

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

In the matter of:

CRC BUSINESS MEETING/LESSONS LEARNED

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 30, 2022

9:30 a.m.

Reported by:

Jacqueline Denlinger



APPEARANCESCOMMISSIONERS

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

STAFF

Alvaro Hernandez, Executive Director
Ravindar Singh, Administrative Assistant
Anthony Pane, Chief Counsel
Marcy Kaplan, Director of Outreach
Paul Mitchell, Data Analyst
Antonia (Toni) Antonova, Data Manager
Raul Villanueva, Deputy Administration

TECHNICAL CONTRACTORS

Kristian Manoff, AV Technical Director/Comment Moderator

LINE DRAWING TEAM

Andrew Drechsler, President of HaystaqDNA
Karin Mac Donald, Q2 Data & Research, LLC
Linus Kipkoech, Software Developer
Jaime Clark, Q2 Data & Research, LLC

Also PresentPublic Comment

Kristin Nimmers

INDEX

	PAGE
Call to Order	4
Roll Call	4
Establishment of Quorum	5
Announcements	6
Director Updates/Reports	7
Public Comment	211

P R O C E E D I N G S

9:30 a.m.

1 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Good morning, California. Welcome
2 to our Citizens Redistricting Commission meeting. Let's
3 start with the roll.

4 MR. SINGH: Thank you, Madam Chair. Commissioner
5 Ahmad? Commissioner Akutagawa?

6 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

7 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Andersen? Commissioner
8 Andersen? Commissioner Fernandez?

9 COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Presente.

10 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fornaciari?

11 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Here.

12 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Kennedy?

13 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

14 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Le Mons? Commissioner
15 Sadhwani?

16 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.

17 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sinay?

18 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Aqui.

19 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Taylor?

20 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Aqui.

21 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Toledo? Commissioner
22 Turner? Commissioner Vazquez?

23 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Here.

1 MR. SINGH: And Commissioner Yee?

2 COMMISSIONER YEE: Here in Grand Junction, Colorado.

3 MR. SINGH: Roll call is complete. You have a
4 quorum, Madam Chair.

5 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Great. Thanks so much, Ravi.

6 So first let me go through the run of show for
7 today. So we will start with announcements and then
8 heading into about 9:45, we're going to do director
9 updates and announcements as well as subcommittee updates
10 and announcements. Two subcommittees have shared in
11 advance that they have some updates for us. So
12 particularly the Finance and Administration and the Long-
13 Term Planning subcommittees. We will go to break at 11
14 o'clock, and then when we return, the Commission will
15 reconvene at 11:15. We'll be entering into closed
16 session for pending litigation matters, so that means we
17 plan to reconvene for the public at 11:45. So when we go
18 on break at 11, the public should plan to join us back in
19 open session at 11:45 where we will continue our Lessons
20 Learned conversation. We have a few guests and some
21 topics that we wanted to make sure that we closed out
22 this conversation with.

23 Lunch will be at 12:45. Forty-five minutes for
24 lunch, and then at 1:30 we will reconvene to do sort of a
25 recap and go over next steps for the Commission. We will

1 plan to go to break at 3:15. Continue our conversation.
2 We've extended the meeting by thirty minutes from our
3 typical ending time, so we'll take -- we plan to take
4 public comment either at 4:30 or upon close of business.
5 Any questions or updates? All right. So at first,
6 any --

7 COMMISSIONER YEE: Commissioner Kennedy has a --

8 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Oh, yes. Thank you.

9 Hi, Commissioner Kennedy.

10 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Hi. Just -- we keep copying
11 and copying the same error on the run of show. We
12 actually go to break at 3 rather than 3:15, because our
13 ninety minutes goes from 1:30-ish --

14 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Good catch.

15 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- to 3.

16 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Yep. Thank you.

17 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Sure.

18 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: All right. Any announcements from
19 commissioners? Yeah, Commissioner Sinay?

20 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Good morning. I just wanted to
21 remind everybody that Commissioner Fernandez and I are
22 presenting tomorrow for Women in California Lead -- Lead
23 California Women, and it's going to be a great panel.
24 There's four of us on the panel. The first presenter
25 will be talking about women in government -- what the

1 numbers look like and such in California. And then
2 Commissioner Fernandez and I will be giving our post-maps
3 presentation. And then Kathay from Common Cause will be
4 giving kind of their perspective on the new maps, and
5 then we'll be taking questions and answers. It is open
6 to the public, and staff has done a great job of posting
7 it on all our social media. So hopefully, all signed up
8 or shared it as well so others can present. I think we
9 have around a hundred people already signed up. So we'll
10 see.

11 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Great. Thank you. Any other
12 updates or announcements? All right. So I will pass it
13 off to Director Hernandez to kick us off with director
14 updates.

15 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Okay. So first
16 as you all know by now, Marcy Kaplan, our outreach
17 director, is leaving the Commission on a new adventure.
18 Her last day is Friday, April 1st -- and no, this is not
19 an April Fool's joke. I do want to wish her the very
20 best in the new adventure. I also want to thank her for
21 all the hard work she put into everything that she did.
22 Her commitment to putting together the best products for
23 the CRC and the wealth of knowledge about outreach that
24 she shared with the CRC and staff.

25 On a personal note, I want to thank Marcy for her

1 constant support and assistance throughout our journey.
2 As I have shared with her before, we made a great team,
3 and I attribute our success to that teamwork. And once
4 again, I want to thank Marcy for everything. So thank
5 you, Marcy.

6 Moving on, I also wanted to share that Fredy Ceja,
7 our director of communication, and another member of our
8 great team, has officially offboarded last week. If you
9 recall, he was on a part-time basis since February, but
10 his new job demands require his full attention. Martin
11 will continue to do our communication, notification and
12 website update as we had reported out last week. Any
13 questions on staffing?

14 Okay. I will move on to our budget we have posted
15 for today's meeting. Updated by just summary report.
16 We've been working with DGS budgets to reconcile the
17 information as much as possible, and we'll continue
18 working with them to review and reconcile the
19 information, both theirs and ours. In an effort to
20 provide you with real-time information, we're using the
21 invoice amounts while DGS reports most of the time
22 reflect what has been paid out by SCO. And there's a lag
23 of about two to three months in their reports. And the
24 other thing is that they categorize information different
25 from how we're capturing the information and reporting

1 the information.

