want to make sure that gets looked at is if we can change
22 the posting date to July 5th so staff has more time to
23 review. And if there's a way to put some money for
24 technology, maybe a limited amount.

25 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you. Commissioner

1 Akutagawa -- I mean, no. Commissioner Andersen?

2 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Just a couple of items to
3 make sure they get addressed is we discussed the idea of
4 when the proposals are due versus when they're opened,
5 however we want to resolve that.

6 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay.

7 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Also, the word "state" is
8 used multiple places in the documents where it should be
9 Commission. I want to make sure that that gets caught all
10 the way through the documents.

11 And then, Commissioner Sinay -- oh, actually, the
12 item that Commissioner Sinay just brought up, additionally
13 I want to make sure, and this is actually for legal and
14 staff to go through, make sure that our attachments, which
15 are not in this, also correspond directly to specifically
16 our conflict of interests. Make sure that they are
17 consistent with this RFP portion that we've looked at.

18 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner
19 Andersen.

20 Commissioner Toledo?

21 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think as much as possible
22 if we can highlight the use of the word "nonpartisan"
23 throughout the contract, just to make that clear. I'm
24 still concerned a little bit about impartiality, although I
25 think the scope of work has addressed some of those

1 concerns and I appreciate for all of your hard work on this
2 to the Commission. Thank you.

3 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you.

4 Commissioner Fernandez?

5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm good. I believe
6 I've already voiced a few things and then I've just got a
7 few minor changes that I'm going to forward to Marcy, so
8 I'm good to go.

9 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay, Commissioner Taylor?

10 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes. I just want to agree
11 with Commissioner Toledo, nonpartisan should be stressed
12 throughout the verbiage of the RFP. I agree with maybe
13 limited funding for technology. And I just think having
14 the applications due and open on the same day is just
15 terribly efficient. So incredibly efficient. So, that's
16 it, thank you.

17 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner
18 Taylor.

19 Commissioner Kennedy?

20 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Not to duplicate anything
21 that's already been said, I'll just reiterate the takeaway
22 from last week's VAC meeting the importance of producing
23 plain language materials. Thank you.

24 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Director Kaplan, were you
25 going to ask a question?

1 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Is that a note as a
2 direction for the contractors to include language like
3 that, the materials that are developed during -- using
4 plain language?

5 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right. That would go
6 under language and communication access, the bullet:
7 Provide redistricting information to persons with
8 disabilities by using braille, American Sign Language,
9 captioning, plain language, and any other tools that would
10 increase accessibility.

11 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Can you just remind me
12 the page? I'm just noting on something else. It's in the
13 --

14 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: That is on page 14.

15 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Okay, thank you.

16 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner
17 Kennedy.

18 Commissioner Turner?

19 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I have nothing
20 additional to ask.

21 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Vazquez?

22 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: With the limited funding
23 for technology, I'm good.

24 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you.

25 Commissioner Fornaciari?

1 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, next.

2 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you.

3 Commissioner Akutagawa?

4 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I will say thank you to
5 everyone for this really robust conversation and appreciate
6 all of the feedback that we received.

7 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay, Chair?

8 CHAIR AHMAD: I have nothing additional to add.

9 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay. So, with that, then
10 I recommend that we make a motion to make the edits to the
11 document as noted by Director Kaplan, getting clarity from
12 and making an adjustment to a portion, a percentage of
13 budget being able to be assigned to equipment within the
14 confines of OLS. And moving the -- excuse me, changing the
15 open time to day of, which I believe is January 25th --
16 excuse me, June 25th, not January. June 25th at 10:00 a.m.
17 versus the 9:00 a.m. time that we have currently.

18 That would be the motion that I would put
19 forward. I think that covered all of the key points.

20 Anybody second?

21 CHAIR AHMAD: I see Commissioner Fernandez as the
22 second.

23 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay.

24 CHAIR AHMAD: So, the motion on the floor is to
25 incorporate the recommended changes by the Commission, as

1 noted by Director Kaplan, follow up with OLS regarding the
2 inclusion of technology funding, and releasing fundings for
3 technology, and change the date of opening the RFP to the
4 same date of the due date by 10:00 a.m., I believe it was.

5 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

6 CHAIR AHMAD: From memory. And the motion was
7 made by Commissioner Le Mons, seconded by Commissioner
8 Fernandez. Do we have any discussion on this item at this
9 time, on the motion specifically on the floor?

10 Okay, can we move to public comment on the motion
11 that is on the floor.

12 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. In order
13 to maximize transparency and public participation in our
14 process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment by
15 phone. To call in, dial the telephone number provided on
16 the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted,
17 enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream
18 feed. It is 92638886526 for this meeting. When prompted
19 to enter a participant ID, simply press the pound key.

20 Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a
21 queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press *9.
22 This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it is
23 your turn to speak, you will hear a message that says the
24 host would like you to talk and to press *6 to speak. If
25 you would like to give your name, please state and spell it

1 for the record. You are not required to provide your name
2 to give public comment.

3 Make sure to mute your computer or livestream
4 audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your
5 call. Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when
6 it is your turn to speak and, again, please turn down the
7 livestream volume.

8 And the Commission is taking public comment on
9 the motion that is on the floor at this time.

10 We do have a caller in the queue, with their hand
11 raised. Go ahead, the floor is yours.

12 MS. GOLD: Good afternoon Commissioners, Rosalind
13 Gold with the NALEO Educational Fund, R-O-S-A-L-I-N-D and
14 the last name is Gold, G-O-L-D.

15 I wanted just to echo our comments regarding
16 kudos for the robustness of the discussion that you've been
17 having on the grant program. When I heard the motion, I
18 just did want to clarify an issue that had been discussed a
19 little earlier. We don't think it will be helpful to put
20 in a explicit restriction on funding going to organizations
21 which also lobby. Lobbying has a very distinctive meaning
22 under the Internal Revenue Code. And if you are a
23 nonpartisan, nonprofit organization and you're a 501(c)(3)
24 you are allowed to do very, very limited lobbying. So, we
25 would not want the money restricted, kept from groups that

1 do lobbying. We recommend that if there is a prohibition
2 it be that none of the money, none of the grant money can
3 be used for lobbying as set forth in the Internal Revenue
4 Code.

5 And, you know, I think there's lots of examples
6 from grant letters from foundations as to what that
7 language would look like, again saying that none of the
8 money can be used for lobbying. You know, some
9 organizations do have partner 501(c)(4)'s that do their
10 lobbying, so they don't do it through their (c)(3)'s.

11 AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: 30 seconds.

12 MS. GOLD: But you can do very limited lobbying
13 through your (c)(3)'s and we wouldn't want to keep those
14 organizations from getting the money, as long as they don't
15 use the money for lobbying. And thank you so much.

16 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And thank you. And I
17 would like to remind those calling in to press *9 to raise
18 their hand if they wish to make a comment on the motion
19 that is on the floor.

20 And there is a raised hand. I did see Ms.
21 Kaplan's hand go up.

22 CHAIR AHMAD: Marcy, do you want -- do you have
23 something to address us?

24 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: I just want to clarify
25 the language in the RFP, the examples of unallowable costs

1 are costs for the contract, so that's where the expense are
2 staff related. Policy, or advocacy, or lobbying is related
3 to the expenses of the contract, not limiting an
4 organizations that does lobbying.

5 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Okay and we will move
6 on to our next caller. Go ahead, the floor is yours.

7 MS. WEST-LUSK: Hello. This is Renee Westa-Lusk.
8 I just don't understand how this outreach effort, going
9 through I guess groups that apply for the grant money,
10 includes going door to door with technological equipment
11 that is supplied by the CRC. I mean you talk about hard to
12 reach, but there are so many rural parts of the state that
13 are extremely hard to reach and they would probably love to
14 have someone come to their door and help them with -- you
15 know, figure out the COI Tool, and print a map, or
16 whatever, do a community of interest map. And I just don't
17 see how just giving certain parts of California this
18 equipment advantage, and extra training, and all that, and
19 the door-to-door service is really fair to the other areas
20 that won't qualify for any of this help.

21 That's my comment. Thank you for listening.

22 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. And that
23 is all our public comment at this time.

24 CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you, Katy. Alvaro, are you
25 ready to call roll for the vote?

1 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Just about. I
2 want to make sure I have the motion correct. It was very
3 lengthy. One second, let me share the screen.

4 CHAIR AHMAD: While you do that, I see
5 Commissioner Akutagawa's hand up.

6 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I think I -- I
7 just wanted to clarify just what the last commenter was
8 asking about. Just for clarification, if I'm understanding
9 it correctly, it sounds like she's not understanding, you
10 know, about I guess going door to door sounding like it may
11 be limited to certain parts of California. I don't believe
12 that that's what we were discussing. It was more
13 specifically about whether or not, you know, technology,
14 the purchase of technology for the purposes of door-to-door
15 outreach should be allowable under the contracts or the
16 provisions of the contracts which would disburse the funds.
17 If and how, you know, each successful bidder would go about
18 taking part in outreach and reaching hard-to-reach
19 populations, which does include rural communities, that's
20 going to be based on, hopefully, the expertise of each of
21 the bidders who are going to successfully win each
22 contract. Whether they choose to use technology or do it
23 in other ways, that's going to be, again, up to each of the
24 successful bidders.

25 I also want to just note that what I said about

1 Jungee (phonetic), which is a rural community in Eastern
2 California, we have been told that, yes, some people would
3 love to see people go door to door, but there are also as
4 many people who would prefer not to have somebody come to
5 their door and knock on their door.

6 So, I just wanted to note that there is -- as
7 there is in California all across the state, there is quite
8 a bit of diversity where it comes to rural communities as
9 well, too. So, just making that note about that. So,
10 thank you.

11 CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you. We are ready for the
12 vote, Alvaro.

13 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Okay, so I'll read
14 the motion once again. The motion to the edits to the
15 outreach RFP as noted by Director Kaplan. Follow up with
16 OLS for releasing funds for technology equipment and
17 changing the opening of proposal time of day of June 25th
18 -- or to June 25th at 10:00 a.m. Is that correct?

19 CHAIR AHMAD: Yes.

20 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Okay.

21 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Chair, there was one
22 distinction, as I'm reading this. It isn't just the follow
23 up with OLS, but it's follow up and incorporate. So, yeah,
24 follow up with OLS and incorporate releasing funds for
25 technology, if permitted.

1 CHAIR AHMAD: Great, thank you for that
2 clarification.

3 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Okay, we'll begin
4 the vote.

