STATE OF CALIFORNIA CALIFORNIA STATE AUDITOR'S OFFICE (CSA)

In the matter of:

2020 CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION (CRC)
Public Meeting of the First Eight Commissioners

721 Capitol Mall, Suite 260 Sacramento, California 95814

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 5, 2020 9:30 A.M.

Reported by Peter Petty

APPEARANCES

COMMISSIONERS:

Jane Andersen, Temporary Chair

Trena Turner, Temporary Vice Chair

Isra Ahmad

Neal Fornaciari

J. Ray Kennedy

Antonio Le Mons

Sara Sadhwani

Derric Taylor

STAFF

Amanda Saxton, Counsel

Shauna Pellman, Auditor Specialist II Acting as Secretary

ALSO PRESENT:

AT&T Operator

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Jaqueline Coto, League of Women Voters

Tammy Tran

Esperanza Guevara, CHIRLA

Mary Anne Foo, Orange County Asian and Pacific Islander Community Alliance (Ocapica)

APPEARANCES (CONT.)

PUBLIC COMMENT:

Tami Bui, California State University Fullerton

Lori Shellenberger, California Common Cause

Julia Marks, Asian Americans Advancing Justice

Kelsey Brewer

Alejandra Ponce de Leon, Advancement Project California

Joseph Williams

James Woodson

Michael Latner

Christopher Sanchez, CHIRLA Sacramento

Julie Tran

Rene Reed

Julia Gomez, ACLU

Elizabeth Alcantar, City of Cudahy

Samuel Molina, Mi Familia Vota

Oralia Rebollo, City of Commerce

Scott McCarty

Manjusha Kulkarni, APPCON

Denise Diaz, City of South Gate

Miguel Canales, City of Artesia

Eddie De La Riva, City of Maywood

	INDEX	
		PAGE
1.	Call to order and roll call	6
2.	Approval of minutes from July 21, 2020, meeting of the first eight Commissioners of the Citizens Redistricting Commission	
3.	Announcements	
4.	Report of counsel. Amanda Saxton, counsel to the first eight Commissioners, will report on activities in support of the Commission, regarding matters relating to administrative support and additional information regarding remaining applicants	
5.	Discussion, deliberation, and action to select the final six members of the Commission, including the following: a. Legal guidance from counsel regarding the selection of the final six commissioners b. Discussion and deliberation about the process for selecting the final six commissioners, including receiving public comment and obtaining additional information from and about the applicants c. Discussion and deliberation regarding the qualities that the first eight commissioners are seeking in the final six commissioners d. Proposal, discussion, deliberation, and voting on one or more slates of six commissioners. e. Adoption of the slate of the final six commissioners	7
6.	Introduction of temporary 2020 Commission staff	

	<pre>INDEX (Cont'd.)</pre>	
		PAGE
7.	Litigation update (informational only). Marian M. Johnston, retired annuitant and 2010 Citizens Redistricting Commission counsel, will update the first eight commissioners on Legislature v.Padilla , S262530	
8.	Public comment on items not on the agenda	
9.	Adjournment	

PROCEEDINGS 1 2 9:30 a.m. 3 CHAIR ANDERSEN: I'll call this meeting out of 4 recess and back to order. 5 Secretary, could you please call roll. 6 MS. PELLMAN: Yes. 7 Commissioner Ahmad. 8 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here. 9 MS. PELLMAN: Chair Andersen. 10 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Here. 11 MS. PELLMAN: Commissioner Fornaciari. 12 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here. 13 MS. PELLMAN: Commissioner Kennedy. 14 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here. 15 MS. PELLMAN: Commissioner Le Mons. COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here. 16 17 MS. PELLMAN: Commissioner Sadhwani. 18 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here. 19 MS. PELLMAN: Commissioner Taylor. 20 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Present. 21 MS. PELLMAN: Commissioner Turner. 22 VICE CHAIR TURNER: Here. 23 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. 24 I see we have a quorum, so we can proceed with 25 our items of business.

For the public, we were in the middle of Item 5 on our agenda, which is discussing, deliberating, and acting, creating our final six members of the Commission, and before we jump into that, we do want to at this time open up the phone lines for public comments, and at this time, I would like the counsel to read the instructions on how to call in.

MS. SAXTON: Thank you, Madame Chair.

If you would like to make public comment regarding Agenda Item 5, discussion, deliberation, and action to select the final six members of the Commission, please call now by dialing (844) 291-5495.

In the next few moments, we'll begin taking public comment, and that number, again, is (844) 291-5495. After dialing the number, you will speak to an operator. You'll be asked to provide either the access code for the meeting, which is 8121803, or the name of the meeting, which is CRC Selection Meeting.

After providing this information, the operator will ask you to provide your name. Please note that you're not required to provide your actual name. When the operator asks for a name, you may provide a name other than your own. When it's your turn to make public comment, the operator will introduce you by the name you provided.

Please be assured the office is not maintaining any list of

callers by name. We ask for you to provide some name to enable the operator to manage multiple calls simultaneously and let you know when it's your turn to speak.

After speaking with the operator, you will be placed in a listening room. In this room, you'll be able to listen to live audio of the meeting. Please mute your computer audio, because the online video and audio will be delayed by approximately 60 seconds and feedback issues may occur, making it difficult for anyone to hear your comment. Also, please do not use a speakerphone, and speak directly into your phone.

When you decide that you want to make a comment about an action item on the agenda, press one, zero. Again, while in the listening room, when you decide that you want to make a comment about an action item on the agenda, press one, zero, and then you'll be placed in the queue to make public comment about that action item.

After joining the queue to make a public comment, you should hear an automatic recording informing you that you've been placed in the queue. When it's your turn, the operator will introduce you. At that time, please state and spell your name for the transcriptionist, and state your comment clearly and concisely.

Comments will be limited to two minutes. You will hear a time check when 15 seconds in your time

remains. After you finish making your comment, we'll move on to the next caller. At that point, please hang up your phone.

If you'd like to comment on another agenda item at a later time, please call back when we open up public comment for that item and repeat this process.

If you are disconnected for any reason, please call back and explain the issue to the operator. Then repeat the process, and rejoin the public comment queue by pressing one, zero.

These instructions can also be found on our website.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Counsel.

So, AT&T operator, do we happen to have anyone on the line at this time?

AT&T OPERATOR: We do have one for comment, and this is going to be the line of Jacqueline Coto.

Go ahead.

MS. COTO: Good morning. Hi, everybody. My name is Jacqueline Coto, from the National Association of Latino and Appointed Elected Officials (sic), NALEO Educational Fund.

First of all, I would like to thank you for your serious consideration that you've given so far to all the Latino candidates that are in the pool for consideration,

and I would like to express that I still continue to deliberate in the process.

I urge you to continue to support having a strong Latino representation in each pool, to ensure the Commission fully reflects the diversity of the state's Latino population, and, again, thank you. Thank you for your public service and for your time in this process. Have a great day.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Do we have any additional people in the queue? $\mbox{AT\&T OPERATOR:} \ \ \mbox{No additional in the queue at this time.}$

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Well, we will wait just a couple of minutes before we jump into everything, to give people a chance to call in, so we can stand down for a couple of minutes.

Seeing that two minutes have gone by, AT&T operator, do we have any people on the line?

AT&T OPERATOR: No one else has dialed in for public comment.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you very much.

Seeing no other people on the line at this time,
I say we should propose that we go ahead and continue our
business, starting with yesterday. Just in summary, we
ended yesterday with sort of discussions, deliberations,

with the reducing of our pool down to a number of four Democrats, five Republicans, and four nonaffiliated people.

At this time, does any of the Commissioners have any additions or, you know, strong, you know, changes in that grouping before we proceed?

(No response.)

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Seeing no comment, then I open up the general discussion for how we would like to move forward.

Okay. Commissioner Le Mons, thanks for stepping up.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Good morning, everyone.

Based on our discussions yesterday, and the list that the

Chairperson just read, I took the opportunity to go back

and look at all of the individuals that we have on that

list, and think about it in the context of our discussions

as well, as it relates to skills, et cetera, and actually

put together a few slate options that I'm prepared to offer

up at the appropriate time this morning. So I'll stop

there.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much.

That's obviously where we will want to go, and should we discuss the idea? Should we come up with at this point, say, a couple of different -- you know, talk about a couple of different slates at this point. You know, having

discussed and looked at people, are there any sort of changes to what we wanted to add, or should we go ahead and actually come up with a couple of slates?

Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Good morning, Madame Chair, fellow Commissioners.

Looking at the list, the narrowed list, as it currently stands, one of my concerns, and I think I voiced this at one point yesterday in a broader sense, but we've really -- I mean, the four Democrats are from Southern California.

All but one of the other candidates are from Northern California, and I am concerned that we may be backing ourselves into too much of a corner if we keep the list this narrow at this point, and I would definitely be interested in hearing Commissioner Le Mons' proposal.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

Commissioner Le Mons, I see your hand went up.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I was just going to ask

Commissioner Kennedy if we have some other recommendations,

or is that an invitation for us to be mindful of that as we
proceed?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: If I can respond, Madame

24 Chair?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, please. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: It's more the latter. I want us to be mindful of it. I mean, there are two or three people in the no party preference pool, but I would be interested in considering -- my initial pick from that pool, of course, was Scott McCarty, whom I mentioned yesterday.

I also am very interested in Vicki Tamoush from
Orange County, and, you know, certainly Mr. Boilard from
Los Angeles County, previously with the Center for
California Studies, is someone who knows the state quite
well. So those three -- I mean, we've been considering
Linda Akutagawa as well, but I would also raise these three
for consideration. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. Just to jump in here, I share the concern about -- you know, Commissioner Kennedy's concern just about the geographic spread of the next six that are selected. I think we all share that concern.

I went through last night using the names that we had identified yesterday, that list that Commissioner Ahmad had put together towards the end of the day, and gave thought about them in terms of both counties as well as the regions that were established by the Auditor's Office.

They had shared with us, and I believe it was also on the website, the map that they used to identify counties with various districts.

I definitely share the concern about the regional spread and the concern that certainly there seems to be more from, say, the Republican Party that tend to be from the north, more Democrats from the south. I also, to some extent, think that that's an issue with the pool, and I don't -- you know, I'm certainly happy to continue, you know, at the broader list.

I think that we've done a really great job of getting to this point of kind of narrowing a little bit. That doesn't mean to say that we can't consider, you know, the ones that -- the applicants that Commissioner Kennedy had thought about, but, to some extent, I do think that our constraints in this pool, geographically -- as I mentioned yesterday, I think, also, there's some interesting professional backgrounds that can correlate, it seems, to those various parties as well.

So, you know, I share this concern. I did go through -- I'm hesitant to share it, because it's another Excel document that no one can see, and, you know, (indiscernible) web site --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: You can always talk about it.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- but I did go through

and identify all of the counties in California by region.

I also included in there the proportion of the population in each region, and the number of current Commissioners and Commissioners in that final list that we had from yesterday, just so we could kind of get a sense of what that might look like.

Now, that being said, again, I know we are not using any sort of metric. I'm not suggesting that the Commissioners we select need to be proportionate to the amount of population, but just to have that, kind of, as a metric that we might consider as we're going through this. Right?

We've also heard from many of the public comments that we've received, particularly in writing, you know, the percentage of Latinos that are in the United -- or, excuse me, that are in California. So I think there's a lot of different metrics that are out there. So that's just another one that we can consider, but, like I said, I hesitate to put that up on the screen at this point, unless there's a strong (indiscernible).

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I'll yield to Commissioner

23 Ahmad.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you.

I think, just to add to this conversation, I would remind us all that the different characteristics listed under "Diversity," all but maybe race, ethnicity, with an asterisk, are fluid. So economic status changes, region changes. Gender is fluid, a social construct. Party, again, is fluid, and I know that this pool, including our own applications, was a snapshot in time of where we stand at that time, which does not necessarily mean that we don't have experiences or perspectives from, let's say, different regions or different economic statuses and whatnot.

So I think -- I know that we have to be looking at these criteria in order to be fair and equitable, because that's how we were judged as well, to get our seats here, but I do think that if we get bogged down on, you know, specific people from specific places, we might be losing out on the whole picture of the fluidity that comes with being a Californian.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner.

Commissioner Le Mons, did you want to -- you had yielded to --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes, yes. So I just wanted to echo what Commissioner Ahmad just said, and also say that, like Commissioner Sadhwani, I took a similar approach of looking at the whole state, looking at the map,

et cetera.

I also wanted to just add that one of the important criteria for all of us in the vetting process was our ability to be as nonbiased and open, et cetera. So I don't personally feel like I'm here representing a particular group. I think that my experience in life is what it is, but, more importantly, our ability to be objective and analytical, and as nonbiased as possible we expect from the remaining six as well as each other.

So I just wanted to say that. I know we all know that, but, if that brings us a little bit in this process, and not, "My God. We don't have the blue, you know, seven-foot-tall person. What are we going to do?" Like?

So I just want us -- I just thought it would be worth raising that up, as just a general reminder to us that we all have the capacity, and I'm sure whatever six we choose will have the capacity as well, and we'll hold each other accountable not just now, but through this entire process.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioners. I just want to appreciate all the comments and the thoughtfulness that you are bringing to this issue, which is exactly what we need.

Commissioner Taylor, I noticed you had a comment.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes. It's the same. I

went about this with a consideration that is, this is a nonpartisan venture that was given to us in partisan constraints. I feel that we all wear a variety of hats. Again, that's why we're chosen, because we're able to be a cross-section of all these people.

As Commissioner Ahmad said, there's a lot of fluidity to us, as Californians, and I like to think that if something is not represented, I can pick up that mantle for a non-represented group. I feel that we can cover all these, and the "blue man" is hard to find. The "seven-foot blue man" is hard to find.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I think that's -- thank you.

Again, well said. I think that's also why we are having trouble. You know, we all had -- you know, when you really thought about it, we had slates of 12, almost all of us.

You know, we had, "I really like that one and that one and that one, but yes, I also like this person and this person." So, unfortunately, the task is we do have to pick just two Democrats, just two Republicans, and just two nonaffiliated people. So, that said, we do need to move forward.

Would anyone like to -- I might just do a little bit of commenting about -- because I did review all these people again, and I also sort of did a task similar to Commissioner Sadhwani, looking at where and how many and,

you know, the particulars of all the different breakdowns, and I added -- you know, if I put different people in, even who were not already in our four, five, and four, how did that affect things?

I agree with Commissioner Sadhwani. There are a lot of sort of restrictions that we were handed by the group of -- it being 35 at this point. There are certain things, you know, we can't do, you know, like, obviously, you know, we had pointed out where people -- we just don't have any people there, period, or, you know, we don't have any Native Americans or, you know, Pacific Islanders. So there are certain things we just can't do.

That said, looking back at the group here, I hadn't mentioned anything about a few of them. Ms.

Quarles, what an outstanding character. You know, we've gone back and forth over multiple different ways on the Democrat group, and I had mentioned her, an outstanding person here. Virtually all of these people who we're looking at and talking about, outstanding characters. You know, we're blessed to have such a great group.

There's a couple things I did notice, though, looking back. Well, as we put a slate together, I think that's going to come up, as we're actually going to discuss particular people. There are certain things I realized that "Wow. We sort of need those characteristics. That's

a person -- those skills, we need."

one.

So, at that point, I am prepared to say, let's propose a few not actual slates. Let's just propose a couple of groups of six, if we put it that way. That way, we know we're still in discussion, and we can work on it. I'm just trying to avoid, if we actually propose a slate, moving us into voting ahead of a full discussion.

You know, again, my purpose here is, I would really like us to come to a consensus of our slate, if we can -- I think that's going to go a long way to keep entire Commission all together.

So, with that in mind, I might ask -- since

Commissioner Le Mons had already sort of said he had a

couple of different, you know, quote, "groups of six"

prepared, if you would like to share those with the group?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Sure. I will just share

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I'll share the first group. It is Peter Blando, Eddie Morgan -- and I just have their names in alphabetical order, by the way, so I know that's a departure from how we had them grouped yesterday. So that's Peter Blando, Eddie Morgan, Patricia Sinay, Pedro Toledo, Karla Van meter, and Angela Vazquez.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. So, just to put that in

terms of how we did that yesterday, for the Democrats, you have Patricia Sinay?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes, and Angela Vazquez.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Angela Vazquez. For the Republicans, you have Peter Blando and Karla Van Meter?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: And for the, you know, nonparty preference, you have Eddie Morgan and Pedro Toledo?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Correct. And this group of six represents, I think, a good cross-section across all the diversity criteria. I also took into consideration the feedback from the various Commissioners on skills that we thought would be great assets to the current eight.

It gives us some representation throughout the geography, gives us a nice cross-section of economic status representation as well. It is heavier in the Southern Coastal and Bay Area, which is reflective of the amount of diverse populations that need to be represented in those particular areas of the state as well.

So those are some of the considerations, and it has good gender parity. Those were thoughts that went into this particular six. It's different than my previous groups that I put forward, which is to indicate that -- you know, I listened very carefully to the other representations that were put forward, and why, and that

really helped me see some things that I didn't see prior, or I was looking at a particular candidate from a different angle initially, which is why this particular list just looks different than any of the lists that I put forward before.

I also want to just say that I also looked at the videos and applications of any name that we also discussed, even if they didn't make the list that we were talking about with the four Democrats, five Republicans, and four nonparty affiliates, because I knew that there was also the opportunity this morning if we wanted to raise someone else up that did get mentioned, and I wanted to make sure that I gave those particular mentions — even though they weren't necessarily candidates that I had put forward, I really wanted to make sure that I gave them the equal due diligence, in terms of review, as we moved into this next phase. So that's my comments.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner.

Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes. Surprisingly enough, in our review, in our discussion, I came up with the same slate as Commissioner Le Mons. I think what's especially notable is that, of the seven regions that are on the map that we were given, that slate speaks to all seven regions, and it also speaks to some of our more populated areas, as

well as our Voting Rights Act.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner.

You know, I must admit, this very much looks like mine. The only possible exception, and this was an area I really did want to discuss, is, in the Democrats, there's the third, Michael Gennaco, with, you know, the Voting Rights Act experience, and I understand this is a -- this is very difficult, because Ms. Sinay has -- all these -- all three are from Los Angeles.

They all bring different aspects to the table, but, you know, are we -- how do we feel about, you know, the Voter -- if we do not -- if we go with this slate, versus saying -- adding Mr. Gennaco, replacing one or the other of the ladies, that would switch gender balance, and, obviously, depending on which one, it would affect the different groupings and connections, but for the legal aspect.

Any sort of thoughts on that? Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes. I like this slate, too. I have the same kind of thought that you have, Chair Andersen.

You know, I put forward Sinay and Gennaco yesterday. Vazquez was right there near the top of my list. I think she's a phenomenal person, and the energy

she would bring would be outstanding. I mean, if I was interviewing her for a job, she would not have left my office without a job offer, and, I mean, yes, she's just amazing. So I think she'd bring a lot to the table.

So this is the -- so these are the three that I had in my Democratic pool, and it's a struggle, right, trading off between those three. I mean, Gennaco brings some phenomenal Voting Rights Act capability to the table that we don't have.

You know, if I look, the only other person on this slate with legal -- a JD -- is Toledo, and he's not practicing at this point, you know, but, you know, I mean, he went to Cornell, you know, got his JD from Cornell. So, you know, I mean, he must have a really good, strong legal background.

So, you know, it's just, that's where my kind of struggle and trade-off would be with this group, but I think, overall, it's a really, really nice group.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy (sic).

Any other -- Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I feel like I have the same struggle as Commissioner Fornaciari. I also had Vazquez and Gennaco as my kind of top Democrats. Both are from Los Angeles. Both are Latino.

You know, I've gone kind of back and forth, like, maybe it's Gennaco and Vazquez, or Gennaco and Sinay, or Sinay and -- I mean, this is like -- it's very difficult, but I think, for me, I do keep coming back to Gennaco.

My understanding -- I didn't follow closely the 2010 Commission, but my understanding was that there were times -- there were several people with legal backgrounds on that Commission, and I believe more than one who had experience with the VRA, and my understanding was that, at different points in time, the Commissioners with that background actually disagreed with the legal counsel that they had hired.

I think having that background could be extraordinarily beneficial to us as we move forward in that process, but, like I said, I mean, I think both are phenomenal candidates. Both are -- you know, I agree she would bring so much energy, and, you know -- yes. But, at the end of the day, I think having the legal expertise specifically to the VRA would be extraordinarily helpful.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner.

Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madame Chair. Just a question at this point. You know, I think we've come this far assuming that we're going to have one VRA attorney working for us, but is there scope that we could

have more than one? Could we have someone on a retainer, so that we have the advantage of differing -- without having to have that, necessarily, among the 14 of us?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes. I was going to say that was exactly what I was thinking, what Commissioner Kennedy just put forward, that there's no limit to how many attorneys we can hire, if we want to.

The other thing is, I think the -- what I'm more attracted to than the VRA, specific -- because I think we should be looking for that in counsel that we hire, absolutely, that expertise, but what I thought that Toledo could bring to the table is just, when you're trained in law, there's a certain way you think, and so I think that that critical thinking, the not being afraid to challenge -- while I'm not trained as an attorney, I actually think a lot like an attorney. People often think I am one.

So it's a certain perspective in how you look at things. So I'm not as afraid -- interestingly, Mr. Gennaco was also in my three, and made it very, very difficult. So I share Commissioners Fornaciari and Sadhwani and others, Andersen, who struggle with those three in particular, for the very same reasons.

I think Commissioner Taylor's -- I believe

Commissioner Taylor yesterday raised up Angela Vazquez, and whoever did got it on my radar, and I had to go back and take another look, and I think that -- not just, you know, her energy, but I think that she is bringing from her background with the school board, and working with young people, and while yes, the voting age that we're looking at is 18, we do know that individuals -- especially in the state of California now, young people can begin to preregister at 16, and begin to prepare themselves, and I think they're the future of where our state goes, in terms of their participation, and one of our big objectives is establishing maps that allow for the, you know, greatest equitable participation in our voting process.

So I think that there's a real value in what Ms. Vazquez brings from that perspective, and you notice (indiscernible) discussion was between Mr. Gennaco and Ms. Vazquez, and not so much Ms. Sinay. I mean, I can't not be -- I can't not listen to a community that has stood up so solidly for her.

Out of every one of the candidates, Ms. Sinay has had the most community support, from organizations as well as individuals. They have used the public comment mechanism to let us know of their support. So, to me, that tells me that this is someone that represents a community,

and people believe in. At least, that's based on what we had in front of us. So I could not strongly consider that (sic).

Particularly as we move forward as the 14, much of our work is going to depend on our ability to connect with and get feedback from the communities throughout California, and so having relationships not only as Commissioners, but with organizations and groups, et cetera, throughout the state, to be able to get us that access to communities with their feedback, which is what informs where we go as well.

So this isn't like these 14 people are going to get together and do all the work. These 14 people are going to facilitate a massive process to get the work done, and so that's why I'm strongly backing -- just in the discussion, I mean -- strongly backing Ms. Sinay.

MS. SAXTON: Madame Chair?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Yes.

MS. SAXTON: If I may interject, just by way of process, I want to clarify at this time whether the Commissioners are engaged in discussion or whether, in fact, we are treating this as a proposed slate by Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Discussion.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: At this point, it's a discussion. We're possibly going to move into a proposed slate. At this point, we're (indiscernible) still a discussion. But thank you for that, Counsel --

MS. SAXTON: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- because I do understand we have to -- slightly different if we do that.

Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: So I just wanted to address something, a question that Commissioner Kennedy brought up related to hiring of external counsel, and I think the conversation went to how we can hire. I think we do live in a world where we're going to have a finite budget, so I don't think we will have the ability to hire as many people as we want to cover all these different areas.

I, too, did not go on my list, actually, throughout all my (indiscernible), based off of the different diversity criteria in the Voters FIRST Act that would represent, as well as the legal background, specifically in the Voters (sic) Rights Act. So I just wanted to throw that out there.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner.

So we have both Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner Kennedy. Which one of you want to go -- you both raised your hands sort of at the same time.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Just one clarifying comment. You know, I just want to make sure we realize Ms. Sinay is from San Diego County. It was mentioned before that they're all from L.A., but she's from San Diego County.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Actually, thank you very much. Yes. We sort of had glossed over that fact. Thank you very much, Commissioner.

Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madame Chair. Just to clarify, I'm not advocating that we hire, full-time, X number of attorneys. I mentioned having someone on retainer. I mean, as long as we have access to various viewpoints, I don't think we need, you know, a whole cadre of attorneys, full-time, with us, but I think it could be helpful to have access, on an as-needed basis, to additional viewpoints, and saying that that might give us what we need.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. I would push back on that just slightly, and, again, both candidates are great. Like, at the end of the day, both are great. At the end of the day, if communities or organizations find that the maps that are drawn by the body of 14 that we're

developing are in violation of the VRA, we can be facing a lawsuit, right? And yes, we can have external, you know, hired attorneys, but I do still think that having some of that expertise on this Commission, one person -- I think it would be beneficial.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner.

Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I just want to state that I would hope that we're not looking -- and this is -- again, I'll preface by saying Mr. Gennaco is, you know, in my top as well, but I would hope that we wouldn't burden any particular Commissioner with -- they're not being hired to be the lawyer for the Commission.

I know that's not what you're saying,

Commissioner Sadhwani. I'm just cautioning our thinking,

and that we don't get lulled into this idea that, because

we have a VRA-experienced attorney on the Commission, that

we aren't at risk, that we won't draw lines that might get

challenged in court, and because we have one on there

doesn't mean we will draw lines that won't.

So I think that we have to be prudent about how we use whatever resources we have in service of our task, and while I think that that's of value, certainly, to have as a Commission, I don't think the success of the Commission rises and falls on whether or not there's a VRA

attorney on the Commission, and I'm speaking more globally, not even about -- in this case, I'm not talking about Mr.

Gennaco specifically. I'm talking philosophically about the issue.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I definitely appreciate that, for sure.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, at this point, I'm thinking we're sort of -- we've discussed every -- I'm thinking we should probably -- possibly create an additional group of six, and then should we then discuss those?

Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I can share my list that I created based off of the different conversations we had yesterday, as well as (indiscernible) public comments that we received, and just revisiting the Voters (sic) Rights Act, the Voters FIRST Act, and the -- so I can share my list, if (indiscernible) or not. It's very similar to Commissioner Le Mons' list. So, for my no party preference group, I had Morgan and Toledo. For my Republican group, I had Fernandez and Yee, and for my Democratic group, I had Gennaco and Sinay.

I'll just add that this list was based off of rebalancing the different criteria that we have to take into consideration that each candidate brings, and it is

different from draft zero and one and two that I presented yesterday, and there are some candidates that are on my now-presented draft list that were not previously, and, similar to Commissioner Le Mons, there are certain points that were made about some of the other candidates that I may have overlooked or looked at from a different perspective, that made me reconsider those candidates for this current draft list.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner.

Well, at this point, you know, I would say, you know, there are certainly -- now, just sort of looking at that group, obviously, you know, it's, you know, not gender balanced, but, you know, that's -- you know, it's close.

We do lose Karla Van Meter.

The one criteria that, you know, I was looking at, and the most important piece of information that we are going to get that we have to work with, and it's going to be paramount to what we do, is the data, and I think, you know, they actually said today, you know, the census group is being asked, "No, you can't have an extension. You have to move it up."

So I believe we already know that the census data is going to be off, and so we know that, to account for that, you do statistical modeling and make assumptions, and in that, there are discrepancies, and listening to -- I

went back and listened to Karla Van Meter's discussion, and I did not realize the depth of the way they do it right now, because of the privacy differential.

You know, we're going to be looking at census blocks in our drawing. We're actually going to be at that detail, and we're only assuming that, okay, that yes, when it says it's going to have, you know, different races in those particular numbers, it turns out that might not be what that actually means, and that is the area where I see -- because there are going to be other outside groups who are trying to influence our lines, and this kind of comes up with "having us taken to court."

I think the most important thing we can do is have a person on our group that has the technical background to go, "No, this is what's really going on," the correct verbiage to support all our people who will be helping us, but actually knows and can work at that detail with, our line-drawing consultants. So I really, really strongly think -- I really like Karla Van Meter in there.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Madame Chair?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I would just like to say that -- or bring forward that that is actually the same reasoning that Commissioner Le Mons made in regards to why we should or should not consider Gennaco at this point,

that we don't want to overburden one Commissioner with a specific task. I do hear you. I am in complete agreement with you with the census. I work in census work right now with my regular job.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Sorry. Could you speak up a little bit? You fade off.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes. I think the reasoning that you stated about census data and the gaps that we may potentially see in those data is quite the reason why I strongly considered Yee, because of those community ties, and the ability to have qualitative data inform some of the gaps that quantitative data may leave us to work with.

So I am in agreement with your reasoning, and I guess my approach is just slightly different in terms of how we can fill those gaps, and as someone who has a statistics background, I know that working with data is very difficult, especially when you have missing data, and that's where I felt strongly that a community perspective might be able to help us alleviate those gaps.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. Thank you.

I would tend to agree with Commissioner Ahmad. I went back and re-watched the interview with Doctor Van Meter as well. The issues that she raises around differential privacy, I agree.

This is a challenge. It is brand new. It is a new way in which the census will be releasing its data for 2020. The issues that that creates, yes, we will all need to be cognizant of it and be thinking about it, but every state in the United States is going to be facing the same issue nationwide when they do redistricting.

So, you know, like Commissioner Ahmad, I also have a background in statistics, and work with census data regularly, and so I don't -- would it be helpful? Maybe. But, in the same regards, as the conversation went around an attorney, I don't know if that's necessarily -- it's not actually an entire gap that we have.

I'm also -- just to put it out there, you know, when we had our trainings -- I guess it was two weeks ago now -- we had one of them -- we watched one of them from Karin Mac Donald with the Statewide Database, which is the organization that compiles all of the voting data that we would need to conduct racially polarized voting analysis. That is something that I do.

Similar to the kinds of pooling that's being described, (indiscernible)-level data is also pooled. So it's not individual-level data that we would be using to conduct that analysis for understanding communities of interest and where vote dilution may be a problem. So I would just put that out there, that this is a new problem

that she identifies in her interview, and talks about.

California is not the only place that's going to be dealing with this problem.

It's also entirely possible -- just to read a little bit more on it yesterday, I was looking at -- what is it called? -- the National Conference of State

Legislatures, which is a nonpartisan organization that works with all elected state-level legislators. In most states, state legislatures are tasked with redistricting, and one of the things that they put out there -- it's entirely possible that states could actually sue based on the way in which the Census Bureau is releasing this data.

I have no skin in the game as to whether or not that happens. I think our job is simply to deal with what we have. But I don't think that this is an issue that is unique only to us. I think it's something that -- you know, there will be conversations going on nationwide about how to deal with this from a redistricting standpoint, and I don't think it completely, you know, takes us off track of doing the analysis of racially polarized voting from the perspective of identifying communities of interest.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. I'd like to say I do appreciate those facts. You're right. But California has -- you know, most of the states, it's actually -- you know, it's voting age, it's -- you know, it does it group

(sic). California, we consider absolutely everybody, and we've also -- when we were doing our census collection, we were under bigtime lockdown.

So our numbers, unfortunately, are going to be worse than many other states, so we are going to have it affected more than other states. New York will sort of have a similar thing, but it was in a more narrow area. Ours is across our entire state. You know, we had to shut down everywhere.

One of the other potential Commissioners here was -- I think it's Ms. Diaz. She also was a -- I was a census ambassador, and she was, too, and, like all the methods of collecting data that were set up for how to -- you know, the outreach breach of people, they have -- you know, they know what areas, you know, you can't count, but they weren't able to count them, and all the things that had been set up all got shut down.

You know, it's going to be Sabbath, Sunday, and everyone will run in, and, you know, got the whole groups and churches to collect this data, and all the churches got shut down. So, when we were collecting, we couldn't collect, and now I don't know. Most people go -- you can actually still report in, even if you think -- you know, I have lived in Berkeley, and Berkeley is going to be totally underrepresented, because all the students left, and many

of them are actually reporting that they're living at home.

So, when they come back, you know, into school, after, you know, COVID eventually happens, we just won't have the funding to support -- you know, for our hospitals and things, for all the number of people that will actually be there, and yes, you know, we have ways around that, but most of California's ways around these things will be different modeling, different -- they're actually going to have to create numbers.

I understand, actually, why both -- Commissioner Ahmad and Commissioner Sadhwani do have really good statistical backgrounds, which is great. I'm actually looking at a person who is part of, I think, with -- well, actually, there are sort of two, possibly, in here, Karla Van Meter and Peter Blando, who are used to working with the actual computer programming part of it, and that's where I think they could talk to -- obviously, we'll have consultants, but they can make sure that those consultants are -- the information that we are used to working with and talking about, making sure that that isn't exactly -- our consultants -- what we're saying is the same thing.

You know, like, there's a very specific expertise in here that I think she really has that -- and fluent with today, which is the difference with Mr. Gennaco. Yes, he has zoning rights experience, and he has a total legal

mind. His zoning rights is actually, you know, many years ago, and, as we all know, Section 5 doesn't apply anymore, although we probably shouldn't look at it that way. So there are changes where, as Commissioner Kennedy said, you know, we can have a person on retainer who has that expertise, and, you know, go to -- you know, we know their particular -- it's more of a defined area.

You can't actually -- I don't -- I'm sure you probably could hire a person with that expertise, as we need it in addressing our data, but I think having a person like that on the committee, you know, on the Commission, would be very valuable.

Then, in terms of -- you know, I know, in terms of -- we're looking at connections, and people in community connections everywhere. Working with the community health centers, you do have connections, and there's not -- you know, obviously, Mr. Yee, he certainly does have a lot of connections all through different parts of, you know, the Bay Area and things like that, but I'm just -- you know, I think there's still value there that we don't actually cover. So it's, you know, my two cents.

Now, so, actually, I guess, with that, I'm thinking, do we want to make another --

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I appreciate,

understand, you know, all of the comments and the perspectives. I just want to throw out there that, you know, for both Gennaco and Van Meter, yes, we can hire that. Yes, we could.

I think it would be great to have them both on our team, to have their perspectives, not that we would heap all that responsibility on them, but I think -- you know, I like Mr. Yee. I thought he was a really good guy, too, and he would bring, you know, definitely a different perspective and a different set of experiences to the team, but, looking at Commissioner Ahmad's six, I mean, I think where I'm at right now would be -- the six I would pick, I'd just switch Yee and Van Meter, and that would be kind of my top list at this point, but that's my two cents.

MS. SAXTON: Madame Chair?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes.

MS. SAXTON: If I may, it may be useful to the Commissioners to know that, under the statute, they, you all, are required to have at least one legal counsel that has demonstrated extensive experience and expertise in the implementation and enforcement of the federal Voting Rights Act of 1965. Just so you know, that will be something, by law, that when you hire that person, they have to have that experience. I just thought I would let you know that that was in the statute.

1 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. 2 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Just as a point of clarification, is it in the statute, also, that we must 3 4 hire a demographer? 5 CHAIR ANDERSEN: No. 6 MS. SAXTON: I believe so, but let me check. 7 me check. 8 CHAIR ANDERSEN: I'm not sure if it's written 9 that way. 10 MS. SAXTON: The initial research, Madame Chair, 11 is that you would have the authority to hire a demographer, 12 but it's not specifically required that you do so. 13 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Another clarification. For line 14 drawing, how is that assigned? 15 I'm sorry. Assigned? MS. SAXTON: 16 CHAIR ANDERSEN: In terms of, you know, 17 obviously, we're -- a consultant to help us, you know, do 18 the actual mapping. Is that actually -- you know, is also 19 a specific requirement, or is, you know, a demographer or 20 all that stuff -- all of that is up to us? 21 MS. SAXTON: It may be helpful, if it pleases the 22 Commission and the Chair, if -- what I hear you asking is, 23 what are you required to -- services to hire, and what do 24 you have authority to procure? And you have, I believe, 25 very broad authority to procure services, et cetera, but we

can look at that further if that's going to help the selection process. As far as I know, there are no prohibitions on hiring any specific skillset.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Here's an idea for the Commission. We are talking about people that we really like, who are qualified, you know, should they have to be on there? We don't want to overburden particular people, though. I think, if that's their specialty, it's like, just try to keep them away from it. I know things that —you know, that's what they would want to do on the Commission, basically, if we had them on the Commission.

Should we maybe take an early break or something, and actually research a bit of this? Because this is crucial to sort of moving forward at this point. In our binders, under tab two, we actually can research that ourselves, you know, if we'd want to have a look, or just take a bit of a break and have legal look into this.

Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I'm a little confused as to how this became crucial, so I think you might be drawing some inferences. I'd like to hear from other Commissioners. Is this really crucial or not? I think it was just questions being asked, information being gathered, but I don't see it as putting the brakes on anything, unless other Commissioners feel like we can't move forward

1 without an answer to the questions on the table. 2 MS. SAXTON: Madame Chair, the requirement for 3 the attorney to have that Voters (sic) Rights Act 4 experience is the only requirement. Other than that, the 5 law says that the Commission can hire the staff, et cetera, 6 as needed. So you have broad discretion, and that's 7 basically the answer. I mean, that is the answer. 8 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you. 9 Commissioner Ahmad, you indicate you --10 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Sorry. My question was 11 answered. 12 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. All right. Okay. Well, 13 moving forward, it looks sort of like Commissioner Kennedy 14 kind of made a similar group of six as, basically, 15 Commissioner Ahmad, but basically switched --16 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Madame Chair, I believe that 17 was Commissioner Fornaciari that spoke. 18 CHAIR ANDERSEN: I'm sorry. I did it to you 19 So, yes, it was Commissioner Fornaciari. So, 20 sorry, Commissioner Fornaciari. Could you repeat what your 21 changes were? 22 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I've changed my mind 23 since then, again, but the one change I had was --24 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, that's a

good -- (indiscernible) your changes are.

25

1 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: You want to know my new 2 changes? 3 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, so we know (indiscernible). 4 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So how about Fernandez, 5 Yee, Morgan, Toledo, and Sinay, and Vazquez, and we hire 6 our expertise, I mean, beyond what we have in the group. I 7 mean, we have expertise in the group. If we need 8 super-deep expertise, you know, in a particular area, then we hire it. 9 10 CHAIR ANDERSEN: I have a -- sorry. Commissioner Le Mons, were you going to --11 12 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes. I just wanted to 13 ask -- my camera failed, so I was preoccupied with that, 14 and I wanted to know if Commissioner Fornaciari could 15 repeat his again. Sorry. CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. We did see the side of 16 17 your, you know, roof or something there for a minute. 18 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Sure. Okay. So I said Fernandez and Yee, Morgan and Toledo, and Sinay and 19 20 Vazquez. 21 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you. 22 MS. SAXTON: Madame Chair? 23 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. Sorry. I'm sorry. 24 Please, Counsel. 25 MS. SAXTON: Were you still writing your notes?

I can wait.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I was. Again, hang on two secs.

MS. SAXTON: Of course.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Yes, Counsel.

MS. SAXTON: By no means do I want to put a damper on discussion, but I do want to provide information about where you will be headed to eventually vote on a slate and select, so we can be mindful of that.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay.

MS. SAXTON: At the point at which there is -the direction I see everyone going, working it through,
but, at the point at which, if it happens this way,
Commissioners are ready to say, "We have six that we're in
agreement about, or some of us are in agreement," whatever
it may be, at that point, a single Commissioner is going to
need to own that slate.

We've talked about that. Slates are proposed by a Commissioner. You have to own that slate. That person, that Commissioner, becomes the only one who can approve Applicants coming on and off. That Commissioner will have to not only propose it, but name it, so we can track it and talk about it in a uniform way.

So that's something I think I wanted to just bring to your attention as you're having your discussion, that eventually it's going to have to collapse into that

mechanical procedure of selecting someone to forward it and say, "I propose this slate to be called X," of the six people, and line them up. So that's all. We're just really mindful of tracking things properly, which is why I asked whether you were discussing or whether you'd moved on.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. I think, you know,

I -- well, okay. I was actually going to say I'm sort

of -- I kind of put a little bit of breaks on calling them

"slates," just because I don't want us to, next thing, jump

into voting. I'd like to get a full discussion, and

sometimes, by calling the slate, you know, then people stop

saying anything and say, "Well, I guess I can live with

it," when I really want people to be able to discuss. So

that was kind of where I was coming from.

Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I have a question for counsel. How is what you just described distinguished from us taking the act of building a slate collectively or collaboratively? I'm just curious from a process point of view.

MS. SAXTON: I believe you have a lot of freedom under the law to do what you're doing right now, and build that slate cooperatively and collaboratively, but, at the point during your discussion, for instance, that there's

1 that lull, and everyone says, "We like this. This is the 2 one, we think," a Commissioner would need to come 3 forward --4 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Got it. 5 MS. SAXTON: -- and it would become that 6 Commissioner's slate, and it would be -- that Commissioner 7 would, for the record, "I propose the following slate to be 8 called, Commissioner Le Mons' slate, consisting of six 9 Applicants," you know, and then listed out, and then, at 10 that point, that would become, for instance, Commissioner 11 Le Mons' slate, and it could sit there, and somebody else 12 could say, "I propose," if there wasn't consensus, and then 13 voting requires a motion. I don't think that you can 14 accidentally (indiscernible). 15 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Vote. 16 MS. SAXTON: Yes, yes, "Ta-dah, we have our six," 17 you know, that sort of thing. So there is that process. I 18 hope that answers your question, sir. 19 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: It does. Thank you very 20 much. And I'm willing to own a slate. 21 CHAIR ANDERSEN: All right. 22 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Madame Chair? 23 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Sorry. We have a Madame 24 (sic) -- let's see. We had, I think, Commissioner Ahmad 25

and then Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: So I just want to take a moment to call myself out. Listening to the discussion and engaging in the discussion about Gennaco and Van Meter, and about these different skills they bring, and the expertise that they have, I heard Commissioner Le Mons and Madame Chair's points very clearly, and I just wanted to recognize and call myself out, that if I am willing to stand behind Gennaco so strongly because of the VRA experience, and not behind Van Meter because of her expertise in statistics, it's unfair of me.

So I just wanted to call myself out, because that's the same criteria being applied differently to two very qualified candidates. I just throw that out there, that Van Meter's experience is just so impressive to me, I want her to be my mentor, but I just wanted to make sure that that was clear, that I understand that that logic that I was using for both of those candidates was being applied differently. So I just want to make sure that everyone can understand my thought process.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner. That actually took quite a lot. That was a very impressive catch, and serving in the spirit of the Board. Well done.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. Yes, yes. I think there is some truth to that. I would also -- well,

anyway, I'll let that go.

Just going back to the group of six, not a slate, the group of six that had been originally put forward by Commissioner Ahmad and revised, I think, slightly by Commissioner Fornaciari, I like the direction of it. I want us to spend a little bit of time just discussing Morgan, and another candidate who had -- or Applicant -- who had come up yesterday was Akutagawa -- and I hope I'm saying that correctly -- from Orange County.

I'm torn on these. Both come from very different regions of California. Neither of those regions have any -- none of those counties have any representation yet on this Commission, and I think that a case can be made in both directions. Some of my work, you know, from an academic standpoint, has looked at the changing demographics of Orange County.

I don't live in Orange County. I have very

few -- I mean, I have some friends, but I don't think of

those as community connections -- in Orange County. But I

do think that Orange County is a place undergoing very

rapid demographic change. Certainly, even since 2010, that

has been the case, and I do want to put that out there.

You know, at the end of the day, I think there's pros and

cons for -- both candidates are great. All of the

candidates in the pool have strong analytic skills, you

know, and generalist ones.

I really did like that Ms. Akutagawa had that background in Orange County, and specifically the community engagement and outreach there, and I feel very uncomfortable saying, like, "Whoa. It's Humboldt or OC," right? But that's one of the things that I'm struggling with, and I think I'd be really curious to hear more from the rest of the Commission on that sort of topic.

I think that she also brings with her -- you know, she's Japanese-American, talked about that experience growing up here in California from that background. So I would just be -- I would really encourage additional conversation, you know, on that selection.

AT&T OPERATOR: Pardon me. We do have a public comment.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, AT&T operator. We're not actually taking those just yet, because we're sort of in the middle of something. We will let you know.

AT&T OPERATOR: My apologies.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: No. Thank you.

Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madame Chair.

The other candidate from Orange County in the no party

preference pool, Vicki Tamoush, I really was moved by her

interview, and, you know, the work that she's done in her

community, and I would ask that we also consider her.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, that's a different case. So would you be talking about, you know, switching someone, taking someone out, you know, in terms of a group of six, Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I'm just saying that -- CHAIR ANDERSEN: Just more consideration.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- if we're looking for someone from Orange County, I hope we'll consider her as well. I really was moved by her --, who she is, what she stands for, the work that she's done and continues to do in her community.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

I'm actually sort of -- Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes. I will say that -no. I'm sorry. I have a question for Commissioner
Sadhwani, so I'm kind of drilling back to the context of
raising the Orange County consideration.

Have you thought about the two individuals in the nonparty affiliate category from Orange County? And, I mean, Commissioner Kennedy just raised another name in that category. I just was wondering if you had looked at both those candidates as far as Orange County representation was concerned, and if you had any thoughts about that.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Correct me if I'm wrong.

I think Akutagawa and Tamoush are the only two left in the Applicant pool from Orange County?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. I would feel very comfortable with, you know, discussing either of those candidates. I thought Ms. Tamoush's interview was -- along with Commissioner Kennedy, I thought it was very moving as well, and I think her years of experience in human -- I believe it was like -- not human rights commissions, but like a human relations commission, I believe, and a number of outreach activities, if I remember correctly, moderating panels between people of different (indiscernible) backgrounds.

So, you know, I think that her -- she similarly has a strong community outreach component that could be really beneficial, absolutely. So I would feel very comfortable discussing both of them in terms of Orange County. I think my question is, you know, can we have this conversation about -- you know, we've only got one -- you know, we've only got that one spot, or two spots, for her, and then what party preference, and how do we want to -- whether there are various kinds of diversity pieces that we want to think about, or thinking about geographic diversity.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I'll just weigh in on that

from my perspective and considerations. While I realize Southern Coastal has various counties in them, I think I probably approached it more regionally than -- not I think, I did. I approached it more regionally than I did specific county.