2 As you all know, we had our bulk of our expenditures
3 in November and December, and so you'll see some changes
4 on the budget summary because of that. We'll continue to
5 work with DGS budgets to review and reconcile our
6 information. So now, I'm going to go right into that
7 report.

8 Starting off in regards to the salaries, you will
9 note an increase in the total expenditures of about a
10 million dollars. I miscalculated the salaries on the
11 last report that was reported in January. And I also did
12 not include the RAs and student assistant wages in that
13 January report. So now, we've updated that information
14 to reflect both the corrected amount as well as the RAs
15 and the student assistants. That's our overall salaries.

16 December travel, TECs amounts are now reflected in
17 the Commission per diem and travel. This item also
18 increased over 500 thousand. I miscalculated the
19 expenditures for the per diem, so that has now been
20 updated. And then the TECs -- we're expecting about
21 fifty thousand that are being processed. In this last
22 month, over twenty thousand dollars' worth of TECs were
23 processed. And so that's not reflected in the reports
24 from DGS because they haven't been paid out. So it's one
25 of the discrepancies that we keep finding.

1 Videography, this amount reflects the total amount
2 expended through December 2021, and we are updating the
3 information with the January, February, March. March
4 will be a little bit higher because we had all of our
5 Lessons Learned meetings.

6 The Line Drawer and Legal Services were updated to
7 reflect all invoices received, and we don't expect any
8 additional invoices coming in. So that is the extent of
9 it. We have added ASL contract. It's one of the higher
10 contracts, so we included that in there so you can see
11 that.

12 In regards to the transcript, this item has been
13 updated. The contracted amount includes the three
14 different contracts that we've had over the course of the
15 Commission. It does include invoices for December and
16 we're leaving about twenty thousand there for the new
17 vendor to complete the missing transcripts from meetings
18 in August and September.

19 The outreach contracts, this includes all the media
20 contracts that Fredy completed. We believe all the
21 invoices have been received. We received the final
22 invoices for one of the vendors earlier this month. So
23 that's also included in there because we're basing on the
24 invoices -- but our budget reports that we get from DGS
25 don't reflect that because, again, there is a lag of

1 about two months.

2 The most significant change, I would say, is in the
3 All Other Operational Costs. You'll note that the amount
4 went down significantly. As we reviewed the DGS reports
5 and dug deeper into what is included in the OE&E -- and
6 OE&E stands for Operational Expenditures and Equipment.
7 We found that their reports included the videography,
8 line drawer, and outreach expenditures in that amount.
9 And so we reduced it because we're reporting it
10 separately. We were double-counting it, and so now we
11 reduced it by nearly two million dollars. So now, you'll
12 see that this reflects more of updated information and a
13 better picture of where we ended in December. And we are
14 working on projections through June 2022. Those are more
15 accurate projections based on that information, and we're
16 tracking our expenditures for the monthly January,
17 February, March, and we'll report that out at the next
18 meeting. I went over that rather quickly, but I wanted
19 to make sure I opened it up for any questions, comments.

20 Okay. Seeing none, I'll continue. Our budget
21 change proposal, our budget office has been working with
22 the Department of Finance to update the BCP document. We
23 have increased the overall ask to include staff salaries
24 and RA's salaries and travel funds for meetings. The
25 travel funds are for the Commission to travel for the

1 scheduled meetings in accordance with the Bagley-Keene.
2 And we have to find the locations, travel expenses for
3 staff, as well as our videography team. And so the total
4 amount of the revised BCP is now 5 million, 527 over the
5 next eight years. That is everything I have.

6 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Thanks so much. Any other staff
7 updates, director updates or announcements?

8 MR. HERNANDEZ: Not at this point.

9 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Great. Commissioner Sinay and then
10 Commissioner Yee?

11 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can you repeat what the budget
12 is for the next eight years? Sorry about that.

13 MR. HERNANDEZ: What our ask is as of the other day,
14 is 5 million, 527 thousand. And if you recall, that's an
15 increase of about two million dollars from what we
16 originally submitted. Because we've been adjusting and
17 working with Department of Finance to dial in all the
18 numbers. Yeah.

19 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Yeah. Commissioner Yee?

20 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. Thank you. So for ASL and
21 captioning -- so you might remember some meetings ago I
22 asked kind of in passing, just, are we required to have
23 both? And our legal team actually did investigate this,
24 and it looks like we're actually not required -- we're
25 required to provide access if requested, but not required

1 to provide both, and not required to provide both all the
2 time absent a request. So it looks like we've been going
3 above and beyond. And I'm just curious -- I don't
4 remember how we made that decision at the beginning. I
5 mean, I think it's a good decision, but -- and then going
6 forward, it just seems like something we should actually
7 decide and not just assume. So I'm wondering, Director
8 Hernandez, if you can somehow go in the Wayback Machine
9 and figure out how we decided to do that from the very
10 beginning. Just let me know. Yeah. Thanks.

11 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Thanks. And I see Commissioner
12 Kennedy and then Commissioner Fernandez after we get a
13 response. Was there a response from --

14 MR. HERNANDEZ: Oh, forgive me. I don't have a
15 response. I don't recall. I'll have to research it.
16 But it looks like Commissioner Fernandez may have that
17 response.

18 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Got it. Okay. Maybe then we can go
19 Commissioner Fernandez, then Commissioner Kennedy.

20 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. And I will have
21 to also rely on my partner, Commissioner Akutagawa, for
22 language access, but I do know that the ASL was part of
23 our language access that we approved a long time ago.
24 And then the captioning, I don't think that was part of
25 it, so I'm not sure about the captioning part. If

1 Commissioner Akutagawa remembers?

2 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I don't.

3 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Commissioner Kennedy?

4 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I just
5 wanted to get an update on where things stand as far as
6 archiving documents, materials with state archives.

7 MR. HERNANDEZ: We are still working on the
8 archiving of the website files. As you recall, when we
9 did the migration, we're moving everything into the
10 Microsoft world. And so we've renamed things. We are
11 preparing that information for when we do provide the
12 information over to the archives department. We haven't
13 done that yet. We're still moving all the documents.
14 The other big task that we are still working on is the
15 database itself and the links to the different documents,
16 shape files, and so forth, that we're still working on
17 that we don't have. Once we have that, I think, it'll
18 make it easier to just transition that information over
19 to the state archives. But as of now, nothing more has
20 been done other than our end trying to organize the
21 information as best as possible.