5 Commissioner Akutagawa?

6 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Alvaro, can you just --
8 I'm sorry, the last part of your motion, can you move today
9 to June -- just remove today. Oh, thank you.

10 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Also, could you fix that
11 the way Commissioner --

12 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: The follow-up part?

13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, the follow-up part
14 that Commissioner Le Mons said. It's follow up with OLS
15 and incorporate, you know, for releasing funds and
16 incorporate -- not incorporating with OLS.

17 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Is that correct?

18 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: We need to delete "for".
19 Incorporate releasing funds. So, it should not be
20 "incorporating for", it should just be incorporate
21 releasing funds.

22 And since we're on that can I just note that
23 equipment, there should not be that extra "e" after "p".
24 And opening should be one "n". Thank you.

25 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yeah, I'm

1 definitely exposing my weakness here.

2 Okay, once again I'll read off the motion.
3 Motion to make the edits to the outreach RFP as noted by
4 Director Kaplan, follow up with OLS and incorporate
5 releasing funds for technology equipment and changing the
6 opening of proposal time to June 25th, at 10:00 a.m.

7 Okay, we'll begin the vote. Commissioner
8 Akutagawa?

9 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

10 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner

11 Andersen?

12 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

13 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner

14 Fernandez?

15 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

16 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner

17 Fornaciari?

18 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.

19 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner

20 Kennedy?

21 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes.

22 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Le

23 Mons?

24 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

25 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner

1 Sadhwani?
2 Commissioner Sinay?
3 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.
4 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner
5 Taylor?
6 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.
7 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner
8 Toledo?
9 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.
10 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner
11 Turner?
12 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Abstain.
13 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner
14 Vazquez?
15 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Abstain.
16 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Yee?
17 VICE CHAIR YEE: Yes.
18 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner
19 Ahmad?
20 CHAIR AHMAD: Yes.
21 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: This is a special
22 vote.
23 CHAIR AHMAD: Anthony, I'm forgetting my training
24 already, is this a special vote?
25 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: It is a special

1 vote.

2 CHIEF COUNSEL PANE: It is because it's for the
3 decision for contracting decisions.

4 CHAIR AHMAD: Got it.

5 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: So, the motion
6 fails.

7 CHAIR AHMAD: All right. I am not sure where to
8 move from here. Perhaps -- we have about -- yikes, we have
9 lunch at 12:45. So, we can either continue this
10 conversation to see where our sticking points are and where
11 we can come to a compromise, or we can table this and jump
12 into the next item and come back to this item at a later
13 point in our meeting. Do we have recommendations?

14 Yes, Commissioner Yee?

15 VICE CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Sadhwani expects to
16 be back after 3:00, if that makes a difference.

17 CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Le Mons?

18 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Well, I guess maybe we
19 should talk to Commissioner Turner and Vazquez to find out
20 what the sticking point is from their perspective.

21 CHAIR AHMAD: I see Commissioner Vazquez, you
22 have your hand up.

23 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I think I need more
24 clarity about if there's a timeline, a quick timeline, even
25 a 24-hour timeline in terms of just checking with the

1 powers that be about what language can actually be included
2 in this type of contract related to technology, and what
3 those parameters would be specifically. Because then, I
4 feel like I could have like a real discussion as to whether
5 or not we include that in this RFP.

6 My problem is that I don't -- we're having two
7 different -- I felt like we were having two different
8 conversations. One, do we include this or not, which is I
9 think the more important conversation. And we were also
10 having a conversation about can we do this or not. And so,
11 I feel like we should just text to see if we can in terms
12 of like what those -- like I would like to know exactly
13 what those parameters are and then I feel like we could
14 have an actual discussion about whether or not we should
15 include it in the RFP. Then I don't feel like we are
16 having two distinct discussions.

17 CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Le Mons and then
18 Kennedy?

19 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Well, my understanding was
20 that we were determining if we could, and if we could we
21 were incorporating it. That's what we voted to do. So,
22 that wasn't an outstanding item.

23 CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Kennedy?

24 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: That was my understanding
25 as well.

1 CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Andersen?

2 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Did we talk about a
3 percentage? If we're allowed, you know, what portion?

4 CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Turner?

5 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you for the
6 invitation, Commissioner Le Mons. I don't have a sticking
7 point. I appreciate all of the discussion and will
8 continue to abstain.

9 CHAIR AHMAD: Yes Marcy?

10 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: I do want to highlight
11 that the way the RFP written it does allow for 10 percent
12 of funds on technology. Then, just clarity around the
13 equipment purchases versus other ways to utilize equipment.
14 So, whether it is through leasing, as was discussed or --

15 CHAIR AHMAD: I see Commissioner Vazquez and then
16 Le Mons.

17 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, thank you for the
18 clarity. I guess it was not clear to me that it would for
19 sure be included. My understanding of the motion was that
20 we were going -- we would check and then some decision
21 would be made at the subcommittee level, and/or with staff,
22 as to what and how to include around technology, and that
23 did not seem sufficient to me.

24 So, if we go back and hear, yes, we can include
25 this piece with these parameters and we'll include it, I

1 mean personally I would like to actually see what that
2 language looks like before approving the RFP, but I also
3 trust my fellow Commissioners in that if they don't feel
4 like they need to review that particular language before
5 approving the RFP, then I could approve this motion with
6 that in mind.

7 CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Le Mons and then
8 Fernandez?

9 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Well, I was just curious
10 on the vote because we have one absent Democrat, we have
11 two abstaining. How many do we need to pass. This is a
12 clarity question on actual votes. Three?

13 LEGAL COUNSEL JOHNSTON: Three from each group.

14 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: And if Commissioner Turner
15 is not going to vote, then we're -- this is just sort of a
16 moot point.

17 CHAIR AHMAD: Three total.

18 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Three total. Who are --

19 CHAIR AHMAD: Three total Democrats would need to
20 vote yes.

21 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Ah, three. Okay, so we
22 could seriously have two, but it's not -- I mean it's kind
23 of unfair to Commissioner Sadhwani who was not here for any
24 of the discussion like -- I don't know. Yeah, I'm really
25 frustrated I guess at this point. Maybe we shouldn't have

1 proceeded with the discussion without having Commissioner
2 Sadhwani present. And I thought part of what we -- why we
3 moved J to the beginning was so that we were allowing for
4 presence because of this potential issue. So, anyway.

5 CHAIR AHMAD: So, we are right up against our
6 mandatory required break, which is lunch. So, I have noted
7 down Commissioner Fernandez, Kennedy, and then Andersen,
8 but we will be taking a break right now and meeting back up
9 here at 1:45. I would like to remind folks that we do have
10 a time-certain presentation today at 2:00 p.m., so we have
11 15 minutes when we get back to continue this conversation
12 and, hopefully, come to a resolution on this item.

13 See you all at 1:45.

14 (Off the record at 12:45 p.m.)

15 (On the record at 1:45 p.m.)

16 CHAIR AHMAD: All right, welcome back from lunch.
17 I just have a few administrative updates for everyone
18 before we jump back in. We will actually be going into
19 closed session today at 3:30 to address data and
20 cybersecurity issues. Ahead of that we have our 2:00 p.m.
21 presentation by the Statewide Database.

22 So, we have about 15 minutes to continue that
23 conversation regarding Item 9-J, the grant -- the contract
24 RFP language. And I had Commissioner Fernandez, Kennedy,
25 and Andersen in the queue.

1 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you. Let's
2 see, is Commissioner Vazquez on? But it was my
3 understanding that if we reworded the motion, I believe she
4 would be in favor of it. She just wanted to make sure that
5 it explicitly stated that if we did find out that we could
6 -- I guess if the contract could include equipment that we
7 would therefore change the RFP to reflect that.

8 So, I'm thinking that what we would do is if we
9 could -- if it could include computers, that we would just
10 get rid of that last bullet on page 15, under examples of
11 unallowable costs, we would just remove equipment purchases
12 including computers. But Commissioner Vazquez is not on
13 right now.

14 CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Kennedy and then
15 Andersen.

16 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. My
17 recollection is that Commissioner Vazquez wanted to know
18 pretty much exactly what language could go in there. So,
19 my proposal would be to table the motion, tomorrow to
20 reconsider. So, a motion to reconsider, tabled tomorrow,
21 would both give us an opportunity to have an answer
22 regarding the technology purchases question, as well as
23 give Commissioner Sadhwani time to review the video of the
24 discussion. So, that's my proposed way forward. Thank
25 you.

1 CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner -- I see Marian's hand
2 up, and then Andersen and Akutagawa.

3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I just, Commissioner
4 Sadhwani said she would be absent tomorrow or a large
5 portion of tomorrow also.

6 CHAIR AHMAD: She -- Commissioner Sadhwani did
7 say she would be back by 3:00 p.m. tomorrow, so if we push
8 this to the later half of tomorrow we could potentially
9 have enough folks for the vote.

10 Commissioner Andersen and then Akutagawa.

11 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'm not going to speak
12 for Commissioner Vasquez, although it was my understanding
13 as long as it had the right words -- she thought it was
14 precluded. And what Ms. Kaplan has said, at least 10
15 percent of the funds being, you know, access to computer
16 and internet that could indeed be part of the money. And
17 if that is indeed what we found out from counsel that that
18 is indeed allowable, I would certainly be okay with that
19 amount being about 10 percent.

20 I don't believe that you can scratch equipment
21 purchases, including computers. You might just have to say
22 eliminate including computers, because I believe there is a
23 contract requirement about that. But that is what I'd like
24 to get from counsel. Thank you.

25 CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner --

1 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And I like -- sorry, I
2 like Commissioner Kennedy's idea, if we have to. Although,
3 I do believe, you know, there are five Democrats, five
4 Republicans, and we have one abstain and one absent so --

5 CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Akutagawa and then we
6 shall wrap up this conversation for now.

7 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I do want to just let
8 you all know that I did have a conversation with Director
9 Hernandez and Chair Ahmad that I think is -- I don't know
10 if this would just -- if we could just continue on this, I
11 know that we have scheduled a presentation or discussion
12 time, but I do want to tell you, or maybe perhaps Director
13 Hernandez could speak to the questions that are open, and
14 have generated the most conversations. That way, then we
15 know. And while the conversation's still fresh, I feel
16 like we can at least address those right now.

17 CHAIR AHMAD: Sure, just want to uplift that we
18 won't be able to take a vote now or right -- or, actually,
19 we do have enough people to vote. Sorry about that.