So I think that, when I think about the sort of holistic diversity approach, and consider region in the context of that, economic, et cetera, I really end up leaning more toward Ms. Morgan, for those reasons, and while I understand that that doesn't answer the Orange County consideration, I guess, for myself personally, I'm not trying to specifically answer the Orange County consideration. Yes.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: So I'd like -- well,
Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes. So, from my perspective, you know, we're here to work to help enfranchise people who are not enfranchised, but also not disenfranchise folks who are, you know, feeling disenfranchised, and, you know, much of the north state is feeling disenfranchised by the larger communities, and so, you know, Morgan brings a regional aspect to it.

I mean, he also brings, you know, a different economic perspective to it, and, you know, I mean, yes, okay, Orange County is different than the rest of Southern

Cal, but, you know, I mean, I think we have no representation in the north state, and lots of representation in the south state.

Now, I know that that's 60 percent of the population, you know, but that's just kind of where I was looking at it. I mean, even the folks from Yolo County, which is North Central Valley, I mean, they're right across the river from Sacramento. It's not like they're really in the north state, north of Sacramento. So that's just the way I was looking at Morgan.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. I'm going to second that.

The north already does -- you know, they're the only area that's saying, like, you know, "We're going to create our own state." They really, really feel as though they're not represented at all, and actually sort of looked down on, and, you know, Eddie Morgan, not only is he -- you know, he's from the north.

He has a lot of community ties, including with the Central Valley, and also Native American tribes, which they're -- you know, he has made connections in many different areas, and has done -- it's not just little -- you know, sort of just, you know, Humboldt. He's actually done work across the entire northern area. I'm looking at some of his studies and things, and a lot of his experience is cross-cultural, which I think would work in

terms of being approachable, or how he would approach people, and, you know, I think the -- I totally echo exactly what Commissioner Fornaciari was saying. You know, there are people who feel disenfranchised already. So I really do not want to make that worse.

So, with that kind of in mind, I'm actually coming back to Commissioner Le Mons' original six, particularly because, you know, with Peter Blando -- I know we're talking dropping him -- he's Filipino, and we've actually had calls in about the Filipino population. Also, he has connections, again, throughout the state. They're different but, I think, you know, equally valid.

I still like Karla Van Meter. You know, I know you were possibly talking D (sic) there, but, you know, I'm actually looking at the sort of group of six that Commissioner Le Mons originally put in. I do come back and forth on -- let's see -- Michael Gennaco instead of Angela Vazquez, just because -- although, then, I really like her. That's just hard.

MS. SAXTON: Madame Chair, forgive me for interrupting. We have four minutes until our first 15-minute break.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Ahmad.

2.2.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I am actually now looking at

Commissioner Fornaciari's list. It was actually (indiscernible). I'm thinking about how I'm applying certain things differently, and I feel like that list that he presented is pretty balanced.

Yes, it's missing some expertise that I would have preferred, or other Commissioners have voiced that they would prefer, but I do think that list that he presented is a well-balanced list, given the information that we got from counsel and the assistance that we will get, and are legally required to have, related to some of the legal concerns that we've expressed. So I'm pretty comfortable with Commissioner Fornaciari's list at this point.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Madame Chair?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes. Looking at both

17 Commissioner Le Mons' and Commissioner Fornaciari's lists,

18 both of those lists seem to satisfy all of the regions.

Although it's impossible to account for all 58 counties in

the state, both Commissioner Le Mons' and Commissioner

Fornaciari's satisfy all the regions.

In listening to the public input, I do hate the thought that, for the 2030 Commission, that there would be a region that says, "We haven't had representation, ever." So I definitely would like to satisfy that, and, of course,

I have a little leanings towards the "blue man" list, because that was my original list as well.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I'm sorry. On that one,

Commissioner Taylor, just so I'm clear, so you're saying -
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I have a preference for

Commissioner Le Mons' first list.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Le Mons. Okay.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: And, sorry, Commissioner -- I'm sorry. I think it was Commissioner Kennedy, and then Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Actually, Madame Chair, very quickly, just to throw something out on the table -- I'm not taking a position on this -- I note that Petaluma is divided between current congressional districts, but, depending on where Mr. Toledo lives, he may be in the same congressional district as Mr. Morgan. So I just put that out there for consideration. I'm not trying to make any statement with that. I'm just observing that.

MS. SAXTON: Madame Chair, it's time for the 15-minute break now.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Sorry. So I left you hanging there, Commissioner Turner. We do need to take that 15-minute break, and so I think we should reconvene -- it is now 11:00, so we'll reconvene at 11:15.

1 I'll call the meeting into recess. Thank you. 2 CHAIR ANDERSEN: AT&T Operator, is that person 3 still in the queue? 4 AT&T OPERATOR: Yes, we do still have one public 5 comment. 6 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. 7 AT&T OPERATOR: Would you like to hear it now? 8 CHAIR ANDERSEN: As soon as we call back, yes. 9 AT&T OPERATOR: Sorry. 10 CHAIR ANDERSEN: I'll ask for you. 11 AT&T OPERATOR: All right. We'll stand by. 12 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. 13 (Off the record at 11:00 a.m.) 14 (On the record at 11:15 a.m.) 15 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. I see we have -- appears 16 we have a quorum. I'd like to call the meeting back to 17 order. 18 Commissioner Turner, I did just now sort of cut 19 you off, but I'm wondering -- we still have that person in 20 the queue for public comment, and I sort of -- if that's 21 all right with the group, I would like to invite that 22 person in. Is that acceptable to you, Commissioner Turner? VICE CHAIR TURNER: Yes, Madame Chair. 23 24 CHAIR ANDERSEN: All right. Thank you. 25 AT&T operator, could you please let the person in the public comment through.

AT&T OPERATOR: Certainly. We'll open the line for Tammy Tran.

Go ahead.

MS. TRAN: Yes. Can you hear me?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. Thank you. Please go

ahead.

MS. TRAN: Yes, yes. Thank you so much for the opportunity to provide public comment, and just by way of background, my name is Tammy Tran. I live in Orange County. I was born and raised here. My parents are immigrants from Vietnam.

So I have two comments that I'd like to submit for your consideration. I really appreciate the discussion, particularly around geographic representation on the Commission. So I'd like to speak to the Orange County representation.

I'd like to respectfully just emphasize that
Orange County is not Los Angeles. I live in Orange County.
I've worked very extensively in the larger, you know,
Southern California region.

Orange County is very unique, and I believe that, you know, it needs to be considered unique to other parts of the region. The demographics have changed in the page 10 years, and even in the past 20 years, if you look at how

Orange County has changed. It's diverse not only in terms of race, ethnicity, and social economic indicators, but there's also still a very wide range of diversity of thought, and it's not monolithic.

There are things about Orange County that haven't changed, but other things that have changed. So I think that's something, really, to consider. We have the largest Vietnamese-American population in Orange County outside of Vietnam. We also have a very large Latino population, and, there's dozens of languages that people speak.

I wanted to speak to the candidacy of one of the finalists, Linda Akutagawa, who I believe is a strong candidate, not just because she is one of -- she's a Orange County resident, but also her demonstrated ability to be impartial, thoughtful, based on data. I know her well from her professional work as the executive director of a nonprofit. I know her, also, in terms of her work as a subject matter expert on diversity, equity, and inclusion, and the (indiscernible).

MS. PELLMAN: Fifteen seconds. Fifteen seconds.

MS. TRAN: The focus would be equity. She is someone that understands and has an extensive community network, and already serves as an advisor, both in the public and the private sector. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Were there any additional public comments in the queue?

AT&T OPERATOR: No, ma'am, no additional public.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you very much.

Well, that will bring us back into our discussion, and I'm sorry to have cut you off there before our break, Commissioner Turner. Can we return to your comments?

VICE CHAIR TURNER: Absolutely. Thank you so much, and just to appreciate all of the comments that has been raised so far this morning, and it's certainly -- the initial, like, kind of the thoughts that I came in with have changed a few different times based on just the lively discussion and counsel, but it still does leave me with things that I wanted to at least (indiscernible) my thinking currently, just really similar to the initial list at this point, which would be Sinay and Vazquez, Blando and Fernandez, and then Akutagawa -- I appreciate the comments that was just made by public comment -- and Eddie Morgan, are the six that I'm looking at.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: So, again, for the public who's sort of tuning in to us right now, we're still in discussion. We're sort of discussing what different groups of six might look like. We are not at a slate stage yet, and we're not, you know, considering actually voting on

1 things. We are discussing different groups and how that 2 might fit together. 3 So, just before I call another Commissioner, I 4 just want to go through that again so I have it down on my 5 list. On the Democrats, you had Sinay and Vazquez? 6 VICE CHAIR TURNER: That's right. 7 CHAIR ANDERSEN: And then you had -- the 8 Republicans, you had Blando? 9 VICE CHAIR TURNER: I had Blando, but also 10 Fernandez. 11 CHAIR ANDERSEN: And then you had Fernandez. And 12 then you had Morgan and Akutagawa? 13 VICE CHAIR TURNER: Yes. 14 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Akutagawa. Thank you. 15 I think I saw a hand up. Commissioner 16 Fornaciari. 17 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes. Let's see. 18 don't want to go past you, Commissioner Turner, but I did 19 want to circle back to before the break, and before the 20 public comment, actually, and I was just going to offer up 21 that, you know, we've talked about pretty much everyone on 22 the list but Pedro Toledo, and, you know, he is a -- we talked about him a little bit, but he does have a JD. 23 24 I think it's important that we have one JD, on 25 the team here, even if we're going to get -- you know, need the expertise. I think it's important. You know, we have expertise in statistics, in mapping, in the work we're going to do, but we don't really have an attorney on the team. So I would offer, you know, the thought that maybe, you know, maybe a trade, Gennaco for Toledo, and then we could, you know, consider Orange County in that, since it is such a large and important county in the state. I just want to throw that out there.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Sorry. Toledo for Gennaco? I'm not quite sure. In terms of -- because your proposal -- the group you're listing --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Attorneys, if we're going to have one attorney on the team, maybe, you know, and we'd want to consider Orange County, and the key people from Orange County are in the nonaffiliated. So maybe, instead of the tradeoff with Morgan, we consider a tradeoff with Toledo. That's all.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, but I think that is what -that's kind of an end -- in Commissioner Turner's group of
six, that is sort of what she did. Is that correct?

VICE CHAIR TURNER: In my group of six, I really am struggling as well with Toledo in the nonaffiliated group. I had Akutagawa and Morgan there, and I also had Pedro, but I know we're trying hard to narrow down to two in the area, and I agree that Pedro Toledo would be an

1 amazing opportunity for us to have on the Commission. 2 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Madame Chair? 3 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, Commissioner Taylor. 4 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: So, as Commissioner 5 Fornaciari is describing, that would be closer to 6 Commissioner Ahmad's group of six, where Toledo is present. 7 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. It's actually -- well, and 8 Toledo is also present in Commissioner Le Mons' group, 9 because he said Morgan and Toledo, and Commissioner Ahmad 10 has Morgan and Toledo, as does Commissioner Fornaciari. It's just, Turner was going Morgan, Akutagawa. Is that 11 12 correct? Am I looking at --13 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Madame Chair? 14 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes? 15 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I think what the -- from the 16 discussion right now, and what's making it quite difficult, 17 is that the only two candidates from Orange County are both 18 within the nonaffiliated group, and we have three, four, 19 five people that we want in the nonaffiliated group. So I 20 think that's where it's making -- it kind of informs in the 21 balance (sic) a little bit. 22 CHAIR ANDERSEN: No, no. This is part of the 23 problem with all of the different groups, quite frankly. 24 You know, who do we put where? I'm thinking --25 Madame Chair, if I can? COMMISSIONER SADHWANI:

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. Yes. I'm sorry. Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. Just in response to Commissioner Turner's list, it's hard, because all of -- yes, everybody -- yes. I can see all of those being great. My only concern with both Blando and Fernandez is they're both from Yolo County. I don't know if that's a concern. It's not a concern, per se, but maybe we can have other arrangements. You know, I think Commissioner Ahmad and Commissioner Fornaciari had mentioned before Fernandez and Yee, which gave a little bit more variety there. I'm just putting that out there.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. That's why I also see that as a concern. I would not do -- that's why I like Blando, and then, of course, I have Karla Van Meter. Here's an idea. What if it's similar to Commissioner Le Mons', but -- well, that would be -- Blando and Yee, but then, if it's Eddie Morgan and Pedro, then we have gone extremely -- like the nine -- I think, you know, that's gone very male-heavy, Morgan and --

Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Hi. So, when I opened this morning, I said that I had a couple groups of six. So I wanted to hold up the alternate group of six. So we have

that first group, which Commissioner Taylor has affectionately named the "blue man group," which I like, but the additional group of six, which I think lines up with, I think, Commissioner Fornaciari, actually, which is - for, the Democrats are Sinay and Vazquez. For the Republicans, it's Fernandez and Yee, and the nonparty affiliate, it's Morgan and Toledo.

So that was one of my other groups of six, but I think that lines -- is that true, Commissioner Fornaciari? I think that's similar to yours or right in line with it.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I think that is.

mean, and I'll tell you why I've shifted to that direction, because, at the hearing on the comments, and what I feel like I -- you know, while I looked at my fellow Commissioners', the eight's, backgrounds, I didn't dig deep. So, hearing the lively discussion earlier from Commissioner Ahmad and Commissioner Sadhwani in terms of -- it wasn't just their background, but I heard a passion around some (indiscernible) things this morning, and I thought, "Okay. We've got some passion at the table on that topic."

So it weakened a little bit of my support on Van Meter for that reason, and I think that coupled with the longer discussion about our ability to bring in expertise,

et cetera, in the form of consultants, and so on and so forth. So I had this other group of six as well, and I thought, "Well, okay. Well, this is lining up kind of near Doctor -- I mean, "Doctor" -- Commissioner Fornaciari."

So I just wanted to raise that up as well. I think this morning I said I wasn't married to that first group, and nor am I married to this one, but it's just to give you some insight into kind of where my thinking is.

So I thought I'd hold this one up as well.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. I might come back to the -- you know, I see where we're sort of shifting and going here, and I do like Linda Akutagawa down in the no party preference, in Orange County, but, you know, I really like Peter Blando. You know, I don't want to come off the Filipino aspect, and just in terms of, you know, the connections across -- the community connections there.

Also, he's actually doing IT work and security for all the UC systems, and, as such, he is working with different groups that I think would sort of benefit the community, and he has, you know, personal connections. So to, you know, kind of switch -- and it is basically -- you know, you're right. Fernandez, Blando, they're both -- or, you know, unfortunately, you know, they're both exactly the same place. I mean, they are literally like 20 miles away from each other.

So, you know, you can't, unfortunately, you know, turn the -- Blando, Fernandez -- I like (indiscernible) and Blando, Yee, Karla Van Meter, and that sort of thing, but, you know, the -- going Fernandez, Yee -- with Commissioner Fornaciari, I think we've sort of gone completely community-based, if that's sort of a -- I mean, it's a bit like we have our passion set of(indiscernible) statisticians. Who is actually going to be kind of drawing, you know, this -- of course, my background is a little bit more technical, so I tend to really like the technical, and both Peter Blando and Karla Van Meter have that in spades.

Not to say that we don't -- well, you know, I think we also have a lot of community activists, but I think we need to reach on each part of it, and to sort of give up both, and also just for -- I realize that -- you know, I'd like to get Yee in there. He has great community connections in one respect. But, you know, Peter Blando does, too. So I'm torn between those two lists. I would actually go with, you know, your "blue man" group, as opposed to the Commissioner Fornaciari group.

MS. SAXTON: Madame Chair?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes.

MS. SAXTON: I'm sorry to interrupt. I just want to clarify again that, at this point, Commissioners are

still in a discussion mode, as opposed to any of these lists of six being actually proposed as slates at this point for action at a later time.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, that is correct.

MS. SAXTON: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIR ANDERSEN: We're discussing different components and different people for -- different Republican, Democrat, nonparty.

MS. SAXTON: Okay. I just want to be clear. 10 Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Is there a -- so we have --Commissioner Kennedy, can we hear from you?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I'm very comfortable with what Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner Le Mons have been sharing with us. I still am wondering, on the nonparty group, having both Morgan and Toledo from the north, and if we want to shift one of those to the south, Orange County. I do agree that having Pedro Toledo's law experience is useful. So, in general, I'm comfortable, just with that one lingering doubt, I guess.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: On which, on one -- that's sort of, I guess, in both different sort of groups. Well, actually, it's in all -- in three of the four (indiscernible) that we're talking about. So which way are you going in terms of -- I guess, actually, looking at kind of the -- on the Democrats, looks like we're -- there's one proposal that doesn't -- well, it does include Gennaco, Sinay, or Sinay, Vazquez, the tradeoff there being, if we sort of do lose -- we go Sinay, Vazquez, that we'd really like to keep Toledo in the nonparty, and with Morgan.

So where did you come down on that? I'm not quite clear.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I'm generally happy with -- I'm generally very comfortable with what

Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner Le Mons had shared with us. My lingering question is on the no party preference group, and whether having both Toledo and Morgan -- I don't know -- as I said, I don't know where Mr. Toledo lives in Petaluma, but, you know, potentially, he may live in the same congressional district, which goes all the way up to the Oregon border. You know, is that enough representation of the north, and that seat could come to the south?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So let me make a new list. It's going to be basically the same list, with a slight tweak. What if we go Yee, Fernandez, Morgan, Akutagawa, Sinay, and Gennaco?

So, Commissioner Sadhwani, I mean, you know, I'd be interested in your thoughts on that specific tradeoff,

since you were the one discussing Orange County.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'm thinking about it. I think that that could potentially make sense. There's tradeoffs, of course. You know, I think we had (indiscernible) removed, Gennaco, in lieu of Vazquez, given kind of her youthfulness, her energy. That representation, also, of a younger generation, potentially, will be (indiscernible).

I also do -- you know, I would raise up, also, just the -- I haven't tabulated them, and I keep thinking that I would like to, but, you know, we have certainly received a large number of public comments, both through the phone and written, regarding Latino representation. I believe some of those have asked specifically for Latino representation in all three categories (indiscernible)in order to be represented by the (indiscernible). We haven't exactly discussed that as a kind of ideal, if that is something that we want to do as a Commission or not, but I might raise that up for discussion.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: One thing that I will say is, I was going to, before we break for lunch, ask for, you know, kind of, a few of our groups -- to ask our counsel and staff if they could include -- like, just do a rough demographic summary for us, say, with, you know -- we can call our -- you know, sort of -- you know, just either

discussion groups, but if we just added those to our -- if that was part of the 14, how do the demographics look? And that being similar to looking at the ARP panel, you know, well, the ARP, in terms of using an actual breakdown by party, by -- you know, it's the -- I'm sure you probably all remember them. It's gender, county, economic, you know, groups, and ethnicities. So, you know, if we want to come -- so think about -- you know, I really like -- you know, we can say, "Well, we have an Ahmad group" --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Madame Chair.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- "we have a Le Mons group," and then sort of do it that way.

Commissioner Le Mons.

recommend us do that. I think we should be very careful doing that. I think we all know what we need to be looking at. I don't think we should start parsing it out, because now we're starting to look like we're getting into a table and tabulations. I don't think that is a good idea. I think that we know what we should be doing, and how we get there. So, anyway, let me stop there on that.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madame Chair.

24 Just to say that I was happier with Commissioner

25 Fornaciari's first concept, the one that coincided with

Commissioner Le Mons' concept, than with his second one.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. Okay. I see what you're saying. Okay. Well, do we want at this time to actually start talking, you know, panels here, continue discussing a little bit more?

You know, we can't hide from -- I don't want to say we're comparing stats to stats, but we cannot hide from that, because we are going to be -- however we make our decisions, we do need to consider what it all actually looks like, and I don't mean that -- you know, possibly, let's not -- you know, okay. Let's not just look at it statistically, but we do need to kind of consider, you know, how, you know, just visually, for our own purposes, even, you know, have we covered all our bases? You know, are we sort of forgetting about something? So, you know, when we put these together, maybe we'll just, you know, put them together. We could come up with, actually, some panels, and then think about it over lunch.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Madame Chair.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes. I just really want to respectfully reiterate what I said. I think that assumption is being made, maybe, on your part about how you need to see it and how you need to look at it, and extending that to how the committee needs to look at it.

I think, if people are having trouble feeling like we're meeting the diversity objective, I feel like the Commissioners should raise that, but I don't think we -- I really feel strongly that we should not make tables and stuff, because it's very hard -- once you go there, you're putting it into a comparison kind of framework, which I think is a slippery slope. So that's why I'm raising that.

I don't know how other Commissioners feel about that, but you all know what -- you all have gotten to this point, and you've gotten here comfortably with the broad-based charge that we have around respecting diversity, but the moment we start parsing it out by race, which we should not do -- I can't say that more clearly, and I think that's what's kind of spurred this, is when the question got raised about the public comment that we received with regard to Hispanic and Latino and Latinx representation, which we all have heard, we have all read.

We're very clear. We know all of the information. And I think that that should go into whatever considerations that any individual Commissioner is making when it comes down to when we vote on the different slates, but I don't think we should take this particular process approach that you're recommending. I personally don't support it.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Thank you. I

appreciate that.

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I agree with

Commissioner Le Mons.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. All right.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And can I make a little proposal, here?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Certainly.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I think we have a lot to digest and think about. It's 15 minutes to lunch. I don't know how the others would feel, but maybe we can take lunch -- start lunch now, and we'll get an hour for lunch, and 15 minutes to kind of self-reflect on where we're at.

We'll come back with public comments after lunch, and hear from the public at that time, because they know we're going to take public comments after lunch, and then we could jump back into this conversation. That's just my suggestion. You know, whatever the group wants to do.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner. I was going to say a very similar thing. The only difference would be, would anyone like to actually come up with a slightly different group before we do essentially break for lunch, or do we think we are kind of covering the topics in the groups that we have? Does everyone feel --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Madame Chair?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I would just say that the original group that was offered by Commissioner Fornaciari and, I think, echoed by Commissioner Le Mons was very similar to that of Commissioner Ahmad. It sounded like that initial group of Commissioner Fornaciari could be supported, potentially, by Commissioner Kennedy. I could feel — you know, I could feel that, too. Yes.

I think that that is a good place to kind of leave off at, and I think feels like no one is getting exactly what they want, but I think that's, to some extent, the name of the game, right, that that's going to happen, to some extent. For me, that's a good place to leave this conversation before we go to lunch, and to pick up (indiscernible).

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Commissioner Ahmad.

commissioner AHMAD: I would just like to echo my earlier point with Commissioner Fornaciari's list as well, and I know at one point threw out there (indiscernible)

Toledo and Akutagawa and (indiscernible) between the two, which I think is up for discussion, but I agree with what Commissioner Sadhwani stated, that, in my notes, this list that Commissioner Fornaciari has presented is very similar to a number other lists that have been presented.

So it seems like we are reaching some consensus. I hear my mom's voice in my head as she says, you know, "Compromise means that not everyone gets what they want." So, if we're all feeling a little bit unhappy with the list, then we successfully have compromised.

So I was keeping that at the forefront of my mind, not to say that any candidate is not qualified, by no means. They are all very, very qualified and skilled, and if we could have a Commission if 37, we would be stellar, but I think that's a good place to start as well, after the break.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

One thing. We could also just take -- there are some people in the public -- in the queue right now. So one thing we could do is just go ahead and take public comments at this time and then break for lunch, knowing that we will come back after lunch to take public comments.

Any other discussion before we jump into public comment?

(No response.)