22 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you.

23 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Any other questions? Commissioner
24 Yee, did you have an additional? Commissioner Fernandez,
25 and then Commissioner Fornaciari.

1 COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Oh, I think we might --
2 okay. I guess I'll do it. Kristian, do you know why we
3 were doing the captioning? I was just trying to think of
4 maybe how we got to the captioning part of it. Thank
5 you.

6 MR. MANOFF: So the captioning that we were
7 requested to do was sort of -- that was originally done
8 by the Applicant Review Panel and that was carried over.
9 And generally, it's sort of a best practices thing that
10 we've noticed amongst agencies that we work for. So I'm
11 not sure -- I don't even know where the original request
12 came from. But I know that we did that for the Applicant
13 Review Panel, and so we carried it over to the
14 Commission.

15 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Commissioner Sinay?

16 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I know we're not discussing
17 getting rid of captioning, but I would strongly recommend
18 keeping captioning because a lot of people have our
19 meetings going on in mute because they're at work or
20 whatnot, and so they're reading. Also, as you get older,
21 sometimes it's just nicer to have captioning so you can
22 follow along. And I have used captioning at times in our
23 meetings when I've missed something, and I'll quickly
24 look to see what was said since it's delayed. So to me
25 captioning has been amazing, and I think it has made it

1 accessible to a lot of people. I think of all the things
2 we've done maybe the captioning has been one of the --
3 besides being live -- one of the things that has been
4 helpful.

5 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Commissioner Akutagawa?

6 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Thanks. Yeah. I
7 guess, I absolutely agree with what Commissioner Sinay
8 said. I mean, I wouldn't want to see the captioning go
9 away. And in the scheme of the budget, the over and
10 unders, it feels pretty small in terms of -- or it seems
11 like it's relatively small, I guess, in relation to
12 everything else.

13 Just for the sake of asking the question, I just
14 want to just verify -- so I do notice that the
15 videography costs are higher than budgeted. I'm figuring
16 it's due to the fact that we had much, much longer
17 meetings which then put the video team, Kristian and his
18 team, into overtime and also additional days and all
19 that. So I think just for the sake of asking the
20 question and so it's also noted and recorded I just
21 wanted to verify that as the case.

22 And then also, Alvaro, again -- also on another
23 note, I noticed that the column -- the very last column
24 where you have the over and under or the over
25 budget/under budget -- it says contract balances. Are

1 you noting that only because those are the contracted
2 amounts that are still expected? I noticed that there
3 wasn't anything similar in terms of an over and under for
4 like the per diems and the staff salaries and other OE&E
5 costs, so. Is that more of a formatting thing?

6 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: The reason we have that is
7 because the contracts have a very specific amount to
8 them, and so because they are over we're going to have to
9 amend those contracts and that's why they're included
10 there. Whereas our per diem and our salaries, we have a
11 budgeted amount, expectations, but there isn't a contract
12 that holds us to that. It is what it is in those
13 instances, whereas in the contracts we have to amend
14 those contracts to reflect -- or to allow us to continue
15 on through the end of June and thereafter. So that's why
16 I've identified that. The amendments will have to
17 represent that amount when we go through that process.

18 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Just wanted to just
19 double-check and ask. Thank you.

20 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: All right. Any other comments on
21 this issue? All right. Let's move to subcommittee
22 updates. And I misspoke earlier. We'll also have some
23 updates from Redistricting Engagement in addition to
24 Long-Term Planning and Finance Administration. So first
25 up, Finance and Admin.

1 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah. A couple things I
2 just wanted to bring up. We were going to have a
3 discussion about staffing today, but it seemed like the
4 agenda was jam-packed, so we're going to put that off
5 until later. We had a long discussion with Alvaro -- I
6 mean, Raul and Alvaro about staffing and slots and all
7 those things. So we'll explain that next time we get
8 together. We didn't think it was urgent. Let's see. At
9 the last meeting there was a lot of angst about the
10 budget and how the budget is going and being overseen.
11 And so Alicia and I just wanted to offer that if anyone
12 else is interested in taking our places in the Finance
13 and Administration subcommittee that we're open to that.
14 Anyway, we're open to that if anyone is interested --
15 wants to be another set of eyes on the budget in depth,
16 then we're open to that. It's up to the chair to appoint
17 committee members, so we just want to bring that out.

18 Another thought that we had was maybe -- we talked
19 to Alvaro about this a little bit, but maybe potentially
20 we can -- if the Commission is interested in bringing in
21 an outside set of eyes to take a look at the budget. It
22 seems like -- I mean, it's challenging and difficult,
23 right, to figure out what's happening. The state does
24 things very differently than I think most of us are used
25 to, and trying to deconvolve all that is a challenge. So

1 I think Commissioner Fernandez has something she'd like
2 to add so I'll stop there.

3 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Not that you need to stop.
4 I was just going to wait in line. It's been a very
5 frustrating process, and I know that I've shared that
6 with all of you in terms of the expenditures and trying
7 to tie those down and they just keep fluctuating and we
8 don't know -- I don't have a comfort level. So I would
9 recommend that we contract to have someone look at the
10 expenditures that we've spent since August of 2020 so
11 that we do have a better idea. And the reason we also
12 need that information -- and we need it to be as accurate
13 as possible -- is we do have to send a report to the
14 legislature and split it out into different categories.
15 And I definitely want to make sure we have the best
16 information possible.

17 And then also a part of that contract -- I know that
18 the FI\$Cal system -- so that's the accounting/budgeting
19 system -- it appears to be cumbersome. It's different
20 than the one that I used to use when I was in that area.
21 And maybe some additional training on that and how to
22 read those reports would be really helpful. And again,
23 as Commissioner Fornaciari noted, anyone wanting to take
24 over, that's fine. There were comments that I did take
25 personally last time in terms of giving our subcommittee

1 a lot of power, and we had no power. Everything we did
2 we brought back to the Commission. We had a lot of
3 work -- policies, reviewing applications, duty
4 statements, budget, expenditures, looking at different
5 meeting scheduled programs. So no power because
6 everything came back -- we weren't a decision-making --
7 we weren't a decision-making subcommittee. So with that,
8 I think that's all I had to say. Thanks.