20 Go ahead, Alvaro.

21 EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: So, we did some
22 additional checking and Raul confirmed that the contract
23 does allow for purchasing of technology equipment, PCs.
24 Just wanted to uplift that it may not be the best use of
25 time or of our resources, state resources, purchasing of

1 PCs. But that would mean the question, the answer is, yes,
2 they can purchase equipment.

3 We also have laptops available here that we
4 could, you know, loan out, so there may be some work-
5 arounds as well, but that question answered.

6 In regards to the timing and the time frame,
7 depending on when we have it approved, this project was
8 based on approval of the RFP on June 2nd. So, if it were
9 to be approved prior to that, then obviously we'll be able
10 to adjust those time frames accordingly.

11 CHAIR AHMAD: Great, thank you. So, for right
12 now I would like to put a pause on this specific item and
13 come back to it tomorrow. That way, we can give some of
14 our colleagues a little bit more time to catch up on this,
15 and then we can take the vote up again on the RFP. But as
16 of right now, just to be very clear, the vote did not pass,
17 therefore there's no direction given to staff right now in
18 terms of moving this item forward.

19 So, with that we have about eight minutes. I'm
20 going to be optimistic here and check in with Agenda Item
21 9-A, the Government Affairs Subcommittee, if you all have
22 your report out ready.

23 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I can be quick. I'm not
24 sure if we can do it in eight minutes, given that we have
25 two policies to review.

1 CHAIR AHMAD: Okay. Is it okay --

2 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'm happy to give the
3 overview and if -- I just don't know if we'd have enough
4 time for conversation, if there is any.

5 CHAIR AHMAD: Sure. Sure. And if it's okay,
6 Commissioner Toledo, can I skip over to a subcommittee that
7 may be able to report out within the time?

8 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Certainly. Certainly,
9 thank you.

10 CHAIR AHMAD: Okay, great. Finance and
11 Administration, do you all have something short?

12 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: We have an item to vote
13 on, too.

14 CHAIR AHMAD: Great. GANTT Chart?

15 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: No further work has been
16 done on the GANTT Chart at this point.

17 CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you for your report out.
18 VRA compliance?

19 VICE CHAIR YEE: Nothing new at this time.

20 CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you. Outreach and
21 Engagement, do you all have a quick report out or do you
22 all have something substantial?

23 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: We have a motion.

24 COMMISSIONER SINAY: We have a motion.

25 CHAIR AHMAD: Okay. And then, Language Access, I

1 know you all are tied into the meeting schedule calendar,
2 if I'm --

3 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, not really. We
4 could discuss it. I don't know if Commissioner Akutagawa
5 -- I think we can discuss whatever changes we have, which
6 we didn't have any changes for language access. It was
7 more of moving some of the dates around. But I believe we
8 were going to discuss that during either Agenda Item 11, or
9 14, because that's more of a scheduling, not a language
10 access.

11 CHAIR AHMAD: Okay, so does --

12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: But we don't have
13 anything else for Language Access.

14 CHAIR AHMAD: Great. I'm crossing that off.

15 Materials Development, that's Commissioner
16 Fernandez and Kennedy.

17 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: We have the paper-based
18 Communities of Interest Tool form that has been distributed
19 as a handout.

20 CHAIR AHMAD: You all have it?

21 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. And at this
22 point I think what we were thinking is we're going to hand
23 it off to I believe the Communications. Right,
24 Commissioner Kennedy? Because we're pretty much done with
25 it, we're getting ready for public input meeting, we need

1 to start sending those out and getting them translated.

2 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right.

3 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So, kind of more of an
4 FYI for everyone.

5 CHAIR AHMAD: And is that to -- you said is to
6 the Communications Team, so Fredy and team?

7 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right.

8 CHAIR AHMAD: Okay. And you all don't need a
9 vote or a motion on any item at this point?

10 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I don't believe we would.

11 CHAIR AHMAD: Okay. Great.

12 Website Subcommittee, Commissioners Kennedy and
13 Taylor.

14 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, this I guess can tie
15 into the communities of interest form. One of the
16 questions that we have at this point, and Commissioner
17 Taylor and I have exchanged some thoughts on the website,
18 and one question that we have is are we making our
19 recommendations to the Commission or are we making our
20 recommendations to the staff?

21 And Marian has said that if the Commission has
22 delegated authority over the website to the staff, then our
23 recommendations will be directed to staff rather than to
24 the Commission. If I understood it correctly, Marian?

25 LEGAL COUNSEL JOHNSTON: Right. And I don't know

1 if that decision has been made by the Commission.

2 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right.

3 CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Kennedy, is that a
4 decision that you would like to bring forward at this time
5 for the Commission to consider.

6 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay.

7 CHAIR AHMAD: Do you have a recommendation on the
8 direction we should take?

9 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: My recommendation would be
10 that the Commission delegate authority over the website to
11 staff and that, therefore, the Website Subcommittee's
12 recommendations would be directed to staff.

13 CHAIR AHMAD: My gut says that this a motion that
14 is required. But given that there's three minutes, we
15 won't be able to take in public comment and do all the
16 things we need to do prior to our guests arriving at 2:00
17 p.m.

18 So, from here shall we come back to the Website
19 Subcommittee? Okay, I've made a note that you all foresee
20 coming.

21 Data Management. Commissioner Turner?

22 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair, we don't
23 have anything just yet to report out on.

24 CHAIR AHMAD: Two minutes, we have.
25 Cybersecurity Subcommittee, Commissioners Fornaciari and

1 Taylor?

2 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: We don't have anything
3 substantial to report out at this time.

4 CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you. Incarcerated Population
5 Subcommittee, that's Commissioners Fernandez and Sinay.

6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: We do not have anything
7 at this point.

8 CHAIR AHMAD: The second Incarcerated Population
9 Subcommittee focused on Federal Facilities, Commissioners
10 Kennedy and Turner?

11 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Nothing to report, other
12 than the letter has reached Senator Padilla's Office.

13 CHAIR AHMAD: Great. Lessons Learned
14 Subcommittee, Commissioner Kennedy?

15 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Our standard refrain,
16 please keep them coming, the log continues to grow.

17 CHAIR AHMAD: And then, IT Recruitment
18 Subcommittee, Commissioners Andersen and Fornaciari?

19 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No, nothing.

20 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes, nothing at this
21 point.

22 CHAIR AHMAD: We just went through 11
23 subcommittees, woohoo. I have made a note on our list of
24 Government Affairs we will return to for a policy review
25 and potential action. Finance and Administrative is

1 expecting a motion. Outreach and Engagement Subcommittee
2 is also expecting a motion. Website Subcommittee is also
3 expecting a motion.

4 And then, now, we will turn it over to our
5 Communities of Interest Tool Subcommittee, Commissioners
6 Akutagawa and Kennedy for their report out.

7 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: All right, great. I
8 know that we will or have -- yes, thank you, we have been
9 joined by our contacts at the Statewide Database. Before I
10 introduce them to discuss the access centers, redistricting
11 access centers, I do want to give an additional, an
12 additional very quick, brief update from a Communities of
13 Interest Tool perspective.

14 One is around the Communities of Interest Tool,
15 specifically around requests for help. We have noticed
16 that there were a couple comments centered around the
17 Communities of Interest Tool and the need for help, live
18 help specifically. I know that at least one comment said
19 that they had tried to request help and had some problems.
20 We did share that -- actually, I take that back. We had
21 two comments around the need for help and we did share that
22 with the Statewide Database folks. And they have noted
23 that they have addressed those. There was one that was
24 also sent back to us in the comment letters.

25 I do just want to just generally say to anybody

1 looking to use the Statewide Database, the Communities of
2 Interest Tool, if at all possible we find that the
3 Statewide Database is very responsive, and that we want to
4 encourage you to access them for live help. And they have
5 both -- they have help both during the day, but also into
6 the late evening as well, too. So, if you are using the
7 tool after work, and after dinner, and after you get your
8 kids settled it is possible to get some help there as well,
9 too.

10 We also believe that they are best positioned to
11 provide the help. However, we do recognize that, you know,
12 maybe there is some difficulty in reaching them. And that
13 if you do need to, you can utilize us, the Commission, as a
14 secondary or backup point. And what we'll do is we'll make
15 sure, then, that we forward the requests or the need for
16 assistance to the Statewide Database.

17 The other thing that I want to also just note on
18 the Communities of Interest Tool is that we've been
19 receiving now weekly updates on the use of the tool. And
20 we are happy to report that we are seeing that the
21 Communities of Interest Tool is growing. We saw it was
22 first -- from the time we started receiving updates about
23 roughly a month ago, first it was like 10 increases from
24 the previous week, and then it became 15, and then 20. And
25 based on the last update, we've had an increase of 30 new

1 users to the Communities of Interest Tool. So, the good
2 news is that the trend is going up, people are using it.
3 And we want to encourage folks to please, please keep using
4 that Communities of Interest Tool. It's something that we
5 think is a unique tool that will enable us, the Commission,
6 to be able to get input directly from you. And you can
7 always go back in and edit it, if you feel like there is
8 something that needed to be edited.

9 So, with that I want to just also next introduce
10 -- or, actually, maybe before I do that, if I can,
11 Commissioner Kennedy is there anything that you want to add
12 to what I just shared, before I introduce our speakers?

13 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: No, thank you for taking
14 care of that.

15 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: All right, great. I
16 would like to introduce Karin MacDonald and Jaime Clark.
17 They are here to speak with us about questions related to
18 the redistricting access centers.

19 I know that in a meeting, I think it was maybe
20 two, or maybe three meetings ago we did have, you know, a
21 number of questions about the role of the redistricting
22 access centers. And we did also ask both Karin and Jaime
23 to come and join us so that we can all hear directly from
24 them around the questions related to the purpose, and how
25 the hiring is going to go, how the staff that would be

1 hired for that is going to be utilized, and how we can also
2 use it to complement the efforts of our Commission field
3 staff as well, too.

4 So, with that I'm going to turn this over to
5 Karin and to Jaime. Thank you for meeting us and joining
6 us here.

7 MS. MACDONALD: Thank you so much, Commissioner
8 Akutagawa. And hello members of the Commission. Thank you
9 for inviting us to be here.

10 Jaime has a PowerPoint that she will share that
11 we're both going to use. So, that's okay, Jaime. And if
12 Kristian will let you, then maybe we can share that.
13 Great, thank you so much.

14 So, this is a little bit of a bigger update,
15 actually, not just about the centers, the redistricting
16 access sites, but also about redistricting software.

17 And, essentially, what we would like to talk to
18 you about is the entire approach of providing access to
19 redistricting software and redistricting data that we have
20 worked on. And again, let me just start by saying we
21 really appreciate your collaboration. And thank you so
22 much for everything you just said about the COI Tool,
23 Commissioner Akutagawa. I think, you know, working
24 together this is going to be a really successful project.