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Seeing no objection, AT&T operator, do we have people in the queue?

AT&T OPERATOR: We do. The first one we're going to is Esperanza Guevara.

Go ahead. Your line is open.

MS. GUEVARA: Hi. Good morning. Yes. My name is Esperanza. I'm here on behalf of Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights, CHIRLA. We're a community-based organization that was founded in 1986 to advance and protect the civil rights of immigrants and refugees.

First and foremost, thank you to all the Commissioners for your service, for all your efforts to have this discussion about the candidates for the six remaining seats. We did want to remind Commissioners of the commitment that they made on the first day of discussion, when several organizations, several individuals, called in to highlight the lack of Latinx representation currently on the -- being represented currently on the eight seats of the Redistricting Commission, and we wanted to uplift specifically that you're not discussing race.

Again, I think that -- we believe that that is detrimental to ensuring that the remaining six seats in the Commission truly reflect the diversity of the state of California. We cannot forget that Latinx contribute \$83,000,000,000 in taxes and have more than \$92,000,000,000 in spending power. We cannot forget that Latinx owned businesses, contributes 650,000 jobs to California, (indiscernible) and bring an approximately \$100,000,000,000 to the economy annually, and we cannot forget that

California is home to roughly a quarter of the nation's Latino electorate, with 7.9 million Latino eligible voters.

So, for these reasons, we want the Commissioners to prioritize the consideration of Latinx candidates for all party affiliations, and, specifically, for the Republican seats, we would like to uplift Alicia Fernandez (indiscernible).

MS. PELLMAN: Fifteen seconds.

MS. GUEVARA: That was the end of my comment.

Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Do we have another person I the queue?

AT&T OPERATOR: We do. We now go to Mary Anne

14 Foo.

Go ahead.

MS. FOO: Hi, and thank you so much. My name is Mary Anne Foo, and I'm the executive director of Orange County Asian and Pacific Islander Community Alliance, and we're a large nonprofit, and we participated in redistricting efforts for the past 20 years, and know it's very challenging, so appreciate all your efforts as Commissioners in choosing.

One thing I really wanted to highlight is the need to ensure that there's representation from Orange County. Orange County is the third-largest county in

California, and we've just been doing -- you know, we've had so much growth here, and I think the 2020 census will show that, and I really wanted to uplift the application of Linda Akutagawa, because I've worked with Linda. I've seen her work for many years, and she's really impartial, you know, and listens to all.

She's worked with major corporations and businesses and communities. She's done so much training of corporations and businesses, but she's also worked, you know, with community groups as well. So I think she has a great background, very comprehensive, knows all sectors, and would be a great asset, and as well would represent the county. So I just appreciate this opportunity to provide public comments, and thank you for all of your service.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Do we have another person in the queue?

AT&T OPERATOR: And we do have one more in the queue. We're now going to Tami Bui.

Go ahead.

2.2.

MS. BUI: Good afternoon, Commissioners. I know I'm standing between you and lunch, so I will keep this at two minutes.

My name is Tami Bui. I am the assistant vice president for government-community relations at Cal State Fullerton. I am also personally someone who has been a

legislative staffer in Sacramento, and so I would just like to say that I applaud and appreciate each of you for your public service. That's why we're all here.

Cal State Fullerton is one of 23 campuses throughout the state, the only one in Orange County. I share that because we are a premier source for the amazing leaders that make up this state, many of whom are first-generation, who represent the stories like someone that you have there in consideration, which is Linda Akutagawa, who I offer my strong support.

A couple things about Linda that I hope you will keep in mind. She is someone who is extremely thoughtful, speaks her mind, but will also seek to understand. So she is impartial. She will be somebody that can build bridges, and who can work along a variety of stakeholders, whether it's business or community or ethnic lines.

I heard some of the discussion earlier about being thoughtful about not parsing things out by race, and I think Linda is somebody, in her work as an executive director at an organization called Leadership Education for Asian Pacifics, knows that the work is effective if and only where she can build coalitions across different lines, and she has dedicated her life to that. So I hope that she is somebody that you keep in mind.

I also would note that, as somebody from Orange

1 County, there are very distinct differences throughout the 2 state, not just because Orange County and other parts, but, 3 as someone who understands those nuances and dynamics, and 4 how the community has changed over the years, I think she 5 can offer a very unique and important lens to the 6 discussion (indiscernible). 7 MS. PELLMAN: Fifteen seconds. Fifteen seconds. 8 MS. BUI: Okay. And that's it. Thank you for 9 your consideration. 10 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. 11 Do we have anyone else in the queue? 12 AT&T OPERATOR: No, there's no one else in queue 13 at this time. 14 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you. 15 AT&T OPERATOR: Ladies and gentlemen, if you have 16 public comment and you have not queued up, press one, zero. 17 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. 18 Since that actually wasn't a time we were 19 planning on taking public comment, I think we don't 20 actually have to wait our, you know, full two minutes at 21 this point. 22 Any additional thoughts before we break for 23 lunch? 24 MS. SAXTON: Madame Chair, if I may, I would 25 suggest that, after lunch, identifying the slates that

you're considering is a good idea, because it complies with the regulations, and additionally to assist the public and staff to track where we are.

The conversation seems to, for the audience, the public, to both seem as though these are truly proposed for consideration and, additionally, discussion, and, additionally, we don't want anyone to have a slate proposed and then, once it's proposed, only one Commissioner -- it becomes their slate. You can only have one at a time. It may appear that certain Commissioners have more than one at a time.

So, again, to sum up, I suggest coming back and considering proposing some actual slates, so we can track them, et cetera, would be our recommendation.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. I think that was sort of the intent. Now we're going back to think about it, when we come back in. So I thank you. Just sort of maybe jumped the gun a little bit, but that's exactly, I think, where we're going after lunch.

Any additional comments before we break for lunch?

(No response.)

23 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Seeing none, I will recess for 24 lunch, and meeting back at 1:00 o'clock.

(Off the record at 11:58 a.m.)

(On the record at 1:02 p.m.)

CHAIR ANDERSEN: We're going to go to public comment at this time as the first -- as we already planned, and we might at this time ask counsel to go ahead and give the instructions on calling in.

MS. SAXTON: Thank you, Madame Chair.

If you would like to make public comment regarding Agenda Item Number 5, discussion, deliberation, and action to select the final six members of the Commission, please call in now by dialing (844) 291-5495.

In the next few minutes, we'll begin taking public comment, and that number, again, is (844) 291-5495. After dialing the number, you will speak to an operator. You'll be asked to provide either the access code for the meeting, which is 8121803, or the name of the meeting, which is CRC Selection Meeting.

After providing this information, the operator will ask you to provide your name. Please note that you're not required to provide your actual name. When the operator asks for a name, you may provide a name other than your own. When it's your turn to make public comment, the operator will introduce you by the name you provided. Please be assured our office is not maintaining any list of callers by name. We ask for you to provide some name to enable the operator to manage multiple calls simultaneously

and let you know when it's your turn to speak.

After speaking with the operator, you will be placed in a listening room. In this room, you'll be able to listen to live audio of the meeting. Please mute your computer audio, because the online video and audio will be delayed by approximately 60 seconds and feedback issues may occur, making it difficult for anyone to hear your comment. Also, please do not use a speakerphone, and speak directly into your phone.

When you decide that you want to make a comment about an action item on the agenda, press one, zero, and you'll be placed in the queue to make public comment about that action item. Again, when you decide that you want to make a comment, press one, zero.

After joining the queue to make a public comment, you should hear an automatic recording informing you that you've been placed in the queue. When it's your turn, the operator will introduce you. At that time, please state and spell your name for the transcriptionist, then state your comment clearly and concisely.

Comments will be limited to two minutes. You will hear a time check when 15 seconds in your time remains. After you finish making your comment, we'll move on to the next caller. At that point, please hang up your phone. If you would like to comment on another agenda item

at a later time, please call back when we open up public comment for that item and repeat this process.

If you are disconnected for any reason, please call back and explain the issue to the operator. Then repeat the process, and rejoin the public comment queue by pressing one, zero.

These instructions can also be found on our website.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Counsel.

Do we have any -- AT&T operator, do we have anyone on the line at this time?

AT&T OPERATOR: We do have somebody in queue. This is going to be for Lori Shellenberger.

One moment, Lori. I'll get your line open. And you are open. Go ahead.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Good afternoon. This is Lori Shellenberger, L-O-R-I, S-H-E-L-L-E-N-B-E-R-G-E-R. I'm a voting rights attorney, and also a redistricting consultant for California's Common Cause, and I'm speaking to you today on behalf of Common Cause.

I'd like to echo the thanks that Common Cause's executive director, Jonathan Mehta Stein, who spoke to you last week, made, and thank you again for your thoughtful research and your deliberations this week as you make the tough decision as to who your remaining six colleagues will

be.

I'd also like to echo the comments made earlier today about the attention that must be paid to your application of all of the selection criteria as you make this final decision.

We appreciate Commissioner Sadhwani's reminder right before lunch that the bloc of Latino representation on the Commission is of grave concern and must be considered as you make your final selection. Latinos make up 40 percent of the state's population, and within that demographic are vast differences in socioeconomic, geographic, and political differences. We urge you to keep this in mind as you finalize and vote on your slate.

Thank you again for your service, and we wish you the best of luck as you launch this process.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Do we have any additional people in the queue?

AT&T OPERATOR: We do have another one. Once
again, one, zero to queue up for comment. We're going now
to Julia Marks.

Go ahead.

MS. MARKS: Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is Julia Marks, J-U-L-I-A, M-A-R-K-S, and I am a voting rights attorney at Asian Americans Advancing Justice, Asian Law Caucus. We are an Asian-American civil rights

organization working to build a democratic society where race, class, and immigration status are not barriers to full and equal participation in American life.

We appreciate the work and the thought that you have put into the difficult process of selecting the final Commissioners. As you continue your deliberations, we would like to again uplift the importance of having a Commission that reflects the incredible racial and ethnic diversity of California.

There is currently no representation for Latinx,

East Asian, and Southeast Asian communities on the

Commission, as many callers and Commissioners have noted.

There are qualified candidates from these communities who would bring very strong skills to the Commission. You can and should consider the racial and ethnic background of candidates, in addition to the other traits and experiences that they will bring to the table.

We recognize that no group of 12 people will ever fully reflect California's diversity, but we urge you to select Commissioners who would make our Commission more representative of the state. This would mean multiple Latinx candidates across political parties, as well as East and Southeast Asian candidates. Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Do we have any additional people in the queue? AT&T OPERATOR: We have no additional in queue now.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Since this was a time we did open up to public comment, we will wait two minutes to see if anyone else queues up. So, Commissioners, be at ease.

AT&T OPERATOR: We do have comment coming from Kelsey Brewer.

Go ahead.

MS. BREWER: Hi. Thanks so much. My name is Kelsey Brewer. I am a resident of Orange County. I moved down here to go to school about 10 years ago, which is crazy to say, and I've been living and working in the community as an affordable housing developer and activist.

I just know how closely so many of the decisions that our congressional, state senate, and state assembly folks make in regard to funding, and Orange County has historically been left out of so many of those conversations at a state and federal level, even here locally, and so I would just really encourage this body to support Linda from Orange County. She is a great representation of our community. She will listen to us and ensure that, you know, we are all heard.

I just really think it's critical that we make

sure that there is Orange County representation. This is a large community here in California, and the idea that, historically, we haven't had that representation is just, I think, inappropriate for one the largest counties that is growing here in California. So I hope that you'll consider supporting her. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Do we have any additional people in the queue?

AT&T OPERATOR: No additional queues -- and one just came in here.

It's going to be Alejandra -- I will try not to butcher your last name. It's a difficult pronunciation.

I'm opening your line now. Go ahead and please spell your name.

MS. PONCE DE LEON: Hi. Good afternoon. This is Alejandra Ponce de Leon, A-L-E-J-A-N-D-R-A, P-O-N-C-E, space, D-E, space, L-E-O-N.

Good afternoon, Commissioners. I'm calling on behalf of the Advancement Project California, and I appreciate all the time and energy and mindfulness that all of you have been displaying as you're continuing to figure out, you know, what is the best, most representative slate to select from.

As many callers have been calling today and these last few days, we want to just continue to reiterate the

importance of having representation from the Latinx community, and we hear you in terms of not being able to use formulas to figure out what the number, right, but, in terms of striving to have as much representation across each of the subpools is critical, the Latinx community being one of the biggest, the biggest, population in California.

It's also super diverse, encompassing many levels in terms of the spectrum, political spectrum, in terms of regions that they live in, both north, south, central part of California, rural, urban, and so all of these perspectives are essential to have included and represented through each of the three subpools.

In addition, East and Southeast Asians, they constitute at least 12 percent of the population, and it would be a mishap to not have any representation at all in any of the -- in at least the Republican and the nonaffiliated pools. Their voices are also critical, and just as diverse as the Latinx population, representing different countries across the world, and to have at least a couple of them, one or two being on this Commission, would be essential.

Again, in terms of regions that need to be represented, Orange County, as many have echoed, is one of the most populous, and we need to have representation as

well, just given the diversity of that county -
MS. PELLMAN: Fifteen seconds. Fifteen seconds.

MS. PONCE DE LEON: -- and the size of that population. And so, definitely, I know that you are considering skillsets, and I just want to uplift that, at least within the folks that you would be able to hire. Having Karin Mac Donald as an expert in data --

MS. PELLMAN: Ma'am, it's time.

MS. PONCE DE LEON: -- is someone that you can have to support and allow you to continue to uplift the racial and geographic representation that's critical. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Do we have any other people in the queue at this time?

AT&T OPERATOR: No additional queues at the moment.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: We'll give it a little bit of time, here, and then we'll move on, realizing, for the people who -- the public who might be listening, we are at Item 5, we are discussing people and possibilities, and whittling our numbers down.

We have not actually reached the stage as of yet where we're putting together slates, and once we -- you know, as we will indeed be breaking for public comment as

1 we complete certain milestones, so there will be additional 2 time for the public to comment on our particular items. Do we have anyone in the queue at this time? 3 4 AT&T OPERATOR: No additional in queue right now. 5 To queue up for a comment, press one, zero. And with that 6 pause, we have nobody that's added to the queue. 7 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you. 8 At this point, I think we'll move on and continue 9 our discussions. 10 Go ahead, Commissioner Le Mons. 11 (No response.) 12 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Your microphone is off. 13 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes. Sorry. Can you hear 14 me? 15 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Actually, you're very quiet. 16 Could you speak up a little bit? 17 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Sure. Can you hear me 18 now, hear me better? 19 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, that's better. Thank you. 20 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay. So I wanted to 21 offer up an official slate for consideration --22 CHAIR ANDERSEN: All right. 23 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: -- and I guess it can be 24 just called "Le Mons' slate." 25 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Please go ahead -- I'm

sorry.

Is that okay? The counsel is taking notes on this, as this will become public record. Are we ready to proceed? Yes.

Go ahead, Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay. I'm going to do it in the party categories, as we've been discussing, a departure from how I did it earlier, in alphabetical order.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: So, for Democratic Party, I have Michael Gennaco, Patricia Sinay. For the Republican Party, I have Alicia Fernandez, Russell Yee, and for no party affiliate, I have Linda Akutagawa and Eddie Morgan.

MS. SAXTON: Madame Chair, if you would give staff just a few moments to --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, certainly.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: If I can comment on this offering, it's a result of having listened to my fellow Commissioners throughout the morning, as well as taking into consideration our conversations yesterday and our charge last evening, in terms of what we were charged to do, to come and prepare today.

I think it does a good job of considering all of the various categories that we needed to consider, and with attention to the regional aspect. I think today that got

1 raised quite a bit in terms of making sure that 2 representation was in the forefront, regional 3 representation was in the forefront, of our consideration 4 set as well, and listening to the feedback on the various 5 groups that we discussed, those are the -- that was my 6 thinking that went into the slate that I just presented. 7 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons. 8 MS. SAXTON: Chairman, may I? Please correct me 9 when I'm finished if this statement is not correct. 10 For the record, let the record reflect that 11 Commissioner Le Mons has proposed the following slate of six, to be called the "Le Mons slate," for selection to the 12 13 Commission: Michael Gennaco, Democrat, Patricia Sinay, 14 Democrat, Alicia Fernandez, Republican, Russell Yee, 15 Republican, Linda Akutagawa, neither party, Eddie Morgan, 16 neither party. 17 CHAIR ANDERSEN: I think --18 MS. SAXTON: Does that accurately capture the 19 slate, the Le Mons slate? 20 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes. 21 MS. SAXTON: Thank you, sir. 22 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Now we had -- thank you, 23 Counsel. And that is how we'll proceed, any slate. 24 need to, you know, take the time, read it back, and verify 25 that.

1 I noticed Commissioner Fornaciari had his hand 2 up. 3 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes. Let's see. couple comments. Just a comment for all of us, but --4 5 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Could you speak up a little bit, 6 please, or a little closer to the microphone. 7 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Can you hear me now? 8 Can you hear me? 9 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. Thank you. 10 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. Hang on. 11 on just a sec. Can you hear me better now? 12 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Much. Thank you. 13 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. Sorry. I turned 14 my fan on because it's really hot in here, but my 15 headphones aren't working, apparently. 16 Let's see. So I want to start with a comment --17 a couple of comments. First of all, I hope I didn't offend 18 anyone in Orange County with my comments earlier, you know, 19 just speaking off the top of my head, and, you know, I 20 certainly recognize that there's a great amount of 21 diversity in Orange County, and a large population, you 22 know, I like going to Orange County so please let me back. 23 The second thing is, we have an overly 24 constrained problem in the nonaffiliated group -- and this 25 is for us, but it's also for the folks listening. Like, so we've -- through public comments, through, you know, our own constraints, we can either not have a person from the northern part of the state, not have a Hispanic, or not have someone from Orange County. That's the tradeoff that we have to make based on the pool that we have.

You know, it's not -- you know, no one is going to be happy with -- you know, jumping for joy with that outcome, but that's the constraint that we're dealing with, based on the rules that have been laid out, based on the set of candidates that we have. So I just wanted to clarify that, especially for the audience that's watching and listening. You know, you may not understand the subtle nuances of the requirements for what you're doing here.

With regards to the Le Mons slate, you know, I'm going to echo Commissioner Ahmad's comment earlier. You know, yes, I think we're all getting to there. I like it. I mean, I think it gets us, you know, where we need to be, along all the axes of diversity that we need to look at.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner.

Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Madame Chair. I am also in agreement with the Le Mons slate. I feel like it touches on all of the different aspects of diversity from the Voters FIRST Act, takes into consideration the discussions that we've been having here today, as well as

public comment that has been pouring in since our first meeting. You know, just to reiterate, back to Commissioner Fornaciari's point that, you know, we are working with a constrained group, by no means -- by no fault of the candidates themselves, just the situation that we are working with, but I support this slate.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner.

Commissioner Turner.

VICE CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Yes. I want to say that I guess I'd like to offer an alternative slate, and the slate that I would like to offer would be for Democrats Patricia Sinay and Angela Vazquez, Republicans Fernandez and Yee, and the nonaffiliated parties Akutagawa and Morgan.

So the slate that I would be offering, "Turner," named "Turner," would have just the slight variation of having Angela Vazquez. I'm still very much so moved by having millennial representation on the Board. Looking at public comments that were sent in and the one that she herself sent in, I think, would be extremely important, to not lose that opportunity on our Commission.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

I know that we need a few minutes for counsel to take that,
get that written in, and then will be repeated, for total
clarification.

1 MS. SAXTON: Madame Chair, if I may? 2 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, please. Go ahead. 3 MS. SAXTON: And please, Commissioner Turner, 4 when I finish speaking, if anything is incorrect, please 5 let me know. 6 Let the record reflect that Commissioner Turner 7 has proposed the following slate of six, to be called the 8 "Turner slate," for selection to the Commission: Patricia 9 Sinay, Alicia Vazquez, Democrat -- excuse me. Let me start 10 again. Patricia Sinay, Democrat, Angela Vazquez, Democrat, 11 Alicia Fernandez, Republican, Russell Yee, Republican, 12 Linda Akutagawa, neither party, Eddie Morgan, neither 13 party. 14 VICE CHAIR TURNER: Yes, that's correct. 15 MS. SAXTON: Thank you, Commissioner. 16 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Counsel. 17 Thank you, Commissioner Turner. 18 Commissioner Kennedy. 19 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madame Chair. 20 I spent the lunch hour reviewing two candidates, and I 21 would like to propose a slate and speak to the two 22 candidates in the nonparty, because it seems that we're 23 very close to agreement on the other two subpools, and 24 we're just having issues with how to deal with the nonparty 25 pool, as Commissioner Fornaciari mentioned: Democrats,

1 Patricia Sinay, Angela Vazquez, Republicans, Alicia 2 Fernandez, Russell Yee, no party preference, Pedro Toledo 3 and Victoria Tamoush. 4 CHAIR ANDERSEN: And, again, we'll wait for 5 counsel, here. 6 MS. SAXTON: Madame Chair, if I may? 7 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Go ahead. 8 MS. SAXTON: Commissioner Kennedy, if after I 9 finish speaking there are any corrections that need to be 10 made, please let me know. 11 Let the record reflect that Commissioner Kennedy 12 has proposed the following slate of six, to be called the 13 "Kennedy slate," for selection to the Commission: Patricia 14 Sinay, Democrat, Angela Vazquez, Democrat, Alicia 15 Fernandez, Republican, Russell Yee, Republican, Pedro 16 Toledo, neither party, Victoria Tamoush, neither party. 17 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: That is correct. 18 MS. SAXTON: Thank you. 19 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: And, as I mentioned, 20 Madame Chair -- if I can speak to the no party preference 21 duo that I've proposed? 22 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, please do. 23 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I reviewed carefully the 24 application materials of both Linda Akutagawa and Victoria

Tamoush during lunchtime. Ms. Akutagawa, I think it's

25

useful to note that she also has experience living and working in San Diego. So she has not only the knowledge of Orange County, she has that experience in San Diego, as well as her experience growing up in the San Gabriel Valley.

Her work on board diversity involves working with Asian/Pacific Islander communities, African-American communities, Hispanic communities, and women's groups. She's also worked -- was working with an Asian-Jewish initiative, and I think one thing that stands out in the letters of reference, integrity and a strong ethical core. She had five comments, written comments, in favor during the application process, as well as the numerous phone calls that we've received yesterday and today.

Victoria Tamoush, I find it very interesting and useful that her work has involved investigating and adjudicating disputes, requiring her to be fair-minded and fact-based. I think her commitment to diversity is quite well demonstrated. She has worked with nearly 60 different groups over the years, or perhaps even more. She said she may have left some off of that listing.

Her work with the Community Relations Conference involved pulling ethnic, racial, and religious groups together to improve their relationships. I note that she spends part of her time in San Luis Obispo County, which

would give us a broader geographic scope as well. Her enormous interfaith contacts, not only in Orange County, but I think those go beyond Orange County, I think, would be useful, and go to the person that she and the work that she does.

She's been awarded for her leadership by both the Orange County Human Relations Commission as well as the Los Angeles County Human Relations Commission. She was one of KCET's women of the year. She clearly advocates for all. Her investigations had to be thorough, well documented, and really sound. She is accustomed to applying the law. She is a quasi judge, and so very much accustomed to applying the law in a very fair manner, and while she has not had phone callers on her behalf, she had 18 written comments come in on her behalf during the application process.