9 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Thank you. Commissioner Le Mons,
10 Commissioner Akutagawa, then Commissioner Sinay.

11 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Hi. First I want to start by
12 thanking the subcommittee for doing an outstanding job in
13 the work that you guys did. So that's how I feel about
14 your role in that.

15 The second thing I have is a question as it relates
16 to -- I thought we hired -- there was a very specific
17 role in our staff that was budget. So if someone could
18 just explain to me whether I'm accurate in that and then
19 what the expectations were of that particular role, if it
20 indeed, existed.

21 And then, finally, I'll just say that I would
22 support if the subcommittee feels like we need an outside
23 set of eyes to do the final analysis in service of a
24 report, I would support that. Because quite frankly, I
25 would think that that job is not the job of the

1 commissioners in the first place. So anyway, those are
2 my feelings about it and thoughts. Thank you.

3 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Thanks, Commissioner Le Mons.
4 Commissioner Akutagawa?

5 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I just wanted to say
6 thank you to both Commissioner Fornaciari and
7 Commissioner Fernandez. I have to say I am so glad that
8 both of you took this on because I would not want to be
9 in your shoes. You both did a fabulous job just -- all
10 the work that we had -- it just really takes -- just
11 really a committed and very, I guess, detailed eye to
12 really look at all the work that needed to be done.

13 And I also agree -- I felt like everything was
14 always brought back to us as a Commission. They did the
15 kind of the legwork to help ensure that we didn't have to
16 get ground up in a lot of the details and just helped us
17 to get us to a place where we can move things along. So
18 I just want to thank the both of you. If you choose to
19 just say, I'm done, I want to move on and allow someone
20 else to take our place, I don't blame you. If you choose
21 to stay on, which would be still great because the
22 knowledge that both of you have built up, I would
23 absolutely still -- I would just say my trust is always
24 in what you all would do on our behalf in the best
25 interests of both the Commission and the state. So I

1 just wanted to say thank you to the both of you.

2 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Commissioner Sinay?

3 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair. I want to
4 say thank you as well, and also an apology that it felt
5 personal. Because I think a lot of times there's a lot
6 of frustration when it comes around the budget, policies,
7 and systems and all of us trying to really get our arms
8 around what is it that we need so we can do governance
9 versus what is needed for the day-to-day, where we draw
10 those lines. And we've talked a lot about understanding
11 what is the role of staff and what is the role of the
12 Commissioners. What's the role of subcommittees? And
13 there have been times when we're -- different times when
14 people are like, wait, I didn't know that.

15 But I think there was a real frustration on
16 understanding the system and understanding staff's role.
17 When I look at our staff chart, I agree with Commissioner
18 Le Mons -- we didn't have one person for the budget. We
19 had multiple people that work on the bureaucracy that is
20 the state and budget processing and all of that. And so
21 it gets very frustrating when you see how much investment
22 of taxpayer's dollars goes into managing the bureaucracy
23 that's called the state government and the state budget
24 and how nonresponsive that system is. We always go back
25 to our staff and our commissioners have yet to receive

1 some of their reimbursements. And for me it's the
2 biggest one, which was in September -- and there's no
3 follow-up and there's no follow-up from staff. It's
4 very, very frustrating.

5 And so I think a lesson learned here is just that we
6 need to be clear -- we need to be more clear with each
7 other where our frustration is directed. And again,
8 thank you so much, Commissioner Fornaciari and
9 Commissioner Fernandez. And also could you be -- I want
10 to build on what Commissioner Akutagawa said, and tell us
11 what is it you're really saying? Do you want to step
12 down? Because it is -- as your colleagues, we want to
13 support you in whichever way you want. And if it is
14 time, let us know. You both have taken on a lot of other
15 tasks as well, so just let us know. We're here for you,
16 and thank you.

17 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Thanks. Commissioner Fernandez,
18 then Commissioner Andersen.

19 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. I just
20 wanted to respond to Commissioner Le Mons. He asked if
21 we have a position to do this, and we do. We do have a
22 position, and we've had a couple people fill that
23 position -- the budget position -- but they're just --
24 there just seems to be difficulty in getting accurate
25 information in terms of what the actual expenditures are.

1 And that's from the FI\$Cal -- it's the accounting system
2 that the state uses -- and so at this point,
3 unfortunately, because we're so short-termed, we really
4 need answers now. We don't have time to try to figure
5 out the FI\$Cal system and read it and interpret it and
6 ensure our expenditures are accurate. I think at this
7 point we just need someone to come in, scrub the data
8 really well, and give us the information that we need to
9 report to the legislature.

10 And also the -- we obviously need to know where
11 we're standing so that we know how much additional
12 funding we're going to need for the next few years.
13 Because part of us estimating our budget change proposal
14 and our need is based on what our projections were, and
15 now that -- I'm not sure how great those projections
16 were -- so it's all -- I think we just need to really get
17 a good handle on it, and if our budget officer can also
18 get some FI\$Cal training on how to read those cumbersome
19 reports, that would be helpful as well in some of other
20 staff probably -- Raul and Alvaro would probably benefit
21 from that as well. Thanks.

22 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Great. Thank you. Commissioner
23 Andersen, Commissioner Fornaciari, Commissioner Le Mons,
24 and Commissioner Kennedy.

25 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you, Chair. I

1 also want to thank both Commissioner Fernandez and
2 Commissioner Fornaciari for the monumental work that they
3 have done on this subcommittee. I completely agree with
4 everything that Commissioner Le Mons said and the way he
5 said that. It was just -- now that we know we do have a
6 person that's kind of a bit odd and the whole structure
7 is very unusual -- I completely agree with what
8 Commissioner Fernandez said about let's get some second
9 eyes in there. It is time -- often things get not
10 "audited" but almost, but in terms of our whole purpose
11 of the Lessons Learned is to understand this is what
12 happened. Now, this is what should happen as we move
13 forward. And this subcommittee, I also agree -- the
14 amount that you guys ended up having to deal with I don't
15 think anyone ever considered when it first started.