25 So, okay, Jaime let's go. Thank you. So, the

1 way that we have approached the access to software for
2 redistricting has really been multifaceted. As you can see
3 on this slide, and as you know, our first tool that you're
4 very familiar with is, of course, the Community of Interest
5 Tool. It was the first Community of Interest Tool anywhere
6 in the United States. It was, of course, not available ten
7 years ago. And, you know, ten years ago not a lot of
8 people thought about making, creating a tool for
9 communities to figure out, you know, where their boundaries
10 and let anyone know what their interests are. So, we're
11 pretty proud of that tool. I think it's pretty successful
12 at this point, as you've noted. And, of course, we have it
13 available in so many languages, which is wonderful. And
14 definitely, there is nothing even remotely similar to this
15 tool out there.

16 So, the second part to this multi-pronged
17 approach to redistricting access or software access,
18 redistricting software access is the redistricting access
19 centers or redistricting access sites. And this is, of
20 course, something that came out of the last redistricting
21 and we'll talk about this in a little bit more detail on
22 the next slide.

23 And then, also, we would like to talk to you
24 about two additional levels of line drawing software and
25 access to line drawing software. And I know that this is

1 something that many of you have been very interested in
2 finding out about, like what were we going to do, and we're
3 now at the point where we would love to talk to you about
4 it.

5 So, there is one, the first level, which is a
6 desktop line drawing software that we'd like to talk to you
7 about and show you. It is at this point called Draw My CA.
8 And then, there is an online line drawing software piece,
9 and we're calling that Draw My CA Districts.

10 So, you see that we're working on a theme here,
11 Draw My CA Community, Draw My CA, and Draw My CA Districts.
12 And these tools are very different from each other, but
13 they also have a lot in common. And they are designed to
14 basically provide users and participants with a pretty
15 seamless transition and seamless experience when they want
16 to perhaps move from the so to speak entry level of drawing
17 their community of interest, and then they get more
18 interested, and then they want to draw a district,
19 actually. So, there's a little bit of a seamless
20 transition to that.

21 But let's talk about the redistricting access
22 centers, first. So, actually we're talking about the
23 Community of Interest Tool first, so sorry. So, the
24 Community of Interest Tool of course is
25 drawmycacommunity.org. The official launch was March 2nd,

1 2021. And we now have 16 languages, which is pretty
2 incredible.

3 There are ongoing updates of support features,
4 which you know. We are still actively working on the tool.
5 It's working very well. But you also know that somebody
6 just recently found a little bug in there and we're always
7 very appreciative to anybody who let's us know that there's
8 anything that's not working. And that is, of course, what
9 we have always done and how we also run the Statewide
10 Database. So, this is not -- you know, us being available
11 and open to input is nothing new to anybody who has ever
12 worked with us.

13 We also, of course, set up this seamless data
14 transmission with the -- or we are setting up the data
15 transmission with the Commission and that is in progress
16 right now. And as you are bringing your Data Management
17 Team online, and you're hiring your Data Manager, all of
18 this will be integrated.

19 As of May 20, as Commissioner Akutagawa just
20 mentioned, we have had 286 individual registered users.
21 And we had 240 completed submissions. And there are, of
22 course, also submissions in the pipeline that are not yet
23 completed.

24 The target audience of the Community of Interest
25 Tool is, as you know, absolutely everybody. Everybody in

1 the State of California. That's why we have so many
2 languages, we're really trying to reach anyone who wants to
3 participate and we're trying to make it very easy.

4 And again, one more time, if you have any
5 problems, please reach out. We have chat support and we're
6 very happy to help. We are trying to get as much feedback
7 as possible from as many Californians as possible, and that
8 is regardless of their knowledge or interest in
9 redistricting. Anybody can participate and just say, hey,
10 this is where my neighborhood is, let me just draw it for
11 you.

12 So, this is a relatively simple task. You define
13 your community of interest. It's a pretty low barrier of
14 entry. And, of course, this is all relative. Sometimes
15 when I say it's a low barrier of entry there's, of course,
16 some people that, you know, are just not familiar with
17 computers. They have never really used line drawing
18 software in any way. And, you know, I'm not going to sit
19 here and say that it's easy for everybody. There are
20 obviously different user groups and for some people it's
21 going to be a little bit more difficult than for others.

22 And we're really hoping that this help system
23 that we have in the background will assist in capturing
24 people that may, you know, not be as familiar with
25 computers but that do want to participate, and that they

1 can walk them through step by step.

2 So, next slide please, Jaime. Thank you so much.
3 Now, we're at the redistricting access centers. So, to
4 remind you, because I know you've heard about them, in 2011
5 we had redistricting access sites funded by foundations.
6 It was the James Irving Foundation. I'd written a grant to
7 them and we'd worked on it, and they funded six centers.
8 They were not fully funded, so they were actually only
9 staffed part time. But we did what we could with the
10 budget that was available. And of course, as you know, in
11 2011 it was a recession, the state wasn't doing very well.
12 So, you know, funds for these kinds of efforts were pretty
13 hard to come by. So, we're very, very grateful that the
14 Irvine Foundation at the time took a chance on us and
15 actually implemented this.

16 And the centers were very well received. They,
17 you know, had technical staff and quite a few people took
18 advantage of them, and also quite a few like local
19 organizations, neighborhood organizations, and so forth
20 used the centers pretty regularly and frequently.

21 In 2021, the state stepped in and said, hey, this
22 worked well. We have some money, let's do it again. And
23 we had hoped to expand to more locations than the six
24 largest urban centers, which is where we landed last time.
25 And, you know, there was a little complex algorithm,

1 actually, that went in to figuring out where they should
2 be. Back in the day we looked at, you know, how long do
3 people have to drive. But I think we all know that, you
4 know, six redistricting access sites for the entire State
5 of California, I mean California's just so large it's just
6 not going to do it.

7 And that's actually, exactly the reason for why
8 we went to this like multi-pronged system, and system of
9 access. So, basically not just have the centers, but also
10 have like different levels of software that people can use.
11 And I'll talk about this a little bit more in a second.

12 So, again, we had hoped to at least meet the
13 level of service that we had last time. We were -- I mean
14 that's what we're hoping now, that's what we are doing.
15 But we had hoped to expand to other locations, but then
16 COVID happened.

17 And when COVID happened, of course everything was
18 just thrown up in the air and we were trying to figure out
19 what to now do. And so, we started to shift to figure out
20 a very robust remote support system for the other tools
21 that we were providing because we didn't know whether we
22 were going to open at all. And so, we didn't know. Nobody
23 knew. So, that's kind of where we detoured a little bit.

24 But we're still at the same level of access that
25 we had last time with respect to the centers and we are in

1 roughly the same areas, also. So, we wanted to make sure
2 that there would not be a reduction in services if health
3 policies allowed and we could open.

4 So we have, as Commissioner Akutagawa mentioned
5 earlier, we have already hired some of the managers for
6 these sites. And the way we did that because, you know, UC
7 Berkeley -- and, I mean, you're going through the same kind
8 of hiring issues, things just take a really long time. So,
9 we ended up having to hire, just to be ready to open we
10 have to start the hiring process pretty early. And had to,
11 you know, get jobs approved in the middle of a hiring
12 freeze, and so forth.

13 So, you know, we are essentially now at the point
14 where the managers that we have hired, they are the ones
15 that are providing that online support. And then, as soon
16 as they can they will be moving into these centers to help
17 people in person.

18 So, just to point out access versus outreach,
19 because I know that this has come up, these are not really
20 outreach centers, they are access centers. So, the primary
21 purpose is to provide a place to use the tools that we're
22 making available. And, of course, in collaboration with
23 you, you are undertaking a much broader effort. You're
24 doing all of this outreach and we basically are the place
25 where people can come and then just use the tools, and sit

1 down, and spend some time, think through these things and
2 create their input no matter what that might look like.

3 So, we're hoping also that we can collaborate
4 with you moving forward, as we have been, just to let
5 people know that these resources are available, that these
6 centers will be open, where they are, and what's available
7 there and so forth.

8 The resources that are available in each center
9 are essentially the same that we had last time, but with a
10 little bonus. So, we have staff trained on redistricting
11 processes and criteria. We have public computers that will
12 be available there. And then, the COI Tool of course is
13 available at the redistricting access sites. And then, we
14 will also have line drawing software available at the
15 sites. And, of course, we now have two different levels of
16 line drawing software and we did not have that last time.

17 So, last time what we had was no COI Tool and
18 just a desktop system. So, there were, you know, I think
19 we had two or three computers that people could use in each
20 site and they had desktop systems. And the level of access
21 is just much different this time.

22 So, the next slide please, Jaime. So, for line
23 drawing software, just to talk about that and kind of get
24 away from the COI Tool and the access centers, so this is
25 like the third level of access, really. It is a different

1 target audience than when you're talking to people about
2 the COI Tool. While it is obviously available to all
3 Californians, I think the people that are going to take us
4 up on actually using the line drawing software, it will be
5 just a different, a different population that may have a
6 little bit more knowledge about redistricting in general or
7 more interest in redistricting. So, and there's also
8 people that may have a little bit more time, to be frank.
9 You know, not everybody has the time to draw an entire
10 district or an entire district plan.

11 They definitely need to know what a district is.
12 They have to know how to draw a legally-compliant district
13 in a perfect world and, of course, we'll have supporting
14 materials available to make it as easily understandable as
15 possible. But it definitely still is a different target
16 audience.

17 The scale of submissions is also going to be
18 different. And this is just some stats, rough stats from
19 last time just to give an idea of the takers here. So, in
20 2011 we had about 22,000 written submissions, so
21 essentially no COI input and so forth. But we only had
22 about 50 or less than 50 plans that were submitted. So,
23 they were either partial or complete plans. And some
24 plans, so when we say plans we basically mean a map that's
25 not a COI map. So, it's a map that was generated with data

1 like, you know, Census data and so forth. So, that's the
2 different in scale. And that leads us basically to that
3 conclusion that this is definitely a different target
4 audience even though we're making it easier, and a lot less
5 expensive this time, obviously, to participate.

6 So, what we're trying to do here is we try to
7 fill the access gap. The COI Tool is basically for those
8 that are providing, you know, neighborhoods, communities of
9 interest, and so forth. Those are little building blocks
10 that you can use to put your district together.

11 And then, there are two options for people that
12 want to try to put those building blocks together and also
13 use redistricting data. And please remember that in the
14 COI Tool we're not providing data. The COI Tool basically
15 collects data. We're collecting data from people about
16 what's going on, on the ground.