So I would ask that we consider my slate, and those are the results of my review of Ms. Akutagawa's application and Ms. Tamoush's application. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you to everyone who's put forward slates thus far. At this point in time, I could see myself being in support of Commissioner Kennedy's slate.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

1	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Madame Chair?
2	CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, Commissioner Taylor.
3	COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes, just to add my two
4	cents. I would be in support of Commissioner Turner's
5	slate. However, I do like the insight that Commissioner
6	Kennedy just brought. But, over the course of my
7	lunchtime, I came up with a similar slate as Commissioner
8	Turner.
9	CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.
10	COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Madame Chair?
11	CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, Commissioner Ahmad.
12	COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Just a point of
13	clarification. I just want to make sure I have it down
14	correctly. The difference between Le Mons' slate and
15	Turner's slate is one candidate in the Democratic Party,
16	right?
17	CHAIR ANDERSEN: Le Mons' slate and Turner's
18	slate?
19	COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes. I guess it's a
20	question for the whole group. Yes.
21	CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, that is correct. Well,
22	yes, that's what I have. It would be on Le Mons' slate,
23	the different candidate, the Democrat, would be Gennaco,
24	and on Turner's slate, the different candidate would be
25	Vazquez. The other remaining five are the same.

I suppose it's time for me to say a few words.

The one thing I did go back and reflect on is, we do have many good candidates. I was a little concerned that -- are we -- in the effect of coming together and compromising, are we actually sort of using a bias against experts?

You know, we say we -- you know, we got a passion, which is really good, and that's what you want to bring to the Commission. Several of our people who we sort of talked about, said, "Yes, but no had come off the slate. Their traits and strengths is what they propose to bring to the Commission." And then we kind of went, "Well, yes, but we don't want to use them too much."

Is that sort of -- did we actually almost sort of swing the other way, looking back at, like, the first sort of grouping of the original -- you know, a group of people who Commissioner Le Mons prepared, versus the sort of group that Commissioner Fornaciari ended up discussing? And with that in mind, I think I'm going to go ahead and propose a slate.

So this will be the Andersen slate, and it will be -- under the Democrats, it will be Patricia Sinay.

(Indiscernible.) Well, it is going to be Angela Vazquez.

Republican, it is going to be Peter Blando, Karla Van

Meter. And then, under the no party preference, it is going to be Eddie Morgan and -- where is it? Actually, you

know what? Actually, I'm sorry. I need to change that. I
misspoke. It should be Patricia Sinay, Michael Gennaco,
Peter Blando, Karla Van Meter, Eddie Morgan, and Linda
Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Madame Chair?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. That's Commissioner

Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes. I would say, similar as Commissioner Ahmad reminded just earlier, we don't want to lean too heavy or have a (indiscernible), either.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I'm sorry. We lost a bit of you. You don't "lean too heavy," and then you broke up.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Towards their expertise, especially when we're able to hire or bring in an expert to sort of fill the need. It just won't be as in-house. So, the same as we consider that expertise, it shouldn't be the end-all, be-all, either.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, that's correct, and I'm just sort of writing this down. You know, I did consider -- the reason, you know, I -- Michael Gennaco, because we are losing -- you know, there is that -- you know, I am looking sort of at legal expertise versus -- and also, of course, Gennaco is down south, and so, you know, I've taken Pedro Toledo off, to adding a county, for Orange County, with Linda Akutagawa.

We could -- you know, I was thinking, instead of Karla -- you know, keeping Peter Blando, and instead of Karla -- which is going back to what Ms. Turner said, Commissioner Turner said, earlier, Blando, Fernandez, but they're exactly in the same spot, and this is again sort of keeping gender balance. I considered Yee, but then it would be very male-dominated.

There is another Republican woman who is down south, Genevieve Murphy. We haven't brought her in yet to be put in there, and her background is business and also the bucket list, other more nonprofit organizations, but I didn't want to add that name in. Again, it was sort of a balancing thing. You know, I just thought I'd put that one out there. It is a little heavy, expertise-wise, and we could make some changes in it, but I didn't want to essentially remove all of them, particularly in the Republican party, too, and I was sort of thinking -- originally, when I thought of my ideal group, I wanted to have a little bit of expertise in each field, in each party, the idea being, that way, we really are totally nonpartisan, and this kind of hits a little bit more with what Commissioner Sadhwani was saying earlier.

It sort of does look a little bit like -- she didn't actually mention party-particular strengths, more like geographical, but it is a little bit party as well,

and, you know, when we actually sort of get down to really working in smaller groups, I was a little concerned about that, originally.

Now, I understand that, you know, with our group of 35, there's only so much we can do, and just as

Commissioner Fornaciari said, you know, in our group of no party preference, at this particular point, we can either -- you know, we have to make someone unhappy, and there are little things like that I was considering.

I went ahead and made this proposal, just for a kind of counterbalance, almost, and realizing that, you know, this one probably isn't going to fly, but is there a little bit more discussion? I guess that's what I was looking for.

So, Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Madame Chair.

This is not a comment on anyone's particular slate at this moment. It's more just about the discussion that we're having related to expertise, and the consideration of expertise in this process.

The Voters FIRST Act does not outline expertise as a criteria in order to be eligible to serve on the Commission, and I would argue that the beauty of this Commission is so that we can get average, everyday people making decisions for the people of California.

I can put myself forth as an example. There is no way biologically possible that I can compete with any of your years of experience. It's just not biologically possible. I was not on the earth for the 10 years that you all have had at various organizations.

So, thinking about that, and my opportunity to be on this Commission and serve the people, and hand over the mike to the people, I would like to elevate that, although some candidates may not have what we consider, in our own biased perspective, to be expertise, everyone made it this far, and is on this list for a reason, and because they are all qualified.

I think, at this point, our purpose is to ensure that we are true to the Voters FIRST Act, which Californians voted into legislation, and that we are now beholden to uphold. So I just wanted to throw that out there for discussion.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I do appreciate that. I might ask -- answer, before I call on Commissioner Le Mons. Yes, I am completely aware, and I did not -- but I was a little concerned how quickly we just sort of -- it was almost like "Well, yes, they're great, but they're too great. We can't consider them."

I was a concerned about that, which is why I went ahead and made this, realizing this was not going to fly,

this group, but I thought we sort of -- we just kind of immediately jumped away from it, and that's what I was really concerned about. It shouldn't be, because they have that expertise, we shouldn't consider them, and that's where I felt we went.

So, you know, this is more -- I think it came to -- Commissioner Le Mons, you might be just about to say this -- but make sure we make the discussion, in terms of, you know, let's get everything out there so, when we do come to that, I think we're going to come to, actually, a consensus, as I said earlier, but I want to make sure that we say those things. So that's, you know, my sort of point. I realize this group won't fly, but I think we, you know, might want to talk a little bit about making a couple of changes in which ultimately slate we end up with.

I'm sorry. Now, Commissioner Le Mons.

things. One is, I just want to be clear that that was not my thinking earlier as it related to discussing expertise at all, and, more importantly, I think that if there's a question about my perspective in particular, I really invite the query, and I think I've kind of spoken up to that a couple times in these meetings, as I feel like assumptions get made by the Chair as to what has been said or whatever you, and there's an interpretation made, which

I respect, but I do invite the query to check in, to make sure that you're hearing it or receiving it the way that us, as Commissioners, intended, particularly for myself, because I'm very clear on what I'm saying and what I mean, and I'm very comfortable making those clarifications. So that's the one point.

The second point is, and maybe it's because I'm in the nonparty affiliate category, I personally didn't approach this thinking about party at all, other than how they're grouped on a piece of paper, which was done for me. So this has been an interesting piece of conversation just for me, in terms of "Okay," and maybe that's because I don't think in those terms, "party first" kind of idea.

So it just never even occurred to me that I was trying to accomplish something within a party. Now, I'm not saying that's correct. That might be a blind spot, or it may be just a perspective that I bring that, you know, when combined with the other seven perspectives at the table, helps us get to whatever our ultimately outcome is.

So I just wanted to offer those two pieces of insight into my thinking and how I see things, so that, you know, that you all aware. I think that's important, and I think we're all learning how we approach things through this process, and I appreciate everybody's comments, including yours as well, Chairperson.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons. That is indeed -- I think, when I say comments like this, it is indeed to come from a completely different angle, and you're right. It doesn't necessarily mean that's my angle, but I know, you know, looking at public comments and other outside influences, we do need to push -- you know, that's why I say let's pause, let's have a look, because we will be looked at, in our decisions and how we ultimately look at everything, from angles that we don't expect, and that's where I sort of went. I went, "This can be seen from a very different angle."

Now, I think we're actually going to end up with a group that we all really like, and, again, that's why I sort of said, "Let's look at the demographics of it, all of them," because we will be faced with that, and I think that's fine, because we're going to put together a group that we're totally prepared to be faced with it, but I also want us to make sure that we do look and, you know, "Yes, I know you're going to bring that up, and we have addressed that. It was a real problem, but we have addressed that." I don't want us to be blindsided by anything, which is why I brought this up for discussion, because I did feel that that kind of got brushed under the table.

So, with that in mind, then, any additional comments or -- you know, I might -- you know, I guess, with

the slate, I can always change my slate. Is that correct?

MS. SAXTON: Correct.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. But do we have any other different comments or things we'd like to -- we sort of have four slates here. Does anybody want to actually propose something different than we had all of a sudden almost immediately come to a conclusion on, or where is

MS. SAXTON: Madame Chair, if I may for the record, for your slate?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes.

everybody?

MS. SAXTON: Let the record reflect that

Commissioner Andersen has proposed the following slate of six, to be called the "Andersen slate," for selection to the Commission: Patricia Sinay, Democrat, Michael Gennaco, Democrat, Peter Blando, Republican, Karla Van Meter,

Republican, Eddie Morgan, neither party, Linda Akutagawa, neither party.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: That is what I ended up saying.

MS. SAXTON: Thank you

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you

Any other comments, or any other thoughts or -- Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I have a question for counsel with regard to changing slates, for example. If

was considering changing my slate, and it mirrors another slate, is that necessary? First question. The second question is, is there an opportunity to withdraw a slate?

MS. SAXTON: Commissioner Le Mons, for your first question, what I understood you to ask was, if you were to modify your slate such that it mirrored another Commissioner's slate, is that necessary? Was that the question that you asked?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

MS. SAXTON: That is a very discretionary decision because, as we've said, a slate can only be modified by the Commissioner who proposed it. So, if you were to modify yours, and at that moment in time, it mirrored another Commissioner's, and you then potentially withdrew your slate, and they changed their slate, then you'd be in a position where you might need to propose a slate again, if you disagreed with the way the other slate had been changed.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I see.

MS. SAXTON: Does that make sense. Yes?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes, it does.

MS. SAXTON: If you wish to withdraw your slate,

23 you may withdraw your slate.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay. Thank you

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Actually, along

those same lines -- thank you for that question,

Commissioner Le Mons. In terms of -- so how does one

modify their own slate, kind of procedurally?

MS. SAXTON: I believe it would be simply you -- if it were the Andersen slate, you would say, "I would like to modify the Andersen slate. I would like to remove Applicant A, and replace that Applicant with Applicant B," and then we would make a note of that, and that would be your amended slate.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay.

MS. SAXTON: We may or may not add an identifier to that title, to keep track. We would need to do it in a clear way. But slates belong, essentially, to the Commissioners who propose them. As I've said, the Commissioner whose slate it is is the only one who can remove an Applicant or add an Applicant. There is no added, yet exciting, hijacking someone else's slate. That is not going to happen.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Exactly. Yes.

Commissioner Le Mons or I, didn't come up with?

MS. SAXTON: Does that make sense?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. And are there any other -- I can't think of -- I think those are our procedural questions with modifying slates. You know, is there another possibility that I haven't -- that we, either

1 MS. SAXTON: I'm sorry. Perhaps --2 CHAIR ANDERSEN: In terms of -- I think we've 3 sort of asked, procedurally -- we now understand our 4 different possibilities. Is there like an additional rule 5 that we should also know about? 6 MS. SAXTON: At this point, I don't believe so. 7 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. 8 MS. SAXTON: Obviously, after slates have been 9 proposed -- and they are, as we have here. I believe we 10 have four right now. Once someone can call for --11 Right, right, right. Yes. CHAIR ANDERSEN: 12 the procedures of voting, which I think, before we do that, 13 I was going to propose that you run through those rules for 14 us again, just for clarification, but I think, at this 15 point, we're still sort of talking about our slates, at 16 this particular point. So, if that's okay --17 MS. SAXTON: Chairman, I would absolutely agree. 18 At this stage, it's premature to discuss the voting process. There will be plenty of public comment that 19 20 you'll want to take, I assume, and time to think, and time to consider. So, yes. 21 22 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Thank you for all 23 those questions. 24 So, knowing what we know now, are there any -- do 25 we need a few minutes? And, also, where are we on -- 2:30

is our next time for a break.

MS. SAXTON: That is correct.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Is there any particular things we were thinking of now?

Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I have a question for my fellow Commissioners, which will inform a decision that I'm pondering, and it's just around gender, thoughts about gender and power dynamics, interesting question, I think. So it's a vague question, isn't it? Everybody has got to look at me like, "What? What is Commissioner Le Mons talking about?"

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Commissioner Le Mons?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes. So I would do something similar as well. Again, if we look at the verbiage of "reasonably reflective," eight to six, female to male, I think that's an acceptable ratio, one way or the other. I think that's still within the parameters.

I think, if you were to go beyond that, you could get into different power dynamics, but I think the one -- based on the constraints that we have, it's no way we can get perfect symmetry. We want that symmetry, but it's just no way to get it. So I'm comfortable, if that's sort of

what you're going with. I would be comfortable being in the minority. I'll stop there.

 $\label{eq:commissioner} \mbox{COMMISSIONER LE MONS:} \mbox{ You fully understand my} \\ \mbox{question.}$

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you for that, Commissioner Taylor, clarification there. That was very well done.

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Sure. Just to echo

Commissioner Taylor's comment, I think -- I don't have to

repeat them. I agree with them 100 percent. But I just

want to make a couple comments, to share a little more

deeply my thinking here, and why I support Commissioner Le

Mons' slate as he put it forward.

There's two things. You know, Commissioner

Turner, I do appreciate your thoughts about Candidate

Vazquez and, you know, what she's bringing to the table,

especially, you know, the millennial perspective.

Clearly, we have a lot of folks who are not millennials, but we do have one who is a millennial, and so, you know, we are not completely unrepresented by that demographic, if you will. You know, we're heavily represented by an older demographic than that, though, and I recognize that. And so, yes, I mean, for me, it was between Gennaco, Sinay, and Vazquez, really tough decision, but I like Gennaco and Sinay, and that's part of the reason

why.

Then, finally, I'll just reiterate, I'd be super uncomfortable with us ignoring one-third of the area of the state of California. It's certainly not one-third of the population, but it's one-third of the area, and I echo Commissioner Taylor's previously comments, too. I'd feel uncomfortable, you know, going into the 2030 Commission with the north states saying again, "We had no representation at all." Thanks.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

I'm sorry, Commissioner Le Mons. We sort of jumped in on you. You were talking. Or had you finished your -- we sort of all kind of jumped --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes. Unless there was someone, other Commissioners, that wanted to add to it, I was comfortable with the feedback that I got.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: There are some hands.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Madame Chair.

Just two quick points. I by no means would want to represent all millennials. I think that would be a really hard task. Maybe we should ask Gen Z what they think about millennials, and that feedback is very disparate.

Then, to the gender point, something that was interesting even through the application process for myself was that (indiscernible) categorized gender as female, you know, and then I believe we had nonbinary as well. So we, just amongst the qualified list set forward by the legislative leaders, we don't have anyone representing nonbinary.

So we're already working with a list that won't be reflective of the diversity we have in California, and then, who knows? Maybe someone checked the box because that's what we are told to do, to put ourselves into boxes, and that might not be truly reflective of someone's self-identification. So I just wanted to share that thought.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.

Commissioner Sadhwani, did you have your hand up,
also?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, just to respond to the question on gender. I so appreciate you bringing that up. I agree with Commissioner Ahmad that, you know, we certainly are already essentially missing out in terms of that nonbinary, I suppose, category.

Then I would just raise that yes, there are constraints in terms of our selection. I think it's interesting, actually, that at this time, given the random

draw that it is, even, in terms of gender, and I would hope that we could uphold that.

I would also just raise that when we're in any kind of group setting, like when we're thinking about gender balance, right, there's also intersectional identities as well, particularly when we are talking about ensuring that there's millennial voices, and those millennial voices are also women of color, right?

So now we're talking about younger women of color -- like, I don't mean to open a can of worms here, but I simply would just put that out there for all of us to continue to think about, as to why gender balance might still be important to kind of uplift and maintain, if possible.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Thank you. Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madame Chair.

I'll go back to something that I cited from Commissioner

Turner in presenting my first concept yesterday. I think

she stated it well, and I think, you know, as Commissioner

Sadhwani has said, I think we're all aware of this, but it

is incumbent on all of us to lift up those who are not

present, and I thank Commissioner Turner for that, I think,

inspiring formulation. I hope that that can continue to

guide us throughout our work.

Just very quickly, in reply to Commissioner

Fornaciari, you know, I'm certainly eager to see us

representing the state as broadly and widely as possible,

but, you know, I do think that it -- and I think someone

else had mentioned this as well -- Sonoma County may be

counted in the Applicant Review Panel's geography as "Bay

Area."

Those of us who have been there, and particularly those of us who have been to Petaluma, know that that's not necessarily the case, and that Petaluma certainly has ties to the north of the state, and I believe, also, that Mr. Toledo -- you know, his awareness of the north of the state is very solid.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner.

You know, I like Candidate Toledo as well, and yes, I will say that, you know, since I'm from the Bay Area, and, you know, no, you -- Petaluma, yes, it's out there, but it's inside Santa Rosa, and anyone from up north says, once you hit Santa Rosa, you're in the Bay Area, and, you know, they would be disenfranchised if we said, "Well, the north is represented by a person who lives in Petaluma." And it's sort of akin to saying -- well, not quite, but someone who lives in, you know, the Yucca Valley represents Los Angeles. It's not quite like that, but something like that. So I understand what you're -- again,

I like your candidates. This is hard. This is just really hard.

Commissioner Kennedy.

commissioner Kennedy: Just repeating something I said earlier today, and at that point, I was just noting (indiscernible). The Second Congressional District goes all the way from Petaluma -- Petaluma is divided between the Second and the Fifth -- all the way up to the border. So, obviously, the 2010 Commission felt that there was sufficient commonality between Petaluma and the far north of the state to group it together into a congressional district.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, yes. Thank you, and we'll certainly -- you know, we'll be looking at those very districts, you know, when we actually, you know, get around to it. Who knows how that's going to break? But certainly everything you said is certainly well spoken, and we appreciate the candidates that you put down, because they're all very qualified. I see that discussion, that sort of three-way discussion, similarly to the sort of three-way discussion we're having with the Democrats. It's very hard. It's just very hard.

My original is, quite frankly, Eddie Morgan and Pedro Toledo, and then we're, you know -- but then that's kind of why I had, you know, Karla in there, too, because

they're Petaluma, Petaluma, thinking a little bit north, but not quite. So I completely understand, and I really appreciate your thorough discussion of those candidates. It just points out how difficult this really is.

Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: In the spirit of discussing, which seems to be, like, the new point of differentiation for certain candidates, I do think that northern Northern California is very different than the Bay Area region, and I'm categorized as Central coastal, but I've never said, "Hey. I'm from Central coastal." It's usually South Bay, right and I personally have never traveled that far up north in California, and I think there would be a certain perspective that a candidate from that part up north would bring to the Commission that I personally would not be able to speak to, and would not be comfortable speaking to, given my lack of experience and exposure to that rea, geographically.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner.

Okay. Now, I have a -- just for discussion purposes, you know, looking at -- because we're sort of -- you know, we're talking about the three -- we kind of weighed back and forth the three Democrats that we're really looking at, and then the three nonpartisans that we're really grappling with. I'd sort of like us to have a

little --

22.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Madame Chair?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Sorry to interrupt. Would you mind naming the three, just so that we're all on the same page?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: And I'm looking at the difference on the slates here. For the Democrat Party, the three candidates we're talking about that vary are Michael Gennaco, Patricia Sinay, and Angela Vazquez, and then, in the no party preference, the three candidates we're talking about are -- actually, I take that back. I guess we're actually talking four, Eddie Morgan, Pedro Toledo, Linda Akutagawa, and Victoria Tamoush, who Commissioner Kennedy has added on his list.

So the conversation a little bit before had been between -- it started with -- you know, originally, the two on the nonparty were Eddie Morgan and Pedro Toledo, then Linda Akutagawa added in there, and then Victoria Tamoush was also added in that. So we've kind of gone through about four people in that group. That's how I'm seeing that. Is that what other Commissioners are grappling with?

(No response.)

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Seeing no objection for that, I think that's sort of the group, and then, in the Republicans, it looks like, you know, basically, the three different takes now are coming to Alicia Fernandez and Russell Yee, and I've been the one who basically has been bringing up other people.

The one I really sort of -- Pedro Blando, he has some qualities that -- I'm really grappling with not having him there, and I think Commissioner Turner mentioned that because, when she put together her second group before the lunch, she had Blando and Fernandez, because they're really good candidates, and that brings the whole Filipino group in, but they're exactly from the same area, and then, again, gender balancing.

Well, if we switched, you know, for -- you know, if we switch Blando out, then, and keep Fernandez, but -- and that's where I came back to, you know, well, if we're trying to do gender balance, but, if we're maybe not quite as concerned about gender balance, what if it was Peter Blando and Russell Yee? Any just thoughts about that grouping, as opposed to -- yes, Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: (No response.)

23 CHAIR ANDERSEN: I'm sorry. We don't have your 24 microphone on.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Sorry. My Turner slate is

recorded as Yee and Fernandez for Republican, not -
CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, correct. I'm sorry. When

I spoke about that, that was before Ms. Turner,

Commissioner Turner, made a slate.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay. So her proposed slate, that's formally in the record (indiscernible)?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: The proposed slate right now does read -- three of the four proposed slates do have Republicans as Alicia Fernandez and Russell Yee. My proposed slate was Peter Blando and Karla Van Meter, and what I'm saying, just for discussion purposes, what if mine was Peter Blando and Russell Yee? You know, what do people feel about that?

Again, we're sort of accessing different groups.

Peter Blando and Alicia Fernandez are in the very

same -- they live within 30 miles of each other. Peter

Blando is West Sacramento. Alicia Fernandez is in -
Clovis? No, no. She is in Clarksburg, which is -- it's a

little more down -- it's closer to the water, to the delta,

slightly different -- well, they're both, you know, sort

of -- they're both kind of rural. Well, one is more rural.

Alicia Fernandez is certainly more rural. Peter Blando is

closer to Sacramento. But, you know, we've all talked

about the qualities of Applicant Yee, which he certainly

has, just so the -- thoughts about that?

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. Thank you, Madame Chair. I actually have a separate question, either for counsel or staff, and my apologies for, you know, leading us astray slightly. It might take a moment, or maybe someone here knows, but this is not directly in response to your question, so my apologies. You can get back to that.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: But we can -- I did want to just clarify -- the motion has been brought up for both the northern -- that northern region that Eddie Morgan is from, as well as Orange County, that neither were represented in the 2010 Commission, and I just wanted to clarify that.