16 And I would almost say for Lessons Learned and
17 moving forward -- just from my perspective -- I would
18 love to have the subcommittee itself actually give us,
19 like, a little summary at some point. But I would
20 separate budget expenses from admin, the policies you're
21 going over, the duty statements. Those are sort of
22 separate items, I believe, that would make this a much
23 more distinct, handleable job. And the reason I'm --
24 where I'm coming from on that is I think several of the
25 subcommittees started out with one idea and then morphed

1 into something else. And I believe this subcommittee
2 clearly did and it involved -- it actually took both of
3 you as Commissioners away from other things that I think
4 you would've liked to have done, could've done even more
5 of. Which is a crime in itself, because we need all the
6 appropriate people in the appropriate subcommittees --
7 not to say you weren't great on this. And I want to say
8 again, thank you, thank you, thank you, but if we want
9 second eyes I'm all for it even if we want to go to the
10 state auditor to go, hey, looking back at this, how would
11 you redo things or -- I don't know -- the appropriate
12 person.

13 And I also believe, as Commissioner Fernandez just
14 said, it would be a learning experience for everyone
15 involved in that to rereview this. So I would agree with
16 that. If the subcommittee has the time to say, this is
17 how we think it should've gone -- separate these out. I
18 believe that, as part of our Lessons Learned, all the
19 subcommittees are supposed to say, this is what our task
20 was. This is what our task ended up being. I know Line
21 Drawing subcommittee is certainly going to do that.

22 And again, I would separate -- I would've, looking
23 back, I'd separate those two. It was too much work it
24 ended up being. And things that didn't necessarily have
25 to be together. But thank you, thank you, thank you for

1 all the work you did and are doing.

2 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thanks, Commissioner
3 Andersen. So I'll just -- I think I speak for both
4 Commissioner Fernandez and I -- it's just been
5 frustrating, and in some ways we feel like we're letting
6 you guys down by not having all the answers that we'd
7 like to have. And so we just want to offer if other
8 folks want to step up that that offer's out there. And
9 we really, really appreciate your kind words. Thank you
10 for that. And we're happy to carry on. Just wanted to
11 offer that to the Commission. Let's see.

12 With regard to the expense reports, we had our
13 budget meeting yesterday and asked to have Wanda send
14 every commissioner kind of a summary email of what she
15 has in the queue for you all just to make sure that she's
16 got everything in the queue. All of the expense reports
17 at this point are at DGS -- except for like three or
18 something like that, and those were recently submitted
19 and they're in the first step of the queue. I guess DGS
20 is the last step of the queue, and so they'll be coming
21 out the other end of the mystery train at some point
22 soon. Apparently, one came in yesterday.

23 And I guess there are still some that haven't been
24 submitted yet. So I would just encourage the
25 Commissioners to get those in as soon as they can, but we

1 all should be getting an update soon. And I think that's
2 all I had. So Commissioner Le Mons?

3 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah. I feel like there's an
4 action needed here. So I want to suggest either I will
5 support a motion or make a motion if what we need is to
6 bring in an outside person in particular that's going to
7 require an expense to do this soft audit or whatever we
8 want to call it to get to the bottom of whatever it is we
9 need to get to the bottom of for what sounds like a
10 couple different objectives.

11 Also, I'd like to suggest that the subcommittee
12 shift to a more facilitation capacity with that process.
13 We're trying to wrap up here; we're also trying to get
14 the financial data that we need (indiscernible) Lessons
15 Learned as it supports recommendations. So it sounds
16 like we're talking about bringing someone in. I'm
17 imagining that we're paying that person that we're
18 bringing in to do that. And this person would be skilled
19 in being able to get to whether that person -- I don't
20 know if that creates a whole hiring process or what
21 that's going to look like, but I guess I need to have a
22 little bit more understanding on this objective outside
23 party. How are we expecting to do that, and can we move
24 forward with getting the ball rolling on that? And then
25 that'll take some of the weight off of what's being

1 expected of the two of you, which I personally feel has
2 become unreasonable. And you continue to offer your
3 knowledge and experience from being a part of this
4 committee since the beginning, but bring in the right
5 resources necessary to get us to our goal. Thank you.

6 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Thanks. I want to make sure
7 Commissioner Kennedy has a chance to ask his question or
8 make his statement and then we can get back to Director
9 Hernandez and Commissioner Toledo.

10 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Yeah.
11 Going back to what Commissioner Sinay said, a lot of this
12 is about where our disappointment needs to be directed.
13 And certainly in my case, a hundred percent of the
14 disappointment is with the state and the state systems.
15 I certainly appreciate the excellent work that the
16 subcommittee has done and continues to do. And we just
17 need to make clear to those who need to understand that
18 all processes related to this Commission need to
19 acknowledge and accommodate the very time-bound nature of
20 this Commission. And I don't think we're there yet on
21 procurement. I don't think we're there yet on budget and
22 expenses. We're maybe partway there on human resources,
23 but all of these processes need to understand the
24 severely time-bound nature of this Commission. So thank
25 you to Commissioners Fernandez and Fornaciari, and thank

1 you, Chair, for the opportunity.

2 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Great. Thank you. Director
3 Hernandez and then Commissioner Toledo.

4 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you. So I just
5 want to once again mention that the process -- and thank
6 you, Commissioner Kennedy for acknowledging that the
7 state process is not the easiest to navigate. The
8 information that we get is based on the reports that are
9 provided and the payment of those invoices is a process
10 that -- it goes through separate and apart from that
11 report.

12 So I don't disagree that we can bring someone in to
13 look at the information, but the information is only as
14 good as what we're getting from the Department of General
15 Services in the reports. So they won't see the reports.
16 What I've provided you today is a combination of some of
17 those reports as well as the invoices that we've captured
18 and the information that we've captured. So I just want
19 to say that's the case, unfortunately. I don't know how
20 much more a second pair of eyes is going to change the
21 process itself.

22 And so the information -- we are getting more
23 information. We are getting summaries of the
24 information. As I mentioned earlier, they categorize the
25 information different from the way that we're

1 categorizing the information. I think moving forward,
2 one of the lessons learned is that the Commission needs
3 to identify how they want their reports. I'm pretty sure
4 that most of the departments that have been around for
5 over fifty years have very specific type of reports that
6 they request and have the information organized in a
7 certain manner that helps them in their processes in
8 reporting and so forth. So we don't have that. A lot of
9 the information is just lumped into one big old category
10 and so we're having to pull out that information.