17 So, California, you know California has some
18 pretty unique needs in data. Obviously, you know, we have
19 the incarcerated folks that need to be adjusted, and we
20 have a nonpartisan approach. And, you know, providing this
21 software and actually making it available, having the
22 software designed in a way that allows for these unique
23 needs and the unique data to be provided is very important,
24 we think.

25 So, it's not a replacement, really, for private

1 software that's used by redistricting professionals. So,
2 you know, there's not the kinds of reporting functionality,
3 and so forth that you might look for when you're a
4 redistricting professional when you have, you know,
5 multiple reports already programmed and so forth. So, this
6 is a different level, most certainly, of software. So,
7 this is really for everybody across the board, but not
8 really for professionals who presumably can afford their
9 own software.

10 So, go ahead Jaime. Thank you. And then there's
11 -- so, there's the desktop software. So, this is our first
12 level of line drawing software. And this again available
13 to all, but it's not an ideal solution for everybody
14 because it's a little bit more difficult.

15 So, the desktop software is a QGIS plug-in. QGIS
16 is an open source software that anybody can download, and
17 this is a plug-in that we designed specifically for
18 California. It's desktop software. It's not online
19 software. You need a -- you know, you need to have a
20 moderate level of, you know, technology sophistication to
21 install it. Even though we're working on a very good and,
22 you know, very clear user guides which, you know, I want to
23 just say thank you to everybody who is beta testing all of
24 our stuff. And I'm sure that perhaps some of you will also
25 volunteer to do that, so thank you again.

1 There are some large data files that you have to
2 download. So, once you have it on your computer, then you
3 have to download data files. And, you know, just to remind
4 you all, California has a lot of geography. We have
5 530,000 something Census blocks. And so, when you're
6 downloading data it takes a minute. And it takes another
7 minute if you have a slow internet connection. So, then
8 you have to set it all up. And this one is not something
9 that you just probably -- that you probably don't do on the
10 fly, just when you have an hour. I think this is ideal for
11 more fixed locations like the access centers, libraries, so
12 library computers. A college, for example, you know,
13 community college GIS labs and so forth.

14 So, this is kind of an ideal package. It's free
15 to use. It is open source. It is designed for California
16 and, you know, what more can you ask for? I'm starting to
17 feel like I'm doing an infomercial, but it is pretty cool.

18 So, the next slide, please, Jaime. So, the
19 features are, so again it's called Draw My CA. It's
20 designed to facilitate access to California statewide
21 redistricting process. Free to use, built on open source
22 GIS software. You don't need a license. You can keep it
23 on your computer as long as you want to and no
24 salesperson's going to ask you to renew it. And, you know,
25 members of the public can download it to their PC and then

1 use at home.

2 And it allows people to submit their district
3 plans directly to you, again. So, there's this seamless
4 transfer that we see with the COI Tool also, where things
5 don't go sideways. They're not going to go to somebody
6 else. They basically just go to you. So that there's no
7 confusion and nobody, hopefully, will be standing there
8 ever and saying I submitted something and now you don't
9 have it, what happened. Because there's no third party
10 involved. You know, it just goes to you.

11 So, the plug-in is available in Spanish and
12 English. And as far as we know, this is the only software
13 that we have found that actually has language capabilities.
14 And again, this is a different user group. We are
15 anticipating fewer users but hopefully, many, many, many
16 more than we had last time and, hopefully, many, many more
17 maps.

18 And I think, Jaime, with the next slide I think
19 you're taking over. Is that correct?

20 MS. CLARK: Yes.

21 MS. MACDONALD: Okay, I will move it over to
22 Jaime. Thank you.

23 MS. CLARK: Thank you, Karin. And just one
24 moment, I'm like rearranging my screen. I'm there now.

25 So, we are going to provide sort of an overview

1 of how to use the Draw My CA tool. And also, we have a
2 video demonstration of the tool, itself. I'm going to sort
3 of jump into that now.

4 This slide details the overall user flow for Draw
5 My CA. So, users log in with the same credentials that
6 they use to log into the COI Tool, for example. From there
7 users can connect to the server or work offline. And we'll
8 go into what that exactly means in an upcoming slide.

9 And then, users create a district plan by type.
10 So, you know, users say I want to create my Congressional
11 District, I want to create an Assembly District, or a State
12 Senate plan for the entire State of California.

13 Through the tool, of course, users create and
14 edit their districts. Users will be able to write comments
15 about their districts. And then, again, submit their data
16 to the Commission.

17 So, when users sort of log in and connect to the
18 server, the reason we have a log in, and for this tool
19 unlike the COI Tool, users will need to log in. And that
20 is so that users can only see their own projects that
21 they're working on, whether or not they're working at home
22 or on a public computer.

23 And additionally, users can connect offline and
24 connect to the server later. So, working offline would
25 look like, okay, I'm going to create my plan. I'm just

1 going to work offline and then when I'm home, or when I'm
2 at an internet connection I can connect to the server and
3 submit once I'm somewhere where there is an internet
4 connection.

5 And additionally, when users connect to the
6 server they can create a plan on one computer, save their
7 work and then keep working on that plan from a different
8 computer. So, once scenario that this could work in is if
9 somebody goes into one of the redistricting access centers,
10 learns how to use the program, and then maybe even gets
11 help installing it on their laptop that maybe they have
12 with them. Then they can, you know, work from the access
13 site, save their work, upload it to the server, and then go
14 home and keep working on that exact same plan from their
15 personal computer that they have at home, should they wish
16 to.

17 And I'm going to hide this. Okay. So, this is
18 sort of a screen. You log on or decide to work offline.
19 And the next step in the process of creating your plan is
20 choosing the area that you want to work with. So, you
21 either can choose geography from their just one individual
22 county, or they could choose a group of counties,
23 neighboring counties, or they can work on a plan with the
24 entire state.

25 The next step is based on the type of district

1 the user would like to work with, the ideal population is
2 automatically calculated by the plug-in. So, users will
3 have everything that they need to be able to draw districts
4 that comply with the equal population criterion.

5 And users will either start with a blank map or
6 with the 2011 statewide districts. So, that means, you
7 know ow, starting fresh or if users want to load up the
8 current plans, the current districts pardon me, and sort of
9 have a really in-depth sense of okay, here's the 2011
10 districts, with the 2020 data loaded into the plan. And
11 can really see like, oh, okay, now ten years later this
12 district is too small in terms of population and it needs
13 to grow. Or, this district is too big in population and it
14 needs to, you know, shed some population. So, a user can
15 start with whatever option they prefer.

16 Users will have access to block level Census
17 data. And block level geography is going to be the exact
18 same database that the Commission is working with. So
19 again, access to California's official redistricting
20 database and this table. The image this year, on the right
21 side of the screen. The red area that's highlighted is one
22 Census block. And users can see all of the information,
23 all of the Census data that is associated with that one
24 Census block.

25 Again, users will be able to export and submit to

1 the Commission from inside the tool. Users who are
2 connected to the server, this is one thing you do need to
3 be connected to the server for, users can submit just one
4 district, or full district plans to the Commissioners. And
5 users will be able to export to their local computer that
6 they're working on, their own equivalency files, and shape
7 files, and PDFs. This is an example of a PDF. It just
8 shows, you know, one district, some of the statistics
9 associated with the district, their district comments. And
10 all of this will review in the demonstration video that we
11 have coming up shortly. Yeah, you know, district comments
12 and again, just sort of an image of the district itself.

13 And with that, I'm going to quit sharing my
14 screen and hand it over to Kristian, who has a copy of our
15 video.

16 AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: All right, let me
17 just wait a moment and we'll bring that up.

18 (Video is played)

19 MS. MACDONALD: Thank you, Kristian for showing
20 this video. And Jaime's going to pull up the PowerPoint
21 again. And I just wanted to give a shout out to our
22 colleague, Sarah, who expertly narrated this video. And
23 she's also the redistricting access center manager for
24 Sacramento. So, I hope all of you at some point will get
25 to meet Sarah in person. So, anyway, pretty excited about

1 this.

2 So, now we're going to move on to the next level
3 of access. So, our next redistricting access tool, number
4 three in the lineup is Draw My CA Districts. It's the
5 online tool. And Sarah spells Sarah exactly like that in
6 the chat. Sorry.

7 So, let me talk about the online tool just a
8 little bit and then I'll pass it back over to Jaime. I
9 just wanted to remind everybody that there are some pretty
10 unique challenges when you're talking about redistricting
11 access, redistricting software in California. And that is
12 really because we're a really big state and we have a lot
13 of people. We have a lot of Census geography.

14 So, any software product has to support an
15 incredible amount of data. And that data for an online
16 tool, of course, has to be sent over the web. So, also to
17 remember that we're drawing lines using block level
18 geography. So again, 530,000 of these. So, when you are
19 doing something that's strictly online, let's say you're
20 drawing an entire district and you're just adding one
21 block, the system computes all of the 530,000 blocks to add
22 that one or take one out. So that, of course, brings up
23 issues of bandwidth, and we have those anyway because,
24 obviously, there are quite a few people that don't have
25 access to the internet or don't have access to high speed

1 internet. Or, you know, maybe have to pay for certain
2 levels of use and start -- you know, not everybody has
3 unlimited access to high speed internet, obviously.

4 And the other issue that this of course raises
5 for any really online tool that anybody's looking at is how
6 long does this take? How long does it take for the little
7 wheel to be spinning for everything to be computed? And
8 some of that, you know, has to do with bandwidth, you know,
9 just the amount of bandwidth that you have available. But,
10 you know, it just has to do with the geographies and so
11 forth.

12 And then the other issue, of course, is the
13 number of potential users. Now, online redistricting
14 software is still pretty new and redistricting doesn't
15 happen often enough that anybody can actually say that they
16 really know what the use is going to be.

17 I spent quite some time throughout the decade
18 looking at jurisdictions that were using online tools and I
19 have to say the number of participants has always been
20 negligible. I mean there has just not been a lot of
21 takers.

22 And when you talk to people a lot of times what
23 they tell you is that it's just too difficult. It's just
24 really -- it's a pretty high level, you know, of entry. I
25 mean, the barrier of entry is pretty high.

1 And so, what we were trying to do with this
2 online tool, with Draw My CA District, is to seamlessly go
3 from the COI Tool to this particular tool and provide
4 something that is already familiar to people. In fact,
5 this tool draws a lot of its design and its functionality
6 from the COI Tool. And it also draws in from the QGIS
7 plug-in. So, essentially, you can think about it as the
8 two bookends. There is the COI Tool on one end and the
9 QGIS Tool is on the other end. So, you know, the least
10 technical knowledge needed for the COI Tool, and then the
11 most technical knowledge really needed for the QGIS Tool.
12 And then, this one is nicely in the middle.