I know for sure that the northern region was not, but I just wanted to check on whether or not any of the 2010 Commissioners came from Orange County. I'm trying to look on the website, and it looks like, when you click on the 2010 Commission, it now leads us to 2020. So I was just — that's more of a question for counsel or the State Auditor's staff, or if anyone happens to know that, and my apologies for leading us astray.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: No, that's a little interesting side bit that might give us a little bit more information. Thank you.

1 Do we have access to that, Counsel, at this time? 2 MS. SAXTON: We can certainly get that for you. 3 It might just take us a minute. I would suggest you 4 continue, if that's what pleases the Commissioners, while 5 we --6 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, yes. I do see a -- I 7 notice one of our illustrious counsel people is quickly 8 rifling through something. I think he might come up with 9 something quickly. 10 MS. SAXTON: Chairman, if I may, I just want to 11 restate what I understood the question to be, Commissioner 12 Sadhwani, which is the 2010 Commission. You wanted to know 13 whether any of the 2010 Commissioners were from the 14 northern region or Orange County area? 15 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Correct. 16 MS. SAXTON: Thank you. 17 CHAIR ANDERSEN: That is an interesting bit of 18 information. So, anyway --19 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Madame Chair? 20 CHAIR ANDERSEN: -- move along. Any other --21 Sorry. Commissioner Taylor. yes. 22 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes, I have a question. 23 know we've been speaking on this. Is the fact that Peter 24 Blando and Alicia Fernandez are from the same area -- is 25 that a misdemeanor? Have we tried that issue? Are we

1 totally saying that they can't be from the same area and 2 still make a slate? Because we do have Commissioners that 3 are within 30 miles of one another. I think Commissioner 4 Le Mons, myself, Commissioner Sadhwani, we're all in L.A. 5 County. So why would that be a dead issue for those 6 Applicants? CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, I (indiscernible). I 7 8 would (indiscernible) actually ask counsel. 9 Is there an actual restriction -- Commissioner 10 Taylor brought up the point that we've all sort of 11 discounted, "Oh, well." If Peter Blando and Alicia 12 Fernandez -- they're basically -- they're all in the San 13 Joaquin County, and they're within 30 miles of each other. 14 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Madame Chair? 15 CHAIR ANDERSEN: They're the -- yes. And then so 16 he was asking, "Is that, you know, for both?" or he was 17 asking about that issue, and then -- I'm sorry. And then 18 we have --19 Commissioner Ahmad. 20 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I don't know if you would 21 want counsel to go first, but I have something to share 22 (indiscernible). 23 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. Go ahead, please, 24 Commissioner Ahmad. 25 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: There is nothing written,

from my understanding, in our legal obligations that restricts two Commissioners from being from generally the same region. I think the purpose of the language is to reflect California's diversity as much as possible. Of course, there's going to be limitations in terms of region, economic status, gender, (indiscernible) county, race, ethnicity, and we see that in our list that we have to work with today. But, I don't think there's any legal taboo, or we're not violating anything if we're considering two candidates from a general region, and to that point, I just wanted to clarify that I definitely was not considering one over the other because of that specific reason.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.

Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I just wanted to echo what Commissioner Ahmad just said, nor was I considering or eliminating either of those based on that consideration at all.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you very much.

Commissioner -- sorry. Counsel?

MS. SAXTON: Thank you, Chair. Yes, Commissioner Ahmad and Commissioner Le Mons are correct. If we go back to the statutory language and think about the training, we spoke a lot about balancing all of the factors. There is

no prohibition that would prohibit two Commissioners being from the same area, et cetera.

The idea is that you want to ensure the Commission reflects the state's diversity, and another Commissioner quoted today the Constitution says it should be "reasonably reflective," essentially. So no, there are no strict, hard and fast rules, just as you're not allowed to apply specific ratios to get where you want to go, or formulas to where you want to go, and, again, you balance.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

MS. SAXTON: I am prepared to answer Commissioner Sadhwani's question, if you'd like.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, please.

MS. SAXTON: We have five minutes until we have to take our next break, if that pleases the Chair and the Commissioners.

17 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, please. Go ahead with that 18 answer. Thank you.

MS. SAXTON: So, for the 2010, there were no Commissioners from the northern region. There was one Commissioner from Orange County.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

MS. SAXTON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: That's interesting. Okay.

Well, Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I just want to make a comment about my slate again. As counsel was reading back the framework by which we are governed and how we should be approaching it, my feeling was very strongly that this slate does that, and that's not to the exclusion of any of the other Commissioners' slates, but I feel like the slate that I put forward, the Le Mons slate, does a good job with all the constraints of balancing the various things that we need to balance, and I think one of the things that stands out to me is the regional aspect of it.

While we do understand that we won't be able to represent every single county in the state of California, just by the sheer numbers, I am committed, like several other Commissioners have put forward, to doing our very best to have the regions of the state represented, particularly since we're drawing maps for the entire state. So I just wanted to say that.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Thank you, Commissioner.

At this time, we have a -- well, we do have a few minutes. Sorry, Counsel. Were you --

MS. SAXTON: Madame Chair, just -- yes. There are three or four minutes until we need to take the 15-minute break, but, also, to let the Chair and the

Commissioners know, we do have public comment waiting. You may want to take the mandatory break or take the comment now.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. We only have a few minutes, though, so we can take a couple of --

 $\mbox{\sc MS. SAXTON:}$ I'm not certain how many people are in the queue.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Actually, AT&T operator, do you have an idea how many people are in the queue at this time?

AT&T OPERATOR: We have one that has dialed in but has not queued up. If you've recently dialed in and would like to comment, press one, zero at this time.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Yes. Go ahead with just the one. Thank you.

AT&T OPERATOR: Okay. And we have Joseph Williams.

17 Please go ahead.

MR. WILLIAMS: Hi, everyone. My name is Joseph Williams. First, I just wanted to thank the Commission for the valuable service that you all provide for the public, and I'm from the Inland Empire.

I served as a local elected (sic) for a community college district in San Bernardino, and I had the opportunity to serve with Linda Akutagawa on the community advisory panel for Southern California Edison, and just

wanted to say that my experience with her is that she was a great ally for the Inland Empire, and just pushing for resources for diverse communities and diverse stakeholders, and just appreciated the experience that I had working with her on that advisory panel, and just wanted to, you know, extend support, and a request that her application be given consideration, because of her leadership and, again, the way that she supports diverse communities.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to speak, and thank you all for your service.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Well, that brings us just about to our mandatory stop. So, at this point, I think we'll go ahead and take our 15-minute break for our sign language and court reporter, and we can also take a 15-minute break and, you know, address this when we come back, one way or another, however we want to sort of proceed at that point.

Do I see any objections? Seeing none, I will call us -- not call us -- the group will go into recess, and we'll see everybody back here at 2:45.

(Off the record at 2:28 p.m.)

(On the record at 2:47 p.m.)

CHAIR ANDERSEN: We do have people in line for the public comment. I'm just wondering, should we go ahead and take the instructions right now, or it's okay to let

people in?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SAXTON: If it pleases the Commission and the Commissioners, you can take public comment from those in the queue. If you wish to open up for public comment right now for a longer period, and invite new folks to come in, then I would read the instructions, and we would proceed.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Then I think that I would -- unless I see objection, I'd prefer just to go with people who are already here, and then continue our discussions. Is that agreeable? I'm getting a few nods.

Okay. AT&T operator, could you bring the people forward who are in queue.

AT&T OPERATOR: Certainly. We'll go first to the line of James Woodson.

One moment, Mr. Woodson. Okay. Go ahead. Your 16 line is open, sir.

17 MR. WOODSON: Good afternoon, Commissioners. 18 Thank you for the time, and thank you for just doing kind 19 of the task that you are facing.

I really wanted to uplift an important principle in your discussions. You know, I've been listening, and I wanted to really uplift the importance of people, right? You know, the principle of one person, one vote is fundamental to our democracy.

You all will be identifying communities of

interest based on testimony from people, based on what people feel like are their communities, and where they have shared interests and values, and ultimately what you'll be doing will have an impact on people, and so I've been a little concerned in some of the discussion as you all have been talking about geographic diversity.

While that is certainly important, I've been hearing a lot of talk about taking into account land and space and property and things like that, and when we're talking about reflecting California's diversity, I want to make sure that we're not divorcing that from demographic diversity, right?

When we spell out sort of the diversity characteristics, there are much more personal characteristics than that, than there are land and space, and particularly when you're thinking about underrepresented communities that have certainly already been lifted up, like the Latinx community, East Asian community, it seems like those things would, you know, balance heavier than, again, land and space.

You all won't be able to make everybody happy, but I want to make sure that this principle of sort of equal representation and ensuring that, you know, one county or one region --

MS. PELLMAN: Fifteen seconds. Fifteen seconds.

MR. WOODSON: -- is overrepresented based on land, that you all think about that, and, you know, just, you know, any sort of slate that has just two Latino representatives seems like it would be unacceptable based on all the testimony that you've heard.

MS. PELLMAN: That is time.

MR. WOODSON: Thank you for your time.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you for the comment.

Do we have any other people in the queue?

AT&T OPERATOR: We do. We'll go now to Michael

11 Latner.

Mr. Latner, your line is open. Please spell your name for the court reporter.

MR. LATNER: Hi. My name is Mike Latner,
L-A-T-N-E-R. I'm a professor of political science at Cal
Poly San Luis Obispo, and a recognized expert on
gerrymandering and redistricting.

I'd like to reiterate the point of the previous caller about the importance of descriptive representation. Ultimately the legitimacy of the very important work that this Commission is doing is dependent in large measure on its descriptive accuracy and the degree to which people in California see themselves as involved and having a voice in this process, and it's crucial that you achieve that in the composition of your Commission.

Latinos are 40 percent of the state of California. They're the largest single racial or ethnic group in the state, and the fastest-growing group of voters. Therefore, I think it's really important that the Commission looks to understand the full diversity of communities in terms of demographics and background, and that includes really integrating both political perspectives and racial and (indiscernible) perspectives.

You should be looking for conservatives

(indiscernible) to the Democrats and Republicans that cross racial lines. You should be looking for a Republican and no party preference (indiscernible) Commissioners. You should be looking for more no party preferences

(indiscernible) Commissioner in terms of growing voter registration.

I really want to reemphasize the importance of descriptive representation on the Commission. The Commission doesn't represent -- and it's true that, you know, the single-member district aspect of our electoral system requires --

MS. PELLMAN: Fifteen seconds. Fifteen seconds.

MR. LATNER: -- some geographic representation, but it's the descriptive representation that counts on this Commission, and I strongly urge you to take that into consideration. Thanks for your time.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Any other people in the queue?

AT&T OPERATOR: Yes. And once again, as a reminder, if you'll dialed in and have not yet pressed one, zero to queue up for your comment, please press one, zero at this time.

We'll go now to Christopher Sanchez, and, as a reminder, please spell your name for the court reporter.

MR. SANCHEZ: Buenas tardes, Commissioners.

Christopher Sanchez, Christopher, C-H-R-I-S-T-O-P-H-E-R,

Sanchez, S-A-N-C-H-E-Z.

I'm calling out of the CHIRLA Sacramento office, and want to urge the Commission to really ensure that the 40 percent of Latinos that are in the state of California are represented because, as previous speakers have mentioned, it is important to ensure that there's diversity in this Commission that is going to make critical decisions not only for elections and political decisions, but will also have great impact on our communities as it relates to social safety nets, to our schools and our communities, the funding coming down, and those allocations.

It's important that the Commission does look like the state, and, you know, I would definitely encourage the Commission to look more specifically at the candidate who's no party preference, Pedro, you know, and all the other

Latino candidates that are still being considered. We would ask that you absolutely consider all of them, and to put them on the Commission in the beautiful state of California. It is the state it is because of Latinos in this state, and it's not that we are no longer represented, it's we should have something that's reflective of our communities, of what the legislature has.

This is the year that the Latino caucus, legislative caucus, has the most amount of Latinos. This is the year when we have the most amount of elected officials, statewide elected officials, that are Latino, and it would be a shame for the Commission not to be reflective of what the state has already told you. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Do we have any other people in the queue?

17 AT&T OPERATOR: Yes, and we'll go now to Julie

18 Tran.

Your line is open. Please spell your name for the court reporter.

MS. TRAN: Hi. Thank you. My name is Julie Tran, J-U-L-I-E, T-R-A-N.

I have been involved in public policy and local politics here in Orange County, California, for the last seven years, and really do a lot with -- I've worked with

elected officials in the federal side and the state side who have been following the redistricting and Independent Redistricting Commission ever since its incarnation, so I really commend you for taking on this momentous task, and really making sure that we have representation across the state of California, so kudos to that.

I am here also to throw my support behind Linda
Akutagawa, as she has time and time again come up and
served her community in Orange County, and we really need
that kind of leadership, someone who will speak up for
underrepresented communities, and allow our young folks the
opportunity to have a voice and to be represented.

So please consider Linda. I would really, really recommend her, and thank you for all that you do.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Do we have anybody else in the queue?

AT&T OPERATOR: We do. We have several more.

Next we'll go to Rene Reed, and, once again, please spell your name for the court reporter. Your line is open.

MS. REED: Thank you. My name is Rene Reed, R-E-N-E, R-E-E-D. I'll be very brief.

I wanted to point out that the Turner slate, by excluding Mr. Gennaco and Toledo, would result in no attorneys on the Commission. Again, thank you so much for

your time.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Do we have anyone else in the queue?

AT&T OPERATOR: Yes. We will go now to Jackie

Coto.

Again, please spell your name for the court reporter. Your line is open.

MS. COTO: Hi. Jacqueline Coto, last name spelled C-O-T-O. I'm calling from the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials, NALEO Educational Fund.

I'm calling again to reiterate the urgent concern of the low Latino selection within your deliberation today, and, given the absence of Latinos so far on your current Commission, I urge you to fulfill your responsibility by selecting Latinos for the remaining seats in each of the partisan affiliation groups.

Without strong Latino presence, the Commission will simply fail to reflect the state's ethnicity, diversity, (indiscernible) and meet statutory requirements, and fully reflect the diversities of the state's Latino population.

I appreciate your consideration and trust that you will exercise the core democratic principle that all people deserve a fair presentation by prioritizing the

1 selection of Latino representation in the final pool. 2 Thank you. 3 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. 4 Do we have anyone else in the queue? 5 AT&T OPERATOR: Yes. We'll go now to Julia 6 Gomez. Your line is open. Please spell your name for the 7 court reporter. 8 MS. GOMEZ: Hello. My name is Julia Gomez, 9 J-U --10 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Operator, we appear to have lost 11 her. Have we lost the operator? 12 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We'll move on to the line 13 of --14 AT&T OPERATOR: I'm sorry. Julia, please hit 15 one, zero one more time for us. There was a glitch. We 16 did lose you. I do apologize for that. We'll try to get 17 her back. There we go. All right. One moment. 18 Julia, thanks for your patience. You are open 19 again. Appreciate your work with us on that. 20 MS. GOMEZ: No problem. Can you hear me now? 21 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. If you -- no. 22 MS. GOMEZ: Hi. This is Julia Gomez. Can you 23 hear me now? 24 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. 25 MS. GOMEZ: Okay. My name is spelled J-U-L-I-A,

space, G-O-M-E-Z, for the ACLU of California, and I urge the Commission to ensure that, going forward, there will be Latinx representation on this Commission.

I think the Latinx community and the wider voting rights advocacy community was incredibly disappointed to learn that there is currently no Latinx representation through the first randomized selection of Commissioners. So this is your opportunity to correct this, and ensure that the Commission includes the full diversity of our state and all of its communities as it draws district lines.

I know you're considering adding two or three Latinx Commissioners, but we don't think that's enough. We call on you to add four or even five Commissioners, to ensure that there's confidence in this process and that the Latinx community sees themselves represented as these lines are drawn. Thank you very much.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Do we have anyone else in the queue?

AT&T OPERATOR: And the next person in queue is Elizabeth Alcantar.

Ms. Alcantar, please spell your name for the court.

MS. ALCANTAR: Thank you. My name is Elizabeth
Alcantar. Last name is spelled A-L-C-A-N-T-A-R, and I'm

calling in my personal capacity as mayor of the city of Cudahy to lend my support for Latinx Applicants. The Latinx community are 40 percent of California' residents, and we need to be more accurately represented on the Commission.

The Commission will be making incredibly important decisions that impact our communities on the ground for the next decade, and will directly impact electoral representation and access to resources. I ask you to fulfill your responsibilities, and ensure that the Latinx community is accurately represented and fairly represented on the Commission today. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Again, do we have anyone else in the queue?

AT&T OPERATOR: And now to the line of Samuel

Molina.

Mr. Molina, please spell your name.

MR. MOLINA: Hi. Good afternoon, everyone. This is Samuel Molina, California state director of Mi Familia

Vota. We're a national Latino civic engagement organization, again calling on you to fulfill your responsibilities and make sure that more Latinos are represented on the Commission, for at least five of those seats, especially from the Central Valley and the Inland Empire. Thank you.

1 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. 2 Do we have anyone else in the queue? 3 Thank you, and now to the line of AT&T OPERATOR: 4 Oralia Rebollo. 5 Please spell your name for the court. 6 MS. REBOLLO: Hi. My name is Oralia Rebollo. 7 Last name is spelled R-E-B-O-L-L-O, and I represent the 8 City of Commerce as the mayor pro tem, and the only Latina 9 on a council seat of four males, and it is imperative for 10 communities like mine that are made up of more than 95 11 percent working-class Latinos to be represented, and I urge 12 you to consider a Latina for one of those vacant seats. 13 This Commission will be making crucial decisions 14 that affect my community directly, so it is important to 15 have that representation in that Commission. So I urge 16 you, I strongly urge you, to please consider, obviously, 17 Latinos, but a Latina as well for one of those seats. 18 Thank you so much for your time. 19 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. 20 Do we have additional comments? 21 AT&T OPERATOR: Thank you, and now to the line of 22 Scott McCarty. 23 Please go ahead. 24 MR. MCCARTY: My name is Scott McCarty, 25 S-C-O-T-T, M-C-C-A-R-T-Y.

First of all, I'd like to thank Commissioner

Kennedy for his kind words of advocacy of my candidacy for a position on this Commission. Thank you very much.

I'm calling as a member of the public, and I'm happy that the eight of you are narrowing in on a slate of six very qualified candidates to fill out the Commission.

My comments regard Commissioner Le Mons' slate of Gennaco, Sinay, Fernandez, Yee, Akutagawa, and Morgan.

My comment is that, with one change to that slate, based on significant valid input from the public already received, and the demographics of the state of California, the one substitution to that list could allow the full 14-member Commission, when empaneled, to better reflect the state's diversity.

The change that I would like you to consider is to replace Eddie Morgan with Pedro Toledo. As I said, I think this will better reflect the state's diversity.

Congratulations to all of you for being selected.

I wish you all the very best going forward. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Anyone else in the queue?

22 AT&T OPERATOR: Thank you. Now to the line of 23 Esperanza Guevara.

Please spell your name for the court.

MS. GUEVARA: Hi. This is Esperanza,

E-S-P-E-R-A-N-Z-A, Guevara, last name spelled G-U-E-V-A-R-A, and I'm calling again on behalf of the Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights, CHIRLA.

I just wanted to again thank the Commissioners for taking into account the public comments you've been receiving throughout the day as you're deliberating on who will serve the six remaining seats on the Commission.

We specifically wanted to uplift the candidate Pedro Toledo from Sonoma County. We are recommending him based on our analysis, and believe that he demonstrates a strong ability and experience to be impartial, and that he has relevant analytical skills and an appreciation for California's diversity, and a commitment toward advancing racial and socioeconomic equity.

I also wanted to add a comment that we would like to push for the Commissioners to acknowledge or provide a summary of the written comments that they have been receiving, to ensure that these are also being taken into consideration, as I know that several organizations have been submitting written comments under the deadline of -- I think it was yesterday at 5:00 p.m. to submit written comments, and we just want to make sure that those are also being taken into consideration as you're reviewing the remaining candidates.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Actually, just a quick in there (sic). Yes. All public comments that are received before the deadline are sent to all sitting Commissioners, and we do indeed read all of them. So they have indeed been received and reviewed. Thank you.

Do we have anyone else on the line?

AT&T OPERATOR: Thank you, and now to the line of
Manju Kulkarni.

Please spell your name for the court.

MS. KULKARNI: Hello. My name is Manjusha Kulkarni, spelled M-A-N-J-U-S-H-A. Last name is K-U-L-K-A-R-N-I.

I am executive director of APPCON, the Asian Pacific Policy and Planning Council. I urge you today to fulfill your responsibility by increasing representation of communities of color, and specifically that of Asian-American, Pacific Islander, and Latino representation, to better reflect the state's diversity.

In terms of the AAPI community, and also individuals who are in Orange County, I think that Linda Akutagawa provides the strongest opportunity to provide impartial input or offer her strong analytical skills, as well as her exceptional commitment to ensuring racial and economic equity for all of those in the state of California. Thank you.

	151
1	CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.
2	Anyone else in the queue?
3	AT&T OPERATOR: And now to the line of Denise
4	Diaz.
5	Please spell your name.
6	MS. DIAZ: Thank you. My name is Denise Diaz,
7	and I am currently a councilmember in the city of South
8	Gate.
9	I am calling today for a call to action and
10	urgency. California has always led with a lens of equity,
11	with a lens of inclusivity. Therefore, having such a low
12	representation of Latinos is alarming, concerning for a
13	community in the Southeast. So today you have the
14	opportunity to put not just three Latinx individuals, but
15	to add a minimum of five individuals that are Latinos.
16	Thank you all.
17	CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.
18	Do we have anyone else in the queue?
19	AT&T OPERATOR: And now to the line of Miguel
20	Canales.
21	Please spell your name.
22	MR. CANALES: Yes. Hi. Can you hear me?
23	CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. Go ahead.
24	MR. CANALES: Great. Thank you. I am Miguel
25	Canales, and I'm from the city of Artesia. Artesia has

about 20,000 people, but Artesia is also 30 miles away from Southeast Los Angeles or from downtown Los Angeles.

You've already heard from the City of Commerce, Cudahy, South Gate. You're hearing from Artesia. We're a group of about 17 cities that are really advocating for regional representation and for (indiscernible) a seat of an individual representing our region, a (indiscernible) seat that actually knows our community.

So I thank you for your time, of the Committee.

I thank you for the important decision you're going to

make. But you've heard millions (sic) of speakers, whether

they're from CHIRLA, from NALEO, from a lot of these

nonprofit organizations that are advocating for a lot of

the same things.

We're advocating for a representative from

Central Valley, from Inland Valley, from San Diego. I

heard there's an individual from Sonoma County by the last

name Toledo. That sounds like a fantastic representation.

Ultimately what we need is, we need a voice, and we hope

that the Commission hears all these calls and advocacy for

the communities, including the (indiscernible) community of

Southeast Los Angeles. Thank you.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Do we have anyone else in the queue?

AT&T OPERATOR: Thank you, and now to the line of

Eddie De La Riva.

Please spell your name.

MR. DE LA RIVA: Good afternoon, everyone. My name is -- I'm Mayor Eddie De La Riva. That's E-D-D-I-E. My last name is De La Riva, D-E, space, L-A, space, R-I-V-A.