11 And I just wanted to make sure that you're aware of
12 that. Moving forward, I think it would be something that
13 we would talk with the Department of General Services to
14 try to create specific reports for this Commission moving
15 forward that will help future Commissions in getting that
16 information timely as much as possible and in an
17 organized manner in which their reports will easily be
18 translatable by future staff. Thank you.

19 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Thanks so much. Commissioner
20 Toledo?

21 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you, Chair Vazquez. I'm
22 just a little bit unclear on the problem statement that
23 we're trying to solve. Because I think I'm hearing a
24 couple of things, and I'm wondering if the problem that
25 we're trying to solve -- and I don't know if this is

1 correct, but is the problem that we're trying to solve
2 the auditing of and accounting of our reconciliation of
3 the invoices and other budgetary processes? Or is it
4 additional support for the committee and for the
5 Commission in the budget process? Additional reports of
6 that that might be coming through? So I'm just trying to
7 get some clarity on the problem we're trying to solve.
8 And there may be multiple problems, but what specific
9 problem we're trying to resolve or trying solve with this
10 resource that we're trying to obtain. So just a question
11 for the group, I guess.

12 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Does anyone have a specific response
13 to that right now?

14 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah. I'll take a shot at
15 it. Part of it is that there just -- I mean, let's see.
16 If we just simply compare the budget estimate we had in
17 January to the budget estimate we have now -- I mean,
18 it's in many areas it's significantly different. And I
19 mean, Director Hernandez has given us an explanation. I
20 mean, there were some mis-projections and also some parts
21 of contracts were included that we were counting
22 separately were included in the OE&E.

23 But it just -- I think for me a second set of eyes
24 would just give me some comfort that another group was
25 looking at our data so that when we put this report

1 together for the Department of Finance we're in a more
2 comfortable place that we're -- that this report is going
3 to be accurate and will provide the next Commission an
4 appropriate and adequate budget. So that's where I'm
5 coming from if that helps clarify it.

6 I did want to respond to a comment by Commissioner
7 Kennedy about departments not understanding the time-
8 bound nature of our work. And that is an excellent point
9 in just -- I want to share a conversation that we had
10 with Raul last week about it. Apparently, last time Raul
11 put together documentation for each department to help --
12 like a documentation on what the Commission's about, how
13 to work with the Commission, what the constraints are, so
14 that when this Commission rolled around that there would
15 be some documentation from the past so that people with
16 no experience with this Commission would have
17 documentation and be able to understand how to work with
18 this Commission.

19 Well, apparently, the purge time frame for documents
20 is seven years and so those documents all got purged.
21 And so there was no documentation for anybody to go to at
22 these state agencies to understand what the Commission
23 was about. So Raul had to go back through that whole
24 teaching process with those organizations again. And so
25 what he's working on now is, again, resurrecting that

1 documentation for those organizations and ensuring that
2 those documents get flagged and don't get purged. But in
3 addition to that, we're going to be keeping a set of that
4 documentation ourselves for the next folks to have to
5 bring back in case those organizations lose their own
6 documentation, we'll have it. And so there'll be an
7 opportunity to retrain and get things up and moving more
8 quickly.

9 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Thanks, Commissioner Fornaciari.
10 Commissioner Le Mons?

11 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I share Commissioner Toledo's
12 position at this point in terms of now I'm not clear on
13 exactly what we're trying to solve. Commissioner
14 Fornaciari just said something as it relates to -- he
15 said a lot of things, but the thing that jumps out for me
16 is accuracy. So I think accuracy is critical. And if
17 the subcommittee has some concerns about our current
18 resources -- being able to deliver that accuracy, I'd
19 like that to be explicitly stated because that would be
20 the solve that we as a Commission have to fix. I don't
21 know that that's the case. I'm not making an assumption,
22 but I'm posing that as a question, because we have
23 several objectives we're trying to meet here with this
24 information.

25 And I think that maybe what we need to do -- well,

1 this also seems very time-sensitive in terms of our
2 broader objectives, so I think that maybe if we could
3 better understand it -- you may not be able to deliver
4 this now, subcommittee, but if we could better understand
5 the exact problems -- even if they're multiple -- and
6 what your proposal is in terms of a recommendation on how
7 we solve them -- then the Commission, the body, can do
8 its job in making sure that that happens. I think we can
9 have a lot of discussions about how we feel about it and
10 what we think about it, but if there are some action
11 items that need to be taken -- I mean, that's the
12 responsibility of the Commission. And I'd like to be
13 clear as to whether that's being called for today or if
14 we should anticipate that being called for or not. So
15 that's where my lack of clarity is at this point. Thank
16 you.

17 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: So can I jump in on that?
18 Okay. Yeah. I think Commissioner Le Mons and Toledo, I
19 think those are great points. I mean, this is just --we
20 don't have a specific action, I guess I would say right
21 now. I mean, it's an idea that we brought up and we
22 wanted to float to the Commission. I don't know exactly
23 what it would look like. I mean, I think I shared my
24 objective for this. I think Commissioner Fernandez might
25 have a comment, so I'll turn it over to her.

1 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Is it okay to go, Chair?

2 CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Yes.

3 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you. My
4 specific action would be to review all of the
5 expenditures from August 2020 to current. And then the
6 second piece to that would be to take that information
7 and project out what we expect our future expenditures to
8 be. And the third piece of it would be to have accurate
9 information or as good information as we can get, to then
10 compile the report that goes to the legislature. And
11 then, I guess, fourthly, a result of all of this would be
12 to have better information, as Commissioner Fornaciari
13 said, for the 2030 Commission in terms of the
14 expenditures. But that would be in the report to the
15 legislature, which the legislature uses that budget and
16 expenditure information to fund the 2030 Commission. So
17 we really need that information to be as accurate as
18 possible.

19 So the goal for me would be to have accurate
20 expenditure information that we can use to project future
21 expenditures.

22 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Commissioner Le Mons, did you have a
23 response?

24 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah.

25 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: And then -- yeah, go ahead.