13 And Jaime's going to show you a little bit about
14 it. So, take it away Jaime. Thank you.

15 MS. CLARK: Sure. Thank you, Karin.

16 So, again Draw My CA Districts, our online
17 redistricting tool is designed to facilitate public access
18 to California's statewide redistricting process. Again,
19 just like the COI Tool it's free to use. You don't need a
20 license or anything like that to be able to use this tool.
21 We are making it as user-friendly as possible and
22 accessible. It is, you know, as we are building out the
23 tool it's undergoing, you know, constant accessibility
24 audits.

25 Users can submit their district plans to the

1 Commission from inside the tool. So, again, no need to
2 download and email files, or any of your testimony to the
3 Commission.

4 Just like the COI Tool, online help will be
5 available through the chat function in this tool. The tool
6 will be available in Spanish and English.

7 And again, as Karin mentioned, it's going to be a
8 really familiar interface for users of Draw My CA
9 Community. So, it's not like learning a totally brand-new
10 tool, there is a lot of overlap. The look and feel is
11 really the same and the overall functionality is similar.
12 With, definitely, more functionality built into this tool.

13 So, the user flow for this tool, Draw My CA
14 Districts, users can log in with, again, the same
15 credentials across all of the tools. Or, users can use the
16 tool as a guest. The difference, of course, is being able
17 to save your district plans in Draw My -- yeah, save the
18 districts plans in Draw My CA Districts, where there's not
19 an opportunity to save your work and come back to it later
20 if you're using it as a guest.

21 Just like the QGIS plug-in, users create a
22 district plan by type. Through the tool users can create
23 districts and edit their districts they're working with.
24 And again at the end, when the user is happy with their
25 work, they can submit directly to the Redistricting

1 Commission.

2 So, and we have some animated slides here so you
3 can see some of the functionality inside the tool. Users
4 create districts based on the Census geography. The
5 drawing functionality is pretty similar to that of Draw My
6 CA Communities. The main difference is that users select
7 the area and then commit the change, just like in the QGIS
8 Tool.

9 And similar again to QGIS, in that plug-in we
10 have a statistics table that shows each district
11 population, voting age population and citizen voting age
12 population breakdowns by race and ethnicity.

13 Again, just like in the QGIS plug-in, the data
14 that's associated with each of the districts is available
15 through the statistics table. And also, users can use the
16 statistics table to, you know, consider whether or not
17 they'll make certain changes. Like, okay, what if I add
18 this area or this Census place to my district? Oh, I can
19 see that that's too many people, so I'm going to need to
20 sort of reframe how I'm working with this.

21 And again, this data is going to be -- is going
22 to be the official redistricting database for the State of
23 California, the same data that the Commission will be using
24 in its line drawing process.

25 Users will be able to provide written

1 descriptions of each of the districts that they're working
2 on, on a district-by-district basis. So, here's my first
3 district. District A I'm calling it. And my comments are
4 I'm creating this district to keep this area and this area
5 together, and that's plus around that.

6 There's also a section for written testimony,
7 where users can include overall commentary on their entire
8 redistricting plan. So, I created these Senate -- this is
9 my Senate plan and I created my Senate districts to keep
10 rural areas and metropolitan areas as separate as possible
11 where I could.

12 And users will be able to export and submit,
13 really similar to the COI Tool. Users can create single
14 districts or full redistricting plans through the tool and
15 submit that to the Commission, from inside the tool. File
16 types available for export to the user's local computer are
17 the same as the COI Tool. It's the equivalency file, which
18 is a Census block assignment file, a shape file which is a
19 GIS layer, and a PDF. It could be a PDF of their single
20 district, if they're doing one district, or a PDF of each
21 district in their redistricting plan.

22 I'm going to hand it back to Karin for this one.

23 MS. MACDONALD: Thank you, Jaime. Thank you.

24 So, again just to summarize, the approach here is that
25 there are multiple options for access. There are centers

1 that are offering in-person and remote support. Not all of
2 our remote people are going to be located in the centers.
3 We also have remote/remote people. So, we're still hiring,
4 we're still in the process of hiring and adding people to
5 the team. We're pretty happy with where we're at right
6 now.

7 And then, you know, QGIS can be used by people
8 where, you know, getting to a center might be impractical.
9 It's just too far away. Or, you know, people just don't
10 have time when the centers are open. So, if there is, you
11 know, a PC available, they have a PC, they can download
12 this and then they can just create their districts on their
13 own time. Again, the support is available irrespective of
14 whether you're in the redistricting access center or not.

15 And then, the online tool is available anywhere
16 people can go online. And that may be in the center, that
17 may be on their computer, or for people that just want to
18 do a little bit more extensive work, they would probably be
19 using the QGIS.

20 The timeline. Of course, the COI Tool was, you
21 know, released March 2nd, 2021. The centers are going to
22 open depending on public health directives. But, you know,
23 there is obviously light at the end of the tunnel, it
24 appears. And then, the line drawing software, right now we
25 are working towards a release date at the same as the

1 redistricting data, the official redistricting database
2 comes out. So, we would load it in and then release the
3 line drawing software at the same time.

4 We will be using -- we will be looking for beta
5 testers, so please let us know if you're up for beta
6 testing. We would really appreciate your input.

7 The Statewide Database's role, as you know, is
8 really the same as with the COI Tool. We will transfer and
9 then just transmit the data securely to you. And we will
10 be providing user support through our team.

11 And analysis and application is, of course, your
12 job. And we will just send you the files over so you can
13 do that job.

14 For future discussion there are probably a lot of
15 things that we'll need to talk about and we're looking
16 forward to it. Like things like are partial plans
17 accepted? And, you know, what do we do about support
18 materials for your outreach. You know, can we collaborate
19 on that? What would you like to see from us? Is there any
20 other way that we can help you? And what else should we
21 talk about? I'm sure -- I mean, this was a pretty dense
22 presentation here, so I'm sure you have a lot of thoughts
23 and we're happy to come back. You know where we live. And
24 we, you know, look forward to this ongoing collaboration.

25 So, thank you very much. And with that, I think,

1 Jaime, we are on to questions. Thanks for your time. And
2 thanks, Kristian for showing this video. And also, one
3 more shout out to our colleague, Marinella, who helped us
4 with the animated sides, and was the UX designer on these
5 tools. And just wanted to say thank you to Marinella,
6 also.

7 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay, wow. Thank you
8 for that. That was great to have that expanded
9 presentation. And I want to see if any of the
10 Commissioners have any questions, comments?

11 Karin, I'm hoping that you'll also be sharing the
12 presentation. I feel like, I know for me I feel like I
13 need to take it and just kind of relook at it and digest it
14 as well, too.

15 Okay, Commissioner Turner?

16 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Uh-hum, Jaime and Karin,
17 thank you for the presentation. Very interesting and
18 exciting, I think.

19 You may have said this, but wondering in a couple
20 of the applications where you're actually supposed to log
21 in and save, you said that we can then print out and use
22 the information. Are you able to see what others have
23 submitted and download -- okay, I see no. That's what I
24 thought. Okay, thank you.

25 MS. MACDONALD: Commissioner Turner, you can -- I

1 think that's on your end how you want to make that
2 available. Statewide Database and we're not going to make
3 that available. We feel like that is up to you what you
4 make available and how you make that available. But we're,
5 of course, happy to work with you.

6 MS. CLARK: Yeah, and just to add to that a
7 little bit. Thanks Karin, and thank you Commissioner
8 Turner for that question.

9 So, for example, should the Commission make all
10 of the shape files available that are submitted through the
11 COI Tool, then a member of the public could download those
12 and then import all of those into their plan in QGIS. So,
13 QGIS is a full GIS software. And our plug-in was built
14 sort of with the framework of that software. But, you
15 know, QGIS itself is really the backbone of the software,
16 or of the plug-in, rather. It's like the foundation upon
17 which the plug-in is resting. And because it has full GIS
18 capabilities users could definitely -- or members of the
19 public should download the shape files, should the
20 Commission make those publicly available, and then import
21 those into QGIS and use the plug-in, use those when they're
22 creating their districts through the plug-in.

23 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

24 CHAIR AHMAD: Oh, Commissioner Yee?

25 VICE CHAIR YEE: Thank you. Thank you, Jaime and

1 Karin. Wow, what an amazing array of tools. I have two
2 questions, basically.

3 One is, you know, it's so much functionality,
4 wow. I mean, as we sit here and think about it, it all
5 makes sense. But I could see how the public would be
6 pretty overwhelmed. I mean just explaining the COI Tool,
7 let alone these other two tools.

8 I'm wondering what our expectation is,
9 optimistically, but realistically, on how these will
10 actually get used, you know? You know, plus the access
11 centers. You know, and as the Legislature funded these
12 efforts, you know, what were their expectations on how much
13 they'll be used and in what form, and in what fashion. So,
14 that was the first question.

15 The question is, well, how about us, then, as
16 Commissioners, you know? As we get into the drafting phase
17 and so on I mean are these tools that we should be good at,
18 you know, and really learn for ourselves? Are there other
19 tools you expect us to be using at that point or is it
20 really option for us as Commissioners because you guys will
21 be doing the line drawing, you know? What would be a good
22 expectation for ourselves in regards to these tools?

23 MS. MACDONALD: Yeah, thank you for those
24 questions and maybe I'll take the second question first, if
25 that's okay. So, just to be clear, Statewide Database will

1 not be line drawing. And I think that with respect to what
2 you should be learning or what do you want to learn, I
3 think perhaps a conversation with our counsel might be in
4 order on that, you know.

5 But these are public tools and that's the way
6 they've been designed. And really, I'm just going to pitch
7 this one more time, if anybody here in this group would
8 like to beta test that will be fantastic. We would love
9 your collaboration and see your -- you know, get your
10 feedback.

11 With respect to the first question, it is
12 definitely not for everybody. And, you know, GIS software
13 is not the easiest. I mean, you know, even just thinking
14 about Jaime and I were formatting the PowerPoint earlier,
15 you know, and there were a couple of page numbers missing.
16 I mean, I think we've all been there. You know, software
17 and doing anything with any kind of sophisticated software,
18 it takes a little time to come up to speed.

19 But having said that, Jaime and I have spent over
20 two years looking at software packages that are out there.
21 And looked at line drawing software. We looked at just
22 anything that we could get our hands on and tried to figure
23 out what's easy and what's not.