I'm mayor of the city of Maywood, a small city in Southeast Los Angeles County, and I echo the sentiment of those callers that have called in, to share my dismay that there is no representation of any Latinos on the Commission.

Given that we are part of an historically underserved region within Southeast County, I think it's imperative that we haveproper representation on this Commission, and also, as being Latino, one of the largest ethnic groups here in California, I think it's only right that we have some representation. So I thank you, and I urge you to please consider adding some more people of color on this Commission, especially Latinos. Thank you so much.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

Do we have any more next in the queue?

AT&T OPERATOR: We have no one else in queue.

24 So, again, please press one, zero if you would like to make

25 a statement.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Well, let's give that a short bit. Those were certainly -- I'd like to say at this point, for all the people who have called in, thank you very much. We really appreciate your comments, your letters, and we do have restrictions of all considerations we must make. Someone is going to be unhappy, but, please, regardless of the final outcome, please stay in communication with the Commission, because we cannot do our work without you.

You know, we're going to try as best we can to represent the entire state of California, but there are only 14 of us, and so, regardless of the outcome, please, please stay in touch, and when we come to your areas, please come out, or, particularly because it might be by Zoom, you might have to call in, and we will need your help, even more so than 10 years ago. So please, please stay involved with the Commission. Thank you.

Do we have anyone else in queue at this time?

AT&T OPERATOR: We have no one else in queue.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you.

At this point, I think we are going to just pause on the public comments and continue on with our work, since we were thinking that was going to be a short bit of time there, but, again, thank you for all the comments.

So, back to where we are and what we're working

with. Commissioners, do we want to make -- does anyone have any thoughts after our break, and then after this, any changes to any slates or different proposals, anything of that nature?

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. Thank you so much. You know, I think, especially after listening to all of the public comments, and also just to go back, this morning, when we opened, I had mentioned that I had gone through all of the different regions that had been established through that map that the Auditor's Office had put together. I've kind of been wrestling with this back and forth all day, or even longer, about this issue, particularly, of representation for the North Coastal region.

I don't take that lightly. You know, I hear that, that we would be lacking representation from that region. But, when I look at the demographics -- and, again, this is not a thought that I'm using any sort of metric or anything like that, or quota system or anything, but those four counties, in total, that are part of the North Coastal, Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, and Lake, make up less than one percent of California's population. What we seem to keep going back and forth on is this issue between representation of Orange County and that northern region. There are so many other factors that we've

discussed today as well.

That weighs heavily on me, and I think everyone in California is very worthy of representation, and I think that that's why we are all here, to ensure that we have a process in which all regions are going to be heard from throughout this process, but I'd like to propose my own slate that's slightly different from the ones that we've had before: for Democrats, Vazquez and Sinay, for Republicans, Fernandez and Yee, and for independents, Toledo and Akutagawa.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: All right. Obviously, we'll need a minute here for counsel to document this, and they will indeed read it back.

MS. SAXTON: Madame Chair, if I may?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, please. Go ahead, Counsel.

MS. SAXTON: Commissioner Sadhwani, if when I'm finished speaking you find there are any errors in what I've said, please do let me know.

Let the record reflect that Commissioner Sadhwani has proposed the following slate of six, to be called the "Sadhwani slate," for selection to the Commission:

Patricia Sinay, Democrat, Angela Vazquez, Democrat, Alicia Fernandez, Republican, Russell Yee, Republican, Pedro Toledo, neither party, Linda Akutagawa, neither party.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, that's correct.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. Commissioner Sadhwani agreed with that reading. Thank you, Counsel.

Any further discussion on -- yes, Commissioner Turner.

VICE CHAIR TURNER: Yes. I was (indiscernible) when Commissioner Sadhwani was giving you the slate. I'd like to modify my slate, and so I'll ask the counsel, perhaps --

I know we received information earlier on that process, but, after she spoke, the slate that I wanted to modify actually is the slate that she just offered. So do I need to delete my slate, rather than offer?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Actually, I believe we sort of did that fine parsing, and unless you want to withdraw your slate, you can just change it, and it will become essentially identical to Commissioner Sadhwani's, because, should Commissioner Sadhwani then want to make another change, yours will still stand as matching what right now is Commissioner Sadhwani's.

So those are your sort of two options. They can be identical, in which case, you know, that would be, say, we'd pick one, and, you know, should we go ahead, we might name a particular slate, propose a particular slate, say, that is called the "consensus slate," which happens to be exactly like everybody else's sort of stands, or some sort

of mechanism like that, but, unless you want to withdraw your slate right now, you should actually just change it and then let it stand.

VICE CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Madame Chair.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: That's my understanding of what you were saying, Counsel.

MS. SAXTON: Commissioner Turner may proceed with her slate as she desires. She may make changes to have it become identical to Commissioner Sadhwani's. She may withdraw it. There are considerations to keep in mind for each of those options, but all of those are available to you.

VICE CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. At this time, then, what I would like to do is to modify my slate so that it will be able to stand alone, with the understanding that, as we move further, I can always withdraw it later if it continues to line up with Commissioner Sadhwani's.

So, at this point, I will modify the Turner slate to remain Patricia Sinay, Angela Vazquez, Fernandez and Yee, Akutagawa. The change would be to add Pedro Toledo and remove Morgan. Thank you.

MS. SAXTON: Madame Chair, if I may?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, please.

MS. SAXTON: Commissioner Turner, if at any point, at the end, I've made mistakes, let me know, please.

Let the record reflect that Commissioner Turner has proposed an amendment to her slate, the Turner slate for six for selection to the Commission. The amended slate, first amendment, now reads: Patricia Sinay, Democrat, Angela Vazquez, Democrat, Alicia Fernandez, Republican, Russell Yee, Republican, Linda Akutagawa, neither party, Pedro Toledo, neither party.

VICE CHAIR TURNER: That is correct. Thank you.

MS. SAXTON: You're welcome.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Any additional comments by any other Commissioner at this point?

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes, I have a couple comments. I just want to clarify something. When I was talking about the north state, and I'm talking about the whole north state, not just the North Coast. So, without someone above Petaluma, we're missing Del Norte, Siskiyou, Modoc, Lassen, Shasta, Trinity, Humboldt, Tehama, Plumas, Sierra, Nevada, Butte, Glenn, Mendocino, Lake, Colusa, Sutter, Yuba, Placer, El Dorado counties, you know, and, granted, I'm aware that the total population in all those counties is, you know, a fraction of Orange County, let's say. So that was just a point I'm going to make, I wanted to make. I was just clarifying. Okay?

So, with regard to Commissioner Sadhwani's

proposal, I was actually kind of monkeying around with that exact, same proposal myself just now, and I want to recognize Scott McCarty and his comments. That proposal is basically the proposal that -- well, he had Gennaco, but somewhat similar to Mr. McCarty's proposal, and I just want to thank him for his comments and his service, but, you know, at this point, you know, I'm, you know, basing the conversation in consideration of all the public comments and feedback. I would get behind Commissioner Sadhwani's and Turner's slate at this point.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: So this kinds of harken back to before our break, and I was thinking of potentially amending my slate. I am struggling with the nonparty affiliate category, and have through the process.

The thought that -- I know we live in a democracy, and at the end of the day, it's about numbers, but there's something about that that just, in my heart, doesn't sit well with me, this idea that "You're just a smaller number of people, so, therefore." So I'm really, really struggling with this idea that, because the northern portion of the state doesn't have the numbers, that we can say, "Oh, well. It was just about the numbers.

The other comment I wanted to make is -- and this is just -- this is in regard to identity politics in general. It's a personal statement that I want to make, because you can read my application, and it tells you a little bit about who I am. It doesn't tell you fully who I am, and I've been a little bit frustrated, and no fault to anybody commenting, understanding what my relationship is to the Latinx community, and how I represent that community as well.

So I sat here and kept my mouth closed in terms of "There's no representation, there's no representation," and I've wanted to scream, and go, "Well, that's just not true." It may not seem like it based upon what appears, but that doesn't make it fact.

So I think about that, too, in terms of how people are looking at the profile and deciding who's represented or not represented, and I struggle with a little bit of that. Just living in the society that we live in, it forces us to check certain boxes, and that was kind of alluded to earlier when we were talking about even gender.

So I just caution those that are observing and watching to not just go with perception. I think that whoever ends up being the final 14, I believe I can safely say that, based upon my experience with this group of

eight, is that our interest is really in representing not just who you think we are, but the entire state of California, and are really committed to ensuring that all of the communities are represented to the degree that we're able to provide the platforms and context for them to show up and be a part of the process.

So I just wanted to go on record and say that, and then I will amend my slate, and I'd like to change it to the following: Democrat, Patricia Sinay, Democrat, Angela Vazquez, Republican, Alicia Fernandez, Republican, Russell Yee, nonparty affiliate, Linda Akutagawa, and nonparty affiliate, Pedro Toledo.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: We'll need to wait a minute for counsel to document and then read back the changes.

MS. SAXTON: Madame Chair, if I may?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Please. Go ahead.

MS. SAXTON: Commissioner Le Mons, if when I reach the end I've made any errors, please do let me know.

Let the record reflect that Commissioner Le Mons has made amendments to the Le Mons slate of six for selection to the Commission to now read as follows: first amended Le Mons slate, Angela Vazquez, Democrat, Patricia Sinay, Democrat, Alicia Fernandez, Republican, Russell Yee, Republican, Linda Akutagawa, neither party, Pedro Toledo, neither party.

1 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: That's correct. 2 MS. SAXTON: Thank you. 3 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioners. 4 Commissioner Ahmad. 5 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. So, based 6 off of what's been discussed and shared, I have 7 Commissioner Le Mons, Commissioner Turner, and Commissioner 8 Sadhwani have the same slate of candidates proposed. 9 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Sorry. Could you speak up a 10 little bit? COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes. Commissioner Le Mons, 11 12 Commissioner Turner, and Commissioner Sadhwani have the 13 same, exact candidates proposed at this time, and Kennedy's 14 slate has the same except one candidate in the no party 15 preference group. I'm just thinking out loud. 16 I, too, have been struggling so hard with the no 17 party preference group, and going back and forth, because I 18 do think that we have a certain number of criteria that 19 falls within that group, and only two slots, and I think I 20 just need to think about this combination a little bit 21 more. 22 CHAIR ANDERSEN: I'm sorry. Again, you need to 23 think about the combination a little more? Is that what 24 you said? 25

Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD:

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I was thinking out loud, and I needed to think further about what's on the table right now.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Thank you, Commissioner.

Since, you know, I have a slate up there which is the most different, I'm going to go ahead and say sort of what I -- a few different ideas, and, you know, I really like Pedro Toledo. He was always on one of my lists to begin with, and I think, you know, earlier this afternoon, Commissioner Fornaciari said, "Someone is not going to be happy with our nonpartisan group," you know, and there's, you know, Eddie Morgan representing, you know, guite frankly, the entire north of the state, and I'll go into that a little bit in a minute, versus Orange County, which is now a much, you know, more populous area. It's a very tight, close area down south, and we do have people sort of above and around that, but it, particularly by itself, is not -- versus Linda Akutagawa, who -- she's Orange County, and Eddie Morgan.

So we have sort of those three, and, basically, what we've been saying just lately is, so we either -- you know, it's kind of the north versus sort of the semi-north, kind of, and I see it a little differently, as in, you

know, I think Eddie Morgan is one of those where we would be disenfranchising.

Again, it's more -- it's not so much -- and someone called in and said it's land. It's not actually sort of land. It's an entire community, and it's sort of a -- it's an entire way of life, with sort of the northern half of the state, which is also similar all through the mountains. This is kind of a more -- again, it's a different culture, which tend to identify with independence and, you know, which is -- you know, who else said, "We're going to break off from the state?"

I'm really concerned with -- I understand, you know, everyone -- you know, someone is going to get unhappy. I am just not comfortable with the idea that it's straight numbers. I think what Commissioner Le Mons said really struck home with me, and it matched some of the call-ins.

I'm sort of thinking on how to do that, and so I need a minute, but I want to sort of get that out there, because I'm trying to balance a few other things as well, and I understand and I appreciate where we had three people basically say, you know, "I could live with this." I think there might be something slightly different that we could all live with as well, is what I'm sort of looking at. So

I will need just a couple of minutes, if someone else wants to say anything.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Madame Chair, I just wanted to make a comment.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, please, Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: As being one of the members of the nonparty affiliate group, along with Commissioner Ahmad, I've felt through this whole process that we're sort of at a disadvantage in numbers, actually, because it isn't an equal number of Democrat, Republican, and nonparty affiliates. I don't really know why, but -- I mean, I've known from the beginning that it wouldn't be, but I think we kind of face the dilemma that we face partially because of that. I mean, we have smaller number of opportunities, even, to seat anyone in those four seats, as opposed to five seats for the other two categories.

So that's neither here nor there at this point in terms of what's available to us, but I felt like that's part of the challenge. I mean, just think about it. If we had that extra seat, we wouldn't have a dilemma, right, Commissioner Ahmad? So, anyway, I just thought I'd share that while you're working on your modifications, Chairwoman.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. I

appreciate that.

I see Commissioner Kennedy's hand is in the air.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, and just to respond to Commissioner Le Mons, I mean, to me -- I was researching this last week, I guess it was. If you look on the Secretary of State's website, and the historical voter registration numbers, I don't have them on my screen right now, but, from memory, when the initiatives passed in 2008 and 2010, the no party preference cohort of the state registered voters was something around 14 percent, and if you look at it as of February of this year, the no party preference cohort in the Secretary of State's voter registration figures is actually, I think, 25 percent, which is even greater than the Republican cohort now, but it wasn't in 2008 and 2010, when the Commission was being created.

So, I mean, clearly that is something that, hopefully, will be addressed in the future, but I think that's how it got to be what it is, and yes, if you look at the current figures versus the historical figures, yes.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Madame Chair?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Sorry to interrupt. I know you're writing down your list. But I like this discussion, and something Commissioner Kennedy mentioned about just the

increasing number. The legislation is actually written that the largest party within California would get five seats, the second-largest would get five, and then the smallest, or "other," would get the four seats.

So I think, in the future, if demographics continue to change, no party preference might be getting proxies, but I think, as it stands right now, as Commissioner Le Mons stated, that one extra seat would have solved all of my dilemmas right now. But who's to say how the future will change, 2030?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Actually, you know, I should say it is true -- I have a friend who is very involved in the elections, and the (indiscernible) no party preference, included in that, which does make it much larger, is -- it's the Libertarians, the Green. It's everybody.

So, until the actual people who write, "Well, no, I really don't have a party preference" actually register as no party preference, that becomes -- that particular group of the non-Republican/Democrat -- not until that particular group gets bigger than, say, in our state, Republicans, then it will be no party, and the Republicans will be one of the "other."

So it's not kind of like the whole group, but you're absolutely right. That went from a very small number in 2010 to a much, much larger number today, and who

1 knows, in 10 years, where it will be? And that certainly 2 would solve our problem, and this would be really easy, but 3 I think, at this point, what I'd like to do is 4 propose -- God. This is really tough. 5 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Madame Commissioner? 6 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. I'm sorry. 7 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Could we stand down for 8 about two minutes? 9 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, please. Thank you 10 very -- that's a -- yes. I could use a bit of a standdown 11 here, and what time do we have? Where are we? We came 12 back at 2:45, so it's not until 4:15, right, our mandatory 13 break? 14 MS. SAXTON: 3:45. 15 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. I'm just checking. Okay. 16 Yes. We could stand down for just a couple minutes, here. 17 Thank you. 18 MS. SAXTON: Madame Chair? 19 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, Counsel. 20 MS. SAXTON: Since we're standing down for two 21 minutes, and then the next break is at 3:45, you may just 22 want to take a longer cohesive break. 23 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Wait. I'm sorry. At 3:45? Ι 24 think thought it's a -- didn't we start up a -- when is it? 25 Is it at 3:45?

1 MS. SAXTON: Let me check on that, please. 2 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, please. Sorry. I thought it was 2:45 to -- I think it was going to be 4:15, 3 4 Sorry. Just a little administration, here. right? 5 MS. SAXTON: Madame Chair? 6 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. 7 MS. SAXTON: I'm going to advise staff that a 8 15-minute break at this point for some technical 9 considerations would be much welcome. 10 CHAIR ANDERSEN: That makes my job easier. 11 for technical considerations as well as giving me a few 12 more minutes, we will take a 15-minute break now. It's at 13 3:45. So we'll resume again at 4:00 o'clock. 14 Any objections to that? 15 (No response.) 16 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Hearing no objections, we'll go 17 to recess, and then resume again at 4:00. 18 (Off the record at 3:44 p.m.) 19 (On the record at 4:00 p.m.) 20 CHAIR ANDERSEN: So we'll come back out of 21 Thank you for -- we had to clear up a few things, recess. 22 here. I have had a chance to take a lot of time and move 23 things along. I'd just jump into -- I would like to make 24 changes on my slate. 25 So, if counsel is ready, I would like to -- in

the Democratic Party, it should now read Patricia Sinay and Angela Vazquez, in the Republican party, Peter Blando, Alicia Fernandez, in the no party preference, Eddie Morgan, Pedro Toledo. While they're working on that and writing that down, I might go through a little bit of thinking here with everybody.

As you see on the -- I've sort of come along -- the three Democrats that we were -- you know, Gennaco, Vazquez, Sinay, those are the ones we've been sort of toying with and going back and forth. I think we certainly talked about their fine characteristics and what we like, and why we'd really like to have all three, and, you know, I won't get into too much of that.

Alicia Fernandez, I did have a relook at her, and she is an inspector. She has the school board experience. You know, she does represent a slightly different group than I had sort of realized, but I did put Peter Blando.

Now, I know they're essentially from the same area, and if we ultimately want to switch that for Yee, but I really like -- they're from a similar area, but they do represent different groups, and the area where they come from, looking back -- and that sort of goes into Eddie Morgan -- we did get a map in our handouts, and that has gone to the public, and it's called the "California Counties and Regions Used in the Application Selection

Process," and in that, it has -- I think that's the one, if everybody wants to pull that up, and I'd like to just kind of show it. It's the one that looks like good like that.

In that, if you look at that map, the people we're talking about here, you know, the two which I have, Peter Blando and Alicia Fernandez, they are both from Yolo, and you look where Yolo County -- but where they are in Yolo County is -- it's essentially Sacramento, and that is smack dab in the middle, low middle, of the entire -- it's actually, I think -- I'd have to look at it, but I think it's further south than Petaluma.

So to say that, you know, that area right there represents the entire North Central Valley and Mountain is a bit ludicrous, quite frankly, but, you know, that's the way it was partitioned out, and so I really -- or Eddie Morgan, who is very qualified -- you know, he's not just "I represent the north."

You know, he has vast experience in, you know, the National Guard. He's been, you know, overseas representative. He has a lot of different -- he has contacts. He has huge cross-community contacts. And yes, he's in Humboldt, but he has contacts all through the north of the state. So I really do -- I really think, you know, he is very important in our group, because we just don't have much experience, among the rest of us, actually being

in that area.

It's not to say -- I totally agree with

Commissioner Le Mons when he was saying that we are all

going to do our absolute best to represent absolutely

everybody, and that's not just pretending that. I

genuinely believe that of all of us, and those are the

characteristics that I am actually looking at in this group

here, and I think they have that with them as well. It's

not something I'm taking lightly, and I know it's not

something that any of us are taking lightly.

So I have Pedro Morgan -- I mean, Eddie

Morgan -- and then Pedro Toledo. I know that that would

be -- instead of Linda Akutagawa, and that's just a hard -
it's a demographic thing. Is it community ties in one

area, versus community ties in another area? And it's just

hard. I totally understand that, but Pedro also has, where

Linda does not -- he also has the legal background, and

although he's not a practicing attorney, he does actually

use that more in the way that we would want someone on our

group to use it. He actually uses it in terms of policy

setting, and how does it affect the group itself, and their

actions in working?

That's exactly kind of what we would like on our -- within ourselves, to catch this before we have to go -- you know, before, you know -- like, I've sort of

overstepped a few times, and counsel has to go, "Wait a sec. Wait a sec," where, if it was within our group itself, that knowledge, that expertise, it would certainly help.

So I ended up with Pedro Toledo versus Linda

Akutagawa, so that is my modified slate, and by talking

through that, I hope I've given counsel time to then read

it back?

MS. SAXTON: Yes, Madame Chair.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you.

MS. SAXTON: At the end, when I'm finished reading, please let me know if I've made any errors.

Let the record reflect that Commissioner Andersen amends the Andersen slate of six, amendment number one, for selection to the Commission to now read as follows:

Patricia Sinay, Democrat, Angela Vazquez, Democrat, Peter Blando, Republican, Alicia Fernandez, Republican, Eddie Morgan, neither party, Pedro Toledo, neither party.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. That is what I did intend.

So do we want to just -- Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. So, over the break, I went through the lists, along with the rest of the candidates on the full list, and tried to come up with a different combination that would satisfy all of the

different criteria that we are attempting to meet, and I was unsuccessful, and I think this is the part where I have to be comfortable with being uncomfortable, and knowing that the slate will not, in combination with the eight of us, truly reflect the whole of diversity within California, and that's something that I personally am just going to have to accept, and it will further make me really aware and keen about making sure that I use the space that I've been given as a Commissioner, to lend that space to voices that will not be represented on the Commission. That said, I am comfortable with supporter Commissioner Turner, Commissioner Sadhwani, Commissioner Le Mons.

Mons.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.

There are a few other hands. Commissioner Le

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: So, over the break, I thought about my comments before I amended my slate, and I felt like my amendment didn't reflect my comments. So it really bothered me, and then, after the whole discussion about the category of nonparty affiliate, and suffering from less numbers, I thought, "My goodness. This is exactly what my point was." It's like numbers, right?

This is just -- I'm going to make an additional amendment, and I'm going to make this amendment because I want it to be aligned with my thinking. It doesn't change

the fact that I support Commissioner Sadhwani and 1 2 Commissioner Turner's slates. I still do, obviously. 3 However, I don't want this slate to be off the table. So 4 I'm going to make another amendment to my slate, and that 5 will be to replace Linda Akutagawa with Eddie Morgan. 6 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okav. 7 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: So my new revised slate 8 reads: Patricia Sinay, Democrat, Angela Vazquez, Democrat, 9 Alicia Fernandez, Republican, Russell Yee, Republican, 10 Eddie Morgan, no party affiliate, and Pedro Toledo, no 11 party affiliate. 12 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons. 13 Any additional -- wait. I'm sorry. Go ahead, 14 there. Counsel is going to -- are you ready to read it 15 back? 16 MS. SAXTON: Yes. 17 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. Okay. Sorry. There was a 18 little confusion among counsel there. 19 MS. SAXTON: It happens. 20 Commissioner Le Mons, if at the end you have any 21 errors that you'd like to point out, please let me know. 22 Let the record reflect that Commissioner Le Mons 23 amends the Le Mons slate of six, amendment number two, for 24 selection to the Commission to now read as follows:

Vazquez, Democrat, Patricia Sinay, Democrat, Alicia

25

1 Fernandez, Republican, Russell Yee, Republican, Eddie 2 Morgan, neither party, Pedro Toledo, neither party. 3 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: That's correct. 4 MS. SAXTON: Thank you, sir. 5 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Commissioner Fornaciari. 6 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So I kind of hate to 7 bring this up. I'm going to. I believe that Genevieve 8 Murphy moved to Orange County. Just throwing that out 9 there. 10 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Troublemaker. 11 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: It's on her application 12 that she was moving to Huntington Beach. So, you know, 13 that would be -- if she has moved to Huntington Beach, that 14 would be, you know, a few weeks or months of representation 15 of Orange County, but I think currently she does live in 16 Orange County. So maybe counsel can verify that. 17 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Could you? Well, that's 18 something different. I did bring up her name. 19 Counsel, could you verify if candidate Genevieve 20 Murphy has relocated to Orange County? She lived in Long 21 Beach, Los Angeles County, but she has relocated. 22 MS. SAXTON: We will. 23 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, thank you very much, 24 Commissioner Fornaciari. 25 Do we have any other comments at this time, and

thoughts? Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: (No response.)