1 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: So I'd like to say that A, I
2 step in to support that. I don't know what that looks
3 like, Chair, if we still have our two-person subcommittee
4 limitation. I want the subcommittee to feel supported.
5 That kind of analysis, I'm decent, I'm good at, so I
6 could do. So I'm willing to support them however you
7 see fit to do that. I don't know if that maybe is the
8 formation of a -- I don't know. I'm not going to try to
9 solve that piece. I'll leave that to you, Chair. I'll
10 just make myself available and --

11 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Gee, thanks.

12 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: -- I think we can go from
13 there.

14 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons.

15 So just to time check us, we're at 10:25. We have
16 two more subcommittee updates to get through before 11.

17 So maybe Commissioner Fornaciari and Fernandez,
18 there's an offer on the table for Commissioner Le Mons to
19 sub in for one of you. And we still have our limitation
20 of two-people advisory committees. So you can either
21 accept that offer now or we can table this for the next
22 meeting and the next chair to make that appointment.

23 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Chair, I'd like to make a
24 comment on that --

25 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yeah.

1 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- before you move on. So
2 a couple of things that I've been waiting to say. One, I
3 think I want to just be clear in terms of the language
4 that we're using about why this is even coming up. There
5 is not a problem. I think there was perhaps maybe a
6 misperception that the request was coming because there
7 might have been a problem. I don't believe that there is
8 a problem.

9 I think what I'm hearing from the committee is that
10 for the sake of better clarity, and also transparency,
11 and also because while they have acquired a great
12 knowledge in the processes, for peace of mind for all and
13 also for, again, transparency it would be best to have a
14 recommendation is to have a audit of all of the finances
15 specific to what Commissioner Fernandez was saying.

16 And so on that note, I think to Commissioner Le
17 Mons's offer, perhaps instead of subbing in if
18 Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner Fernandez is
19 willing or intending to remain, if nobody else wants to
20 take their place, maybe separately, and what might be
21 better, is to create a separate audit committee for the
22 purposes of this particular task instead of saying it
23 comes under the auspices of the Finance and
24 Administration Subcommittee.

25 I think that that for the sake of transparency and

1 also having a separate set of eyes under the guise of a
2 different committee, perhaps creating an audit committee
3 that Commissioner Le Mons and perhaps another
4 commissioner who's interested and willing to serve with
5 him can do that much, much more deeper dive. Be that
6 kind of third and fourth pair of eyes.

7 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Okay.

8 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: The other question I have
9 is, and maybe this is also a question for, I don't know,
10 Alvaro or someone else, but is this something that the
11 state auditor's office could help support, since I
12 believe this is what they do for the state? Although I
13 may be wrong in terms of understanding one of their main
14 roles. But anyways, just wanted to add those. Thank
15 you.

16 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Okay. So I'm hearing and accept a
17 recommendation for establishing a separate subcommittee.
18 So first, let's get through that piece.

19 Commissioner Le Mons, would you be willing to be on
20 an audit subcommittee? And then I'll look for volunteers
21 to join that subcommittee first? Commissioner Le Mons?

22 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes, I would be willing to do
23 that, Chair.

24 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thank you.

25 Okay. So do we have volunteers to be on that

1 subcommittee with Commissioner Le Mons?

2 Commissioner Andersen?

3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I was actually going
4 to propose that very same thing what Commissioner
5 Akutagawa said. And yes, I would be happy to be that
6 fourth set of eyes.

7 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great.

8 Commissioner Taylor, were you volunteering, as well?
9 Do you want to arm wrestle Commissioner Andersen?

10 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah. I was, again, never
11 have a problem serving where needed. I had the same
12 thought in mind. And then I was like, wow, I'd actually
13 be using my accounting degree instead of fighting crime.

14 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Commissioner Andersen and
15 Commissioner Taylor, how do you want to proceed?

16 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, I have an engineering
17 degree. I don't have an accounting degree. So if the
18 accountant would like to step up, I'd be happy to step
19 back.

20 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Okay.

21 Commissioner Taylor, sound good to you?

22 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes, that's fine.

23 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Okay.

24 So we have a new subcommittee, an audit
25 subcommittee, Commissioner Le Mons and Commissioner

1 Taylor. Thanks so much for your service.

2 Commissioner Le Mons, did you have anything else you
3 wanted to add?

4 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: No.

5 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thank you.

6 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I've gotten myself into
7 enough already today.

8 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yeah. Be careful what you wish for.

9 All right. Commissioner Kennedy, I know you had
10 your hand up for a while. Did you have anything to add
11 on this committee update?

12 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: No. I'm very happy with the
13 outcome.

14 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Okay.

15 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thanks.

16 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Last call for comments on this
17 committee update or we'll move on.

18 (No audible response).

19 Great. Thanks so much.

20 Term planning. Just as a time check for the rest of
21 the Commissioners, we're going to give 15 minutes for
22 each of these next two subcommittees. So please plan to
23 keep your comments brief.

24 Long-term planning?

25 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, yes, sorry about that.

1 I was --

2 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: That's okay.

3 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- looking for my document.

4 Let me shift gears right now.

5 So based on the information or the discussions that
6 we've had actually throughout the full Commission, I was
7 keeping track and so was Commissioner Akutagawa as
8 everyone else was in terms of potential legislative
9 changes. And also based on lessons learned.

10 So what Commissioner Akutagawa and I did was we put
11 together a listing. And we divided it out into different
12 sections and it was posted yesterday, I believe. And the
13 first section, A, is the potential changes that we think
14 there's general consensus and maybe not. If there isn't,
15 then we can either put in or pull out some of the items.
16 But these were the items that we felt that we could move
17 forward with. We see it kind of like a lower hanging
18 fruit in terms of not much discussion on the negative
19 side of it.

20 And then we have section B, which is other areas
21 that are currently intersecting with other committees.
22 And so they are items that were brought up, but they are
23 being addressed elsewhere.

24 And the third, the longest area is area C, which is
25 areas needing further discussion. So that would be

1 either we haven't discussed it yet or there's been quite
2 a bit of discussions, and it's not at the point where it
3 appears we're comfortable moving forward with it.

4 And then the last section, D, is the constitutional
5 code language areas.

6 So what we were thinking of is really just
7 concentrating on A in terms of those areas where we feel
8 we can move forward with. Again, I see a great
9 opportunity in having an author, having an assembly
10 person willing to author this and not having to look for
11 an author in the future and, right?