24 And, of course, everybody says that it's easy,
25 but it isn't. And let's not fool ourselves. I mean it

1 isn't easy. But what we found is that most of the
2 redistricting software, in particular that's out there, is
3 very much geared to the most frequent users, which are
4 people that are, you know, drawing political districts.
5 So, that goes again toward that whole like California is
6 unique because we have different criteria. We do things
7 differently than most people, right.

8 So, that was one thing that was like why are all
9 these functionalities in there? Why are we constantly
10 looking at, what is it, donkeys and -- was it donkeys and
11 elephants? Anyway, various, various animals on there.
12 And, you know, while that's kind of cute, it's just not how
13 we draw lines.

14 So, we looked at why are there all these bells
15 and whistles if they're not applicable to California? Why
16 are there, you know, all these compactness measures in
17 there if the California -- when the California Constitution
18 is very specific about what compactness measure -- what the
19 compactness measure is for California. And that
20 compactness measure is not in there.

21 So, what we set out to do, once we started with
22 the COI Tool, was essentially to make things as easy as
23 possible by not adding things that people don't need. So,
24 there is not as much functionality in there as you will see
25 with other software. And that is specifically geared or

1 designed that way because we don't want to confuse people.
2 We feel like if we provide the essentials and we provide
3 those essentials well, we will be able to get more people
4 to use these tools and get more people to participate.

5 With respect to the level, you know, like the
6 user -- like how many users are going to be using the -- or
7 utilizing the redistricting access site, I don't know that
8 there was a specific expectation. I think our expectation
9 -- our expectations, at Statewide Database, was that we
10 would be able to meet the same level of access. So, we
11 looked more at it from the access perspective to just make
12 it possible for people to participate, if they want to.

13 And, you know, the Legislature was incredibly
14 open to our suggestions. And in fact, you know, when the
15 funds were transferred to Statewide Database it was before
16 COVID so we had, you know, higher expectations of perhaps
17 more sites. And, you know, we basically just said, hey, if
18 we get a good Commission and we get people that really do,
19 you know, help us, and collaborate with us, and do
20 outreach, then we will get more people to go to these
21 sites.

22 And then, of course, with COVID and so forth it
23 just turned into a little bit of a broader project by
24 saying, okay, well, if we never are able to open these
25 sites then, you know, how do we catch people? What do we

1 do?

2 And, you know, the online tool versus the QGIS
3 tool came in at that point where we said, okay, the online
4 tool is going to be the easiest, quote/unquote, to use
5 while still not super easy because it's still GIS software
6 and it has to be learned. But QGIS is for more
7 sophisticated users that perhaps want to spend more time,
8 have more time, and want to do more complicated things and
9 perhaps submit more than one district, more than one plan.

10 So, I'm sorry, Commissioner Yee, I don't really
11 have any numbers for you of expectations. I think my
12 expectation would be to make it as easy as possible in this
13 very complicated field to open the door to anybody who
14 wants to participate and to have a robust, you know,
15 support network in place that will help people that get
16 stuck somewhere along the line.

17 So, I hope that answers our questions.

18 VICE CHAIR YEE: That's fine.

19 MS. MACDONALD: And I'm very happy to be talking
20 about this.

21 VICE CHAIR YEE: It does, thank you.

22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. And I see
23 Commissioner Sinay and then Commissioner Turner.

24 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Commissioner
25 Akutagawa. Thank you, Karin and Jamie for the

1 presentation. As Commissioner Akutagawa says, it's going
2 to take a little bit of time to soak in all the different
3 pieces.

4 But as I was watching the presentation and this
5 is the same question I've had with the COI Tool, and these
6 may be questions for 2030, but how do we -- how do other
7 redistricting efforts, how are these tools -- how can these
8 tools be used by other redistricting efforts in California?
9 You know, the cities, and county efforts, and school boards
10 they don't -- they're not putting in as much resources, but
11 the community does want to be able to use some of that.

12 So, what thoughts do you all have about how the
13 community can use this for, you know, the local
14 redistricting efforts?

15 MS. CLARK: Thank you for your question. The
16 answer is definitely not as simple as with the COI Tool,
17 where you can export your files and then email them to the
18 appropriate place. These tools really were geared towards
19 the statewide process. There's not going to be a way to
20 say, you know, here's my ideal -- here's my ideal
21 population per district. I'm going to plug that in and
22 then magic is going to happen where, you know, it's
23 certainly not quite that simple. I suppose that an
24 enterprising person could say, okay, I know what my ideal
25 population is. I know what my geography is. And I'm going

1 to do my best with these tools to make districts that meet
2 that ideal population, and export my files, and send those
3 in that way. But, you know, it's certainly not as simple
4 as with the COI Tool.

5 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thanks Commissioner. I
6 think it was Commissioner Turner that was next, and then
7 Commissioner Andersen.

8 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes, thank you. I wanted
9 to just ask how are you, as the Statewide Database, how are
10 you marketing these tools so the communities even know that
11 they do exist, all of the different components?

12 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Well, so far -- thank you
13 for that question, Commissioner Turner. So far, we haven't
14 marketed them at all. You are the first people to find out
15 about them. You know, aside from our beta testers who have
16 been working behind the scenes on them. So, this is our,
17 you know, public reveal so to speak.

18 And we will put notifications onto the Statewide
19 Database website. Of course, we're hoping again to talk,
20 to collaborate with the various groups that were
21 collaborating with us when we first came out with the COI
22 Tool. And, of course, with you.

23 So, you know, we'll tell everybody we talk to
24 about these tools. In particular, you know, as we move
25 forward with developing them, and they're set, and people

1 have tested them, and we will do what we can. But we'll
2 heavily rely on you and your, you know, outreach
3 mechanisms, and we will support you as much as we can. But
4 then, also, through the access sites of course. You know,
5 there will definitely be something there, also.

6 COMMISSIONER TURNER: And yeah, Karin, I'd love
7 to beta test.

8 MS. MACDONALD: Oh, great. We will be in touch.

9 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I know that Commissioner
10 is next, followed by Director Kaplan. I also want to just
11 note that we are going to be due for a break in ten
12 minutes.

13 Also, Karin, before Commissioner Andersen speaks
14 can I just mention, I thought I saw something about the
15 tool will go live at the end of September or late
16 September. Is that true?

17 MS. MACDONALD: Yeah, so that's our development
18 deadline right now. Because, remember that these tools
19 they rely on data, right. So, and since we have to use
20 official redistricting data, essentially we need to load
21 something in and right now there's nothing there. So, our
22 -- you know, our focus has been on making sure the COI Tool
23 is in really good shape, then move on to the QGIS Tool and
24 then, you know, use the code from both of these to do the
25 online tool. So, that's just basically our development

1 timeline. And happy to continue to update you on how
2 that's going and, you know, talk about these things.

3 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I just wanted to
4 ask because Commissioner Turner's question about marketing
5 is not something that you can market just yet, then,
6 because you're still developing it.

7 MS. MACDONALD: Right, so I do -- I do feel like,
8 you know, Commissioner Turner's point is really well taken
9 because just letting people know that this is coming is
10 going to be very important. Because otherwise people get
11 stressed out. They're like is there going to be anything?
12 You know, how am I going to be able to participate? And
13 just letting them know it's there and perhaps just provide
14 updates to you on a regular basis might be a really good
15 thing because you're getting more coverage, also, as people
16 are starting to check into the redistricting process. So,
17 I think that's going to be very important.

18 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, and my thought is
19 that the people who will most likely be interested will be
20 the ones who are watching us.

21 Let me go to Commissioner Andersen, then Director
22 Kaplan, then back to Commissioner Turner, and then I think
23 we will be at break.

24 Commissioner Andersen?

25 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you for a very

1 interesting presentation, much more than I was expecting.
2 I was expecting this to be about the centers, the access,
3 and the COI Tool. Had no idea that this redistricting tool
4 is being presented today. So, there's a lot of issues to
5 be discussed with that one. Coordination, criteria,
6 training. Let's start on the easy stuff and I won't even
7 get into some of it.

8 The centers. Do we have any idea of how many and
9 where they are. And then, yeah, you know, on the staffing
10 and when are those going to be open?

11 MS. CLARK: Yeah, thank you for your question.
12 There are going to be six centers and they will be located
13 in Sacramento, Oakland, Fresno, Long Beach, San Diego, and
14 San Bernardino. And we will be opening them, you know, as
15 possible based on public health guidelines. We have, you
16 know, active -- we're calling our old site managers and
17 just in general our redistricting access support team. We
18 have, you know, a number of people already hired and we are
19 continuing to hire for these roles.

20 As Karin mentioned, you know, it's not quite as
21 easy as if we were a private organization and could
22 immediately put out a job description and hire. There are
23 a lot of steps. We are in a hiring freeze and we're having
24 to get exemptions for every single hire. And then, there
25 are a lot of official processes that we follow.

1 And, you know, we have a number of people hired.
2 We are also in the process of interviewing others. We have
3 some really great candidates. And also, everybody that
4 we've hired so far is amazing.

5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Great. And just a --
6 then the COI Tool, obviously we're -- this is going to be
7 supported at these access centers, and that information has
8 been greatly coordinated with the Commission. We
9 understand how we're handling all this stuff.

10 Coordinating a redistricting tool, though, are
11 you already envisioning what committee or is this also
12 going through the COI Tool? Do you want us to create a new
13 -- a subcommittee to deal specifically with the mapping
14 input? You know, obviously we need -- there's a line
15 drawing component, there's a data management component.

16 So, how soon can we start coordinating with you
17 on this?

18 MS. MACDONALD: I think any time, it's up to you.
19 Again, we're in development on both of the tools. So, you
20 know, as you organize ourselves, whatever works for you is
21 going to work for us.

22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Great, just want to make
23 sure that we're on track for our break.

24 Director Kaplan, and then Commissioner Turner,
25 and it looks like Commissioner Fornaciari.

1 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Thank you. I'll just
2 be quick. Thank you again for the presentation. And just
3 to echo some of the comments that have been discussed, and
4 the offer that you made about communications materials, you
5 know, I think staff will want to work with you on, and with
6 the Commissioners on how we can message this and provide,
7 you know, as much information to the field staff, also, as
8 they're out in the field that they're communicating these
9 resources and directing folks.

10 Also, I had more like a longer general question,
11 I think for the Commission, and for Karin and Jamie. For
12 when the Commission comes out with draft maps is it this
13 Draw My CA Districts Tool would then be what people would
14 utilized to provide feedback on draft maps, or maybe this
15 is for another discussion. But I think it's helpful. I
16 know we're now just in the COI input phase, and thinking a
17 little bit further along on this I think is helpful.