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I'm sorry. I looked right at you and said the wrong name. I'm terribly sorry.

Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Madame Chair. So the amended list that Commissioner Le Mons proposed was one of the many lists that I scribbled down, recognizing that including Candidate Morgan and removing Candidate Akutagawa would mean the elimination of representation from Orange County, but then we would get representation from northern Northern California.

So I'm still in support of the Turner/Sadhwani slate. If consensus moves towards the new Le Mons slate, that is one of many slates that I have in front of me that I am comfortable supporting as well. I know that doesn't help our discussion, and I apologize for that.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: No, I appreciate that. Thank you.

I do have something to go ahead and say. You know, this -- I think, you know, we've made several modifications. There's a lot to consider. There is also -- if counsel can find out about Genevieve Murphy, that would add -- I know there's a -- that might help us, quite frankly, in representing Orange County, although not

necessarily. They're different people, but it's certainly another little piece of the puzzle.

Even regardless if that's true or not, I would like us to take the time to really consider these, and consider, you know, are these slates that, you know, I really like, you know, "If I just switched that person with that person, I'm totally in," or, you know, "Yes, I can go with this one or that one, and think about this overnight"?

Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I'm just curious as to whether we could put any of these slates to a vote. I mean, I think they're all off by a person or two. Whether we're going to suddenly sleep on this and come to a slate that we all just happen to agree on every single person on it, I think that, based on the discussions, that doesn't seem likely.

I think it's going to come down to us deciding if we can live with the slate before us, like meaning from a vote perspective. So I don't know how the Commissioners are feeling. I personally don't think that there's anything I'm going to glean between today and tomorrow that would change what I understand about the candidates before me.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I just wanted to caution our

further investigation into residence of Candidate Murphy, because we are not doing that for every other candidate on the list, and we might not have that information on the application from the time we submitted applications to this moment in time. I think it would be unfair for us to go off of individual for one candidate on the list that is not presented to us, and not do the same for literally every single other candidate on the list who may have potentially relocated, and we are just not aware of that.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I just wanted to throw that thought.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I appreciate that. I'm going to stop you there. Actually, as you do modify the address, you do submit that. That is part of the application, and several of our candidates, they actually have, you know, and I'm looking at it. I have been considering that, and they have moved. So that actually is part of the current updating, and, actually, unless you go to the application itself, the initial application, and they're looking through it, the city where they live is not listed. Like, these essentially could be out of date (indiscernible).

Yes. Go ahead, Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you for that clarification. I am going off of the list that the

California state legislature forwarded back to us, or back to the Auditor's Office, and that information is not reflected on that list. So I'm not sure if we are dealing with an outdated list, or if there's something lost in translation, but I just wanted to make sure that we were fairly evaluating each of the candidates.

MS. SAXTON: Madame Chair, we --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.

MS. SAXTON: We keep official records. We're checking official records right now, and then we will confer and let you know.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Actually, I totally agree, and I see your point, and I don't mean to speak for Commissioner Fornaciari. I don't believe that was "Let's contact her to find out." That was "Let's just verify the official record," because we did sort of put these things together kind of quickly, and I know I asked for some information, and some of it, in turn, was pulled together, and it was actually pulled together from what was already in a spreadsheet.

MS. SAXTON: Madame Chair, I'm sorry to interrupt.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Go ahead.

MS. SAXTON: We checked our official records. We have not received any address change.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: A changed address.

MS. SAXTON: Genevieve Murphy still shows --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Los Angeles.

MS. SAXTON: -- in, yes, Los Angeles.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: (Indiscernible) Long Beach.

Well, there we go. Thank you very much, Counsel, and I appreciate those.

That was certainly the right sentiment, and thank you very much, Commissioner Ahmad, for bringing that up, because yes, that's not an indication of "Let's go ahead and ask someone else for information," because we have not done that before, and I totally agree that we want to treat everyone the same as we have been treated, you know, fairly, which we'll all saying is correct, the same thing. So I didn't mean to imply anything that changed on that.

I am going to say, though, Commissioner, you might have mentioned -- Commissioner Turner did have to go away. So she's not here for the vote, and I really feel that's very important, which is another reason why I said let's really kind of contemplate and think about this. You know, I know that I could probably make a change, and I think it looks like Commissioner Le Mons and I -- our slates are getting almost identical at this point.

I think there is a bit of room where we could do a consensus, and so I'd like us all to kind of look at, you

know, if this one -- we all say that's it, or, you know, like, "That would make sense for me," and give each other a little bit of room, and have a discussion, and it was proposed before.

Now, on Friday, that's the time when the, I guess -- what do you call them, temporary staff? -- temporary staff can come and discuss with us. So, now, I'm assuming that will all be remotely. Are they coming here, to Sacramento, or are they calling in remotely?

MS. SAXTON: That I don't know, but, if they appear, they will appear either as you are, or as the Commissioners Zooming in.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. So what I'm actually going to propose, and I want us for discussion, but that we do break, we might take public comment, but we go ahead and break, and then don't meet back again until Friday, taking tomorrow off, Thursday, and then meeting Friday, and at what time would that -- would that be our regular 9:30?

MS. SAXTON: Correct.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay.

MS. SAXTON: And, also, Madame Chair, if I may, although many Commissioners -- as I think Commissioner Le Mons pointed out that he is ready to vote, I make no comment about that in any way, shape, or form, but, with these sorts of meetings, and particularly in this time of

pandemic, and with some of the sentiment that Commissioner Sadhwani had put forward, that day of time gives the public opportunity to get in all of their public comment that we receive over the website, et cetera, so that that public comment can be taken prior to the vote. Right now -- and, of course, it's up to the Commissioners to decide -- if a vote were to be taken, that opportunity would be very truncated for the public, to have their essentially last and final say before you take your vote.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Right. Okay. So that is -- Commissioner Le Mons.

about that. I feel like we have made available public comment throughout the day, and people have commented on the slates, and so I guess maybe I don't understand the process that -- maybe we need to have clarified the process, because I remember earlier, when we asked about the voting, we held off and didn't talk about what that process was. I think it was indicated that it was premature to talk about it at that time.

So I'd like to understand what the requirement is as it relates to public comment and a vote, because my thinking was I could make a motion to vote -- it may not pass -- but that I'd be able to make a motion to vote right now, which I'd strongly consider doing, and voting on

Turner's slate, because Turner designed it. So the fact that Turner is not here to vote on it, it's her slate, so that would be my angle.

Anyway, so maybe we need to turn to counsel based upon -- and, again, I'm clear that that may not happen, but I do want to understand what we're obligated to, legally, and what we can and cannot do, and I don't support waiting until Friday.

MS. SAXTON: In terms of public comment, public comment must be taken before the action item, before the vote. That would be up to the Commission, to determine what a reasonable length of time to take public comment would be prior to the vote, under the circumstances.

The way that approval with votes would work for a slate to become the slate, to be the approved slate, would be a motion and a second. We would do a roll call vote.

The slate must be accepted by a vote tally that includes at least two Democratic Commissioners, two Republican

Commissioners, and one Commissioner who is not a Democrat or a Republican.

Is there other information? I'm not certain if that is enough.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes, it is.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. At this point, I

25 understand the push, and my concern all along here is that

1 five votes, and that's that. It's done. There is no 2 further discussion. And without Commissioner Turner here, 3 we can't have a vote that's unanimous, regardless of -- I 4 mean, she might have wanted to change something as well. 5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Madame Chair? 6 CHAIR ANDERSEN: I understand there's a push --7 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Well, we do have a quorum. 8 I'm just going to get (indiscernible). 9 CHAIR ANDERSEN: That's correct. 10 (Indiscernible.) 11 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Well, if we have a 12 quorum --13 CHAIR ANDERSEN: We do. That's correct. 14 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: And we may not be 15 unanimous. So we need to be comfortable that we may not be 16 unanimous, either. I understand that we want to try to 17 come to a consensus, and try to be unanimous, but we have 18 at our disposal the tool of voting, and we have it for a 19 reason. 20 CHAIR ANDERSEN: We certainly do, and if you 21 really want to push it to a vote, I don't know if we can 22 stop you, but, in terms of our discussion, that strikes me 23 as a little aggressive, and with Commissioner Turner out, 24 I'd really, really rather not do that. 25 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I understand your

position, Madame Chair. Aggressive? I don't think it is at all. It's clarity. It's options and tools at my disposal, if that's something that I want to do, and I think for you to expect that we just do what you think we ought to do is what I take exception to.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, I understand.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: So I haven't called for a vote. I haven't motioned for a vote at this point. So the fact that I'm exploring it as an option should not be perceived as aggressive, and I'm not quite sure where you get that.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Well, I'm not sure where you perceive that it was my way or not. So I think that's the same. I apologize for coming across as "This is what I want to do," but I should have maybe said it differently.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Well, I think it's in line with your comments about Friday, too. You seem to have had a whole plan as to how this is supposed to play out over the next couple days, so that's what leads me to that belief about your comments and your actions, so that you're clear on why I feel that way.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you for that. I did get the possible pause on Thursday from the notes that we did receive from counsel, from an idea, and without going into a personal matter, Commissioner Turner is not here, and

that's where that came from.

So, to move off this topic for a minute, Commissioner Ahmad, you also had raised your hand.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I was just going to say that we do have a forum to vote, and I think that's something important that we take into consideration, as I expect, over the next 10 years, one of us will be missing a meeting at one point or another, and a vote will have to still take place.

So I think that's just something that we should be aware of and be comfortable with, that there's 14 of us for a reason, so that if I, for example, have to miss a meeting, I can rely on my fellow 13 Commissioners to carry the work forward, as we are still limited by (indiscernible).

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, and that's absolutely true. And, certainly, you know, if we do want to come to a vote and sort of finish all our business, that's certainly within our right.

MS. SAXTON: Madame Chair?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes.

MS. SAXTON: If I may, I just do want to clarify that getting to the point where the Commissioners are today, and then taking the day off to consider and give time to consider, and to take public comment, and come back

on Friday, was my suggestion, again, a suggestion for the Commissioners, and it was based on the 2010 Commission's success in that fashion, or at least appeared to be successful to draw in that public comment, and also Commissioner Sadhwani's concerns about public comment, and people who wish to make public comment having advance notice and opportunity to do so.

Again, legal counsel doesn't make decisions. I simply suggest. So I do want to just state that, that that is where that came from.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Counsel.

So we have a few suggestions on the table. Where would we like to continue from here?

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. Hearing everybody's thoughts on this, I mean, you know, I can see pros and cons on both sides. You know, I certainly think, while it is within our bounds to hold a vote at this point in time, I also have a concern -- you know, I think having additional public comment could be helpful.

I also haven't -- we haven't actually heard from all of the Commissioners about the most recent kind of changes to the slates. That would be helpful for me, also. I don't know -- it sounds like there was a note of some sort. I was not privy to that note regarding whether or

1 not we're going to meet on Thursday or Friday. 2 CHAIR ANDERSEN: It was just a suggestion. 3 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I don't know what that 4 For me personally, I had committed to being here every 5 day, you know, so I do feel a little bit blindsided by 6 suddenly saying, you know, "We're not going to meet 7 tomorrow. We're going to wait until Friday." I'm not 8 certain what the circumstances are, exactly, you know, 9 where that came from. It sounds like maybe it's 10 consideration of public comment, maybe. 11 CHAIR ANDERSEN: (Indiscernible.) 12 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I heard some mention, 13 also, of Commissioner Turner. I wasn't sure --14 CHAIR ANDERSEN: (Indiscernible.) 15 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- Commissioner Turner. 16 You know, so I think my preference would be to continue as 17 scheduled, on a daily basis, until we conclude, and I'm 18 happy to, you know, receive additional public comment. 19 That is something that's very important to me, and by no 20 means, you know, would I want to rush into anything. 21 I might step in right here CHAIR ANDERSEN: 22 because this confusion has obviously started with me, and I 23 should say that this was an administration issue. You 24 know, part of our agenda is adoption of the slate -- I'm

sorry -- instruction of the temporary 2020 Commission

25

staff, which is Item Number 6.

They cannot be here until Friday, and possibly that did not get -- I thought that was brought up right away, right in the very beginning of the meeting, and possibly that was not made clear. So, even if we do finish early, we'd have to, you know, get together to have that meeting on Friday. So I then just put it together.

We're kind of, you know, at a good stopping point. Rather than pushing through, since Commissioner Turner is not here, then should we just break, and then just do an all-day Friday -- or not all day, but, you know, essentially come together, talk about it a bit, get all the public comments, possibly vote, have this, and then be done Friday, as opposed to a little bit, little, "We're kind of done, sort of," and then we have to come back again, you know.

So that was why I brought that up, and that's a possibility. You know, I apologize if that seemed a little, kind of like out of the blue, but, again, it's because those people can't be here until Friday. So that's where that came from.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Madame Chair?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: My thoughts are this. I

25 think that both our deliberation and the public comments

have been helpful to me. I would make use of the evening -- this list has become even more finite, so I think it's just a matter of a small tweak here or there, being comfortable to where the hole might be, the dissatisfaction that one group might have, and being able to rationalize and work towards that, and then it's no holds barred tomorrow, whatever we choose to do tomorrow, but it is my assumption that we are going to operate as scheduled.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: So I'm sorry. Just to clarify, there was a little bit of background. It could have been on our end here. Commissioner Taylor, so you said that you would like to kind of possibly break, but continue again tomorrow? Is that what you were --

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: That's correct. I can use the night to sort of -- it's a finite list now, so it's just a matter of a tweak here or there, and then I think, tomorrow, whatever is available to us, according to Robert's Rules of Order, are at play.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. And then, realizing that, you know, if we come to a vote, we do have to get together on Friday, regardless. I want to be clear on that.

Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Madame Chair. I would also suggest, given the time, that we break for the

day, have the time-certain public comment at the beginning of tomorrow's meeting to allow folks to call in about what we have for discussion on the table, and then continue our work.

My understanding with the introduction of temporary staff, though, is that their availability is for Friday, and if the meeting adjourns prior to Friday, the next opportunity for us to meet the temporary staff would be at our next public open meeting, and that would, coincidentally, coincide with the time that all 14 of us will be meeting.

So that's my understanding, so I don't think we should necessarily schedule the task that we have, the very specific task we have in front of us, around availability of schedules for other items. My understanding is that we can adjourn the meeting prior to Friday if we choose to do so, and then temporary staff would come introduce themselves at the next open meeting, and please, anyone, correct me if I'm wrong about that understanding.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: On that one, we do have other items on the agenda, other than this. We do have the introduction -- Item Number 6, introduction of temporary staff. We also do a litigation update for information, then public comment. So I don't know if we -- you know, that's sort of --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Chairperson, can we ask counsel? If we decide we want to table those two items until the next live meeting where all 14 are seated, is that within our purview?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: That's what I was exactly going to ask. It's been in our discussion here. I know you've been busy doing some things. If we just meet and, you know, propose, and conclude our business, say, tomorrow, Thursday, we still have Items 6 and 7, which would be introduction of temporary staff and litigation update. Are those part of our tasks that we should complete as a group of eight, or do we propose our slate, table these until -- basically table them for the full Commission? That's being asked. Or, since we have published the agenda --

16 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I'm not asking, "Do we?"
17 I'm asking --

CHAIR ANDERSEN: No, no, "Can we?"

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: -- "It is within our purview to do that, if we choose to?"

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, exactly.

MS. SAXTON: If you decide -- if I may, Madame Chair -- that you would like to vote on your slate, and approve a slate, and conclude your meeting, you may. The next meeting that will happen will be agendized and put

together as the full 14. That is my understanding.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Right.

MS. SAXTON: At that time, that agenda, if it can be arranged, et cetera, which I imagine it can, those discussions that we had agendized now can be put onto that agenda.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay.

MS. SAXTON: You're not required, necessarily -or, excuse me, you're not required to have those agenda
items occur at this meeting, if you wish to adjourn once
you vote the slate.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I think that was the exact question. Are these two items part of what the group of eight need to know?

MS. SAXTON: They are not part of any required content for the first eight. They are not mandatory. They were arranged to give opportunity for the first eight to meet temporary staff and hear a little bit from them, and the litigation, et cetera, but, if that's something that you don't wish to avail yourselves of, it's not required.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: But that information being valid, it would still be totally valid for the full Commission. Is that correct? I mean, that's -- I mean, it isn't as though is our, you know, "now or never," essentially.

MS. SAXTON: The people to whom you were to be 1 2 introduced are the temporary staff for the full 14. So you 3 would meet them at the later meeting, the next meeting of 4 the full 14. 5 CHAIR ANDERSEN: And the litigation update, 6 that's just a --7 MS. SAXTON: The office --8 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. We can have that 9 regardless. 10 MS. SAXTON: The office set this up. Again, we 11 offer. We agendized it, and believed it would be a nice 12 wrap-up, but, again -- and I hope I've answered the 13 question that was directed, which is this not mandatory. 14 You are not required to participate in those agenda items. 15 You can vote your slate, and conclude the duty of the first 16 eight, which is to pick the next six Commissioners, and you 17 can choose -- the Commission can choose to adjourn. 18 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you very much, 19 Counsel, and I think that I -- does that appear to answer 20 everyone's sort of questions? Is that correct? 21 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Absolutely. 22 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Okay. 23 Then, given the -- yes. Given the time is a 24 quarter to 5:00, I would, well, propose that since we've 25 had a few other Commissioners that say it's a bit late,

shall we adjourn for today, and then continue tomorrow morning at 9:30, so we have overnight to sleep on this, and come in with, possibly, a few discussions, and start putting up final slates, modification, and then set about picking six?

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes, but do we want to -- explicitly announce that you would have public comment at the beginning of the meeting?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, absolutely. I think
that's -- unless I misinterpreted, that might become
our -- and we'll obviously propose this to the entire
Commission, but that might be standard practice, so there's
sort of a --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And especially for tomorrow. You know, we have a couple slates on the table right now, for folks who have been listening, so they can take the evening to -- for the public to mull over, and, you know, know that tomorrow at 9:30 we'll be taking public comments before we begin further discussion. Does that sound right to the rest of the Commissioners?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I'm seeing nods everywhere, all around. So, yes. With that, you know, anyone who happens to be listening, please note that is the intent of the group.

Commissioner Le Mons.

I'm wondering if we should have counsel just quickly read the slates, particularly since we're asking for public comment first thing in the morning, the slates that are currently available, and encourage people to, you know, dial in in the morning, send their comments via the website, et cetera.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Actually, that's exactly where I was going with that. Thank you very much, Mr. Le Mons.

So, Commissioner -- sorry. Now I turn and go this way, Commissioner.

Counsel, would you please go ahead and read. As I see it, we have five slates. Is that correct?

MS. SAXTON: That is correct.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. Great. Thank you. So, if you could go ahead and read the five slates, please.

MS. SAXTON: And I appreciate everyone making it so that I don't have to interrupt again. So I was going to ask if I could.

At the current time, prior to adjournment of this meeting, the following slates have been proposed: Le Mons, Le Mons slate, amendment two: Angela Vazquez, Democrat, Patricia Sinay, Democrat, Alicia Fernandez, Republican, Russell Yee, Republican, Eddie Morgan, neither party, Pedro

Toledo, neither party.

Commissioner Sadhwani's slate: Patricia Sinay,
Democrat, Angela Vazquez, Democrat, Alicia Fernandez,
Republican, Russell Yee, Republican, Pedro Toledo, neither
party, Linda Akutagawa, neither party.

Commissioner Turner's slate, amendment one:

Patricia Sinay, Democrat, Angela Vazquez, Democrat, Alicia

Fernandez, Republican, Russell Yee, Republican, Linda

Akutagawa, neither party, Pedro Toledo, neither party.

Chair Andersen's slate, amendment one: Patricia Sinay, Democrat, Angela Vazquez, Democrat, Peter Blando, Republican, Alicia Fernandez, Republican, Eddie Morgan, neither party, Pedro Toledo, neither party.

Commissioner Kennedy's slate: Patricia Sinay,

Democrat, Angela Vazquez, Democrat, Alicia Fernandez,

Republican, Russell Yee, Republican, Pedro Toledo, neither

party, Victoria Tamoush, neither party.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: I concur with that.

Do the other Commissioners? Okay. Seeing no objections, I think we'll make sure the public -- those are the slates as we see them heading into the evening. Please contemplate.

We will begin deliberation and proceeding on those slates in the morning, starting at 9:30, but we will first open for public comment. So, if you have comments,

please call in at that time.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

With that, unless I see any objection -- yes. Sorry, Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Do we have any public comment waiting? I hate to keep everyone, but I think it's our obligation to check right now. Is there any public comment waiting right now?

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner.

AT&T operator?

AT&T OPERATOR: Yes. Thank you.

If you would like to make comment at this time, please press one, then zero on your touch-tone phone.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Thank you. Do we happen to have anyone in queue at this time?

AT&T OPERATOR: We do not.

CHAIR ANDERSEN: Okay. We'll wait a few minutes, because, yes, you're right. We did say, you know, at the end of meetings, we'll allow a little bit of time. So I guess we can sort of pack up.

AT&T operator, if we do have anyone who comes on line, please let us know.

22 AT&T OPERATOR: All right. Thank you. There's 23 currently no one.

MS. SAXTON: Madame Chair, I would like to let you know that I've been advised that the building is going

1 to shut power to this floor for some routine maintenance, 2 and so we don't know exactly, but any time now. 3 some revised information about that. In any event, I 4 encourage us to --5 CHAIR ANDERSEN: To wrap up. 6 MS. SAXTON: -- not be in the dark. 7 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes. We might be in the dark, 8 so this might become a sort of moot point here in a few 9 minutes. 10 MS. SAXTON: Well, and, additionally, I did not 11 read the instructions. I believe that those folks that 12 would have been in the queue would have been people who 13 joined on their own, and so now it seems unlikely that, 14 until we officially open it up back again, that there would 15 be more people joining --16 CHAIR ANDERSEN: I agree. 17 MS. SAXTON: -- but that's just for you to 18 consider. 19 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Right. 20 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Madame Chair, a motion 21 that we adjourn. 22 Say, "Recess," please. MS. SAXTON: 23 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, recess. 24 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Recess. Recess. Sorry. 25 CHAIR ANDERSEN: Yes, recess.

MS. SAXTON: Okay. CHAIR ANDERSEN: I was just going to say, since I've just finished packing up, I think I second it. So, all in favor of that one? Again, a simple hand will do. Okay. I call the meeting in recess, and we'll meet again tomorrow at 9:30 a.m. Thank you very much, Commissioners. The big wave. (Thereupon, the Citizens Redistricting Commission meeting was adjourned at 4:50 p.m.)

REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

I do hereby certify that the testimony in

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 2nd day of November, 2020.

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

November 2, 2020