12 We are totally aware that we can continue to request
13 legislative changes in future years, but I also feel that
14 the topic is, I don't want to say hot, but at least it's
15 present in most people's minds right now. And if there's
16 a few items we can take care of during this process,
17 that's less that we have to take care of in the future.

18 And so Commissioner Akutagawa, did you have anything
19 on that?

20 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think you gave a great
21 summary. Thank you.

22 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So of the six items
23 in A, one is the requiring (audio interference) state
24 incarcerated people. Okay. I don't have to say thing.

25 Okay. Commissioner Sinay?

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So sorry, I haven't gone really
2 deep on this. I think that the As make sense. And I
3 guess I was just curious on how did B2 and A2 differ?

4 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: The reason we put B2 is
5 because there is a separate -- Commissioner Kennedy and
6 Commissioner Turner are also working with the Federal
7 Bureau of Prisons to get that information. So we wanted
8 to show that there's additional action on this effort
9 that we want to proceed with. There's a legislative
10 government language change that we would need to pursue.
11 And then there's also other action and communication.
12 And I believe Commissioner Kennedy was also checking with
13 other states to see how they're dealing with the
14 federally incarcerated population.

15 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Also on that note, I
16 believe there is also ongoing conversations from a census
17 perspective to reallocate those who are incarcerated so
18 that the census numbers will come with the reallocations
19 already done.

20 So there's multiple streams of work going on. What
21 we just noted in that section A is the part where we felt
22 we can address, and then there's the other parts that are
23 also simultaneously being addressed. But there are
24 multiple pieces that need to be addressed so we wanted to
25 note that in the A part.

1 And also just make it clear, what we are proposing
2 is that we'd like to take a vote today on the parts that
3 fall under section A to be able to move forward with the
4 legislature and the sponsor that has been lined up
5 already or who has stepped up to help move our items that
6 we're interested in moving forward. So just for clarity.

7 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. And then I guess to
8 clarify the clarity, if there's items that as a
9 Commission we feel aren't in A and we need to move to C,
10 that's fine too, and we can work with that as well.

11 So it's A for now; doesn't mean that that's the end
12 all to everything so.

13 Chair Vazquez, did you want me to call on -- okay.

14 I see Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner
15 Kennedy and Commissioner Andersen.

16 Commissioner Fornaciari?

17 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Sure. A couple things.
18 I'll just comment first on list A. I think 1 through 4 I
19 support. I think we're ready to pull the trigger on
20 those. I think A5 I think we need a lot more thought
21 about what that looks like, what fully functional means
22 in -- yeah, I'll just stop there.

23 And I guess A6 I'm okay with going ahead with too.
24 But I think A5 we need a lot more work.

25 So help us understand what the process is, though.

1 Because if you look at the -- it's 25250 -- what is it --
2 2 -- 8251, it says that the language must be provided
3 verbatim -- well, that's not what it says, I'm
4 paraphrasing -- by the Commission. And that the
5 legislature can't change the language. We provide the
6 language.

7 So what's the process we're going to go through to
8 develop the language for these bills?

9 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So in terms of developing
10 the language, we would work with our chief counsel on
11 that language. And then also there's specific ways
12 things are written in code. And I'm hoping that maybe
13 our chief counsel can help us on that piece of it.

14 Commissioner Akutagawa, just step in all the time,
15 please.

16 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I guess maybe I'll
17 take a step back. So what we're going to do is once we
18 get the list from grouping A, an agreed-upon list that
19 everybody's comfortable that we move forward to, what we
20 will do is we will present it to the legislature.

21 And then from there they still have to agree to
22 either accept all or they may choose to accept a portion
23 of it. The ones that will move forward with the sponsor,
24 legislative language does need to be written. They will
25 be working with our chief counsel. But also what we were

1 told is that they have, I guess, language writers on
2 their side. They have counsel on their side that will
3 also help to craft the language in the proper way.

4 My understanding is that we will still have a say in
5 how that will -- what the final language is going to look
6 like. They will help us to write the language, but we'll
7 still be coming back to the Commission to present the
8 language and all that.

9 So there's still multiple steps, but we've just got
10 to get to an agreement on what do we want to forward so
11 that then the work could start.

12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Kennedy?

13 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. I've obviously
14 not been able to keep up with things quite as much as
15 normal, but I did check the handouts for today's meeting,
16 I believe, around this time yesterday morning, and the
17 only thing that I recall finding on the handouts page was
18 the run of show. Maybe I'm mistaken, but I don't feel
19 like I'm in a position to support anything at this point
20 because the last time I checked the handouts page the
21 only thing there was the run of show. Thank you.

22 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And Commissioner Andersen?

23 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you. Again,
24 this is more like a process, which is what Commissioner
25 Fornaciari was saying. I sort of thought that we were

1 going to jump into essentially some of the ones in D,
2 some of the ones that I thought there was consensus
3 about. We need to move the final date, the idea some of
4 those items.

5 So I'm kind of surprised that we're not -- and I
6 thought that is what our person who has the offer on the
7 table, hey, I'll help you out, was actually talking about
8 doing that.

9 I see some of these other ones as, yes, absolutely.
10 I kind of see these as lower hanging fruit, which is
11 great to go with. I don't think A4 is low hanging fruit
12 at all. As soon as they say you don't have to do the
13 contract and regulations for, like, say, the line
14 drawers, that's going to just blow up. I might be
15 misunderstanding what we're actually talking about on
16 that item.

17 And then I see several of the ones in C that I
18 thought we did, indeed, have -- that we're in total
19 agreement about. Like, what's a day in C5, C12, C2. I
20 thought those were -- I didn't believe that we had any
21 dissent in exactly what those were. I thought those
22 would be A items. So I'm a little taken aback.
23 Unfortunately I, also like Commissioner -- wait a
24 minute, did not have the time to really, really go over
25 these and say, okay, I put these as A and those as -- a

1 decision to rearrange it. I appreciate the way you
2 brought us together because this is the only way we can
3 actually have this discussion. So I really appreciate
4 that.

5 And the language on the bills, I do have a process
6 question. So this subcommittee is going to essentially
7 propose the language, or is that going to assign certain
8 languages to other subcommittees? I'm not quite clear on
9 that as we kind of walk through.

10 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So the issue -- and I
11 appreciate all of the questions -- the issue, concern,
12 whatever we want to call it, is in order to move forward
13 in this legislative