18 MS. MACDONALD: Yeah, and thank you for that
19 question. I think once the draft maps come out we can move
20 them as a geography into the tool, so people can see what
21 the draft maps look like. And then, they can either -- you
22 know, they can evaluate them for themselves, they can make
23 changes, and then submit a map with their changes, and then
24 also with their comments in both tools. So, that can be
25 done over either one of them.

1 And I just kind of wanted to say something about
2 the comments section. That's actually a really important
3 one because you may get a -- somebody, you know, gives you
4 a couple of districts and they're very well-drawn
5 districts, and you don't really know what they were trying
6 to accomplish. So, you're looking at these districts that
7 somebody spent a lot of time and you can't perhaps use the
8 exact districts, but you might be able to accomplish
9 something that is very close to what the submitter wanted
10 to do. So, if they put into the -- it into the comments,
11 I'm submitting these districts because they're keeping XY&Z
12 communities together. But then, I also have to equally
13 populate these districts, so I just added this and this and
14 this, then you know why it was drawn that way. And you
15 might be able to just accomplish the essence of the
16 district in your district. So, that's why that piece is
17 also important.

18 And I just thought I'll flag that because you
19 asked, you know, how do people provide feedback and I think
20 that's the way to do it. So, I hope that made sense.

21 OUTREACH DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Yeah.

22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay, thank you very
23 much. Commissioner Turner said she will pass. And let's
24 go to Commissioner Fornaciari and then we will be turning
25 it back over to Chair Ahmad for a break.

1 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Just in consideration
2 of our break, I'll just quickly volunteer to test and we
3 can talk about my other questions then, thanks.

4 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Not seeing any
5 other comments, Chair Ahmad turning it back over to you.
6 Thank you. You're on mute.

7 CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you, Jaime and Karin for this
8 presentation and to the COI Tool Subcommittee for putting
9 this together for us.

10 As we heard this is, you know, very early in the
11 process so we have lots of time to provide our feedback and
12 to get organized around utilizing these tools.

13 But as of right now we do have a break until
14 3:30, and we will be joining in Closed Session at 3:30.
15 And you all should have gotten that link. So, see you all
16 at 3:30.

17 (Off the record at 3:16 p.m.)

18 (Closed Session at 3:30 p.m.)

19 (Public Session resumed at 4:21 p.m.)

20 CHAIR AHMAD: Welcome back everyone. We just
21 popped out of a Closed Session. And I would like to report
22 that we met in Closes Session regarding data and
23 cybersecurity issues and no action was taken.

24 With that, we have about 9 minutes left with our
25 team, so I just wanted to do a quick overview of the agenda

1 for tomorrow. Tomorrow is going to be motion Tuesday,
2 because we have quite a few items on our agenda that
3 require some motions. So, I will review them now.

4 So, Item 9-A, the Government Affairs
5 Subcommittee. Item 9-B, Finance and Administration. Item
6 9-E, Outreach and Engagement. Item 9-H, the Website
7 Subcommittee. Item 9-J, the Grant/Contracting
8 Subcommittee.

9 And then, we still have to hear from the item
10 under Item 10, which is the Legal Affairs Subcommittee.
11 Item 12, which is the Line Drawer Updates Subcommittee.

12 And I would also like to emphasize that we do
13 have a presentation, a COI input -- a Communities of
14 Interest input dry run starting at 1:30 tomorrow. There
15 are quite a few number of items to make motions on and
16 approve for that session. And I would prioritize that
17 before going out to the subcommittees because of the fact
18 that we have to post the agenda very quickly.

19 So, I'm hoping we can get through all of those
20 items tomorrow. But before we close is there any other
21 items that I'm missing that m colleagues would like to
22 raise at this time?

23 Yes, Commissioner Fernandez and then Andersen.

24 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I was just alerted
25 that we may need to take a motion on the paper COI in terms

1 of having it translated into all the languages. But I'm
2 not sure if we can have -- hopefully, a quick discussion on
3 that tomorrow.

4 CHAIR AHMAD: And that's for Materials
5 Development, correct. Okay.

6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, 9-G, sorry.

7 CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Andersen?

8 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I was just
9 wondering, you know, in terms of the -- we have copies of
10 virtually everything except for on 9-E. What are we -- a
11 motion? Is there a document, a handout that should be --
12 that goes to that item? 9-E was just Outreach and
13 Engagement.

14 CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Sinay and/or
15 Fornaciari, do you all have --

16 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, there wasn't a
17 document. We were just going to talk about the --

18 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Anything else the public
19 education and going into phase 2, and so it's just a quick
20 and easy one, really.

21 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.

22 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.

23 CHAIR AHMAD: Yes, Commissioner Sinay?

24 COMMISSIONER SINAY: On the COI paper tool, are
25 we going to discuss it? Because there is a second half of

1 it that we haven't had a conversation on.

2 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: We can discuss it, but
3 we really need to try to finalize that and move forward.
4 But yeah, of course. There's a handout, so if everyone can
5 take a look at that tonight that would be great. Thank
6 you.

7 CHAIR AHMAD: Great. And then, just another
8 reminder tomorrow's meeting starts at 1:00 p.m., not the
9 usual 9:30 a.m.

10 With that --

11 LEGAL COUNSEL JOHNSTON: Public comment.

12 CHAIR AHMAD: Yes, public comment.

13 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: All right, we end our
14 day. In order to maximize transparency and public
15 participation in our process, the Commissioners will be
16 taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the
17 telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is
18 877-853-5247. When prompted, enter the meeting ID number
19 provided on the livestream feed. It is 92638886526 for
20 this meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID,
21 simply press the pound key.

22 Once you have dialed in you'll be placed in a
23 queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press *9.
24 This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it is
25 your turn to speak you will hear a message that says the

1 host would like you to talk, and to press *6 to speak. If
2 you would like to give your name, please state and spell it
3 for the record. You are not required to provide your name
4 to give public comment.

5 Please make sure to mute your computer or
6 livestream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion
7 during your call. Once you are waiting in the queue, be
8 alert for when it is your turn to speak. And again, please
9 turn down the livestream volume.

10 And we do not have anyone in the queue at this
11 time.

12 CHAIR AHMAD: We can budget a couple minutes.

13 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And we do have someone
14 in the queue with their hand raised. And go ahead, the
15 floor is yours.

16 MS. SHELLENBERGER: Good afternoon, this is Lori,
17 L-O-R-I, Shellenberger, S-H-E-L-L-E-N-B-E-R-G-E-R. I'm the
18 Redistricting Consultant for Common Cause. Good afternoon
19 Chair Ahmad and Commissioner.

20 I'm calling regard the draft policies on your
21 subcommittees and third-party communications. First, I'd
22 like to acknowledge that some of the hot water you got into
23 was from an information sharing meeting that Common Cause
24 did participate in. And looking back, and given Common
25 Cause is a champion of transparency, we probably could have

1 brainstormed an approach with you that would have furthered
2 your information on an urgent matter and then consistent
3 with your subcommittee and third-party communication
4 policies, but that would have avoided the blow back that
5 resulted.

6 So, on that note we'd like to put forth an idea
7 we think would maximize transparency and minimize the
8 likelihood of after-the-fact allegations about third-party
9 communications.

10 But first, I'd like to commend you on the
11 radically inclusive approach you've used to inform your
12 planning and implementation of your unique 2021
13 redistricting process. We echo the legal and voter support
14 for the policies that have facilitated that, which you
15 adopted after thoughtful discussion and consultation with
16 your counsel.

17 Even more importantly, we appreciate the way in
18 which you've followed those policies and diligently
19 reported out the content of the subcommittee work and the
20 information gathering you've done.

21 As a party to some of those communications, I
22 feel they were reported out thoroughly and accurately.

23 However, even though those conversations don't
24 involve district lines, talking about other subjects behind
25 closed doors still gives some members of the public pause.

1 And their concern is genuine and it's fair. Setting aside,
2 you know, the conspiracy theories and nefarious intent and
3 bad faith accusations others, including former
4 Commissioners, and independent Commission proponents are
5 raising concerns that details of nonpublic conversations
6 could be unintentionally left out, or subtle dynamics could
7 somehow influence a Commissioner.

8 So, we're recommending that you adhere to your
9 policies, but consider recording and posting all
10 conversations within third parties within a certain time
11 period, 24, 48 hours. I'm not sure what works for your
12 staff, of course, and the logistics there.

13 But we, and those who have followed your work
14 closely over the last several months know that you are 100
15 percent aboveboard, and we're incredibly grateful to see a
16 Commission so committed to the broad outreach and inclusion
17 that you've pursued so far.

18 But by taking -- but if you take these extra
19 steps of recording and posting third-party conversations,
20 then anyone would be able to watch, provide public comments
21 --

22 AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: 15 seconds.

23 MS. SHELLENBERGER: -- related to the
24 conversations, or offer up their expertise, or ask for
25 their own meeting. We hope you'll consider incorporating

1 this into your policies and that you regularly explain
2 those policies to the public --

3 AV TECHNICAL DIRECTOR MANOFF: 2 minutes.

4 MS. SHELLENBERGER: -- just to avoid future
5 criticism. Thank you for your time.

6 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And thank you. And we
7 do have one other caller. Please go ahead.

8 MS. WESTA-LUSK: Hello, this is Renee Westa-Lusk.
9 I just had some questions because I haven't been able to
10 watch the meeting, all the meeting. Will the public -- my
11 first question is will the public input meetings after June
12 14th be in person or will they be in -- well, in virtual
13 form? I know you said the two statewide public input
14 meetings would both be virtual, I assume. But what happens
15 about the ones when you're in the different regions?

16 And then, the second question I have, do persons
17 wanting to give public input at the statewide public
18 meetings, or the other regional meetings, will they have to
19 make appointments in order to get a slot to speak? And
20 those are my questions. thank you.

21 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. And those
22 are all our callers at this time.

23 CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you.

24 LEGAL COUNSEL JOHNSTON: Let me answer the first
25 question, which is the answer is we're waiting for a

1 direction from the Governor. And he's supposed to make an
2 announcement before June 15th as to what the post-COVID
3 rules are going to be. And until we get that information,
4 we don't know what the Commission will be allowed to do as
5 far as actual public meetings.

6 CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you. And with that, we don't
7 have any more public callers at this time. We will go into
8 recess until tomorrow at 1:00 p.m. Thank you, everyone.

9 (Thereupon, the Citizens Redistricting
10 Commission meeting recessed at 4:32 p.m.)

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

REPORTER' S CERTIFICATE

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 reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter 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.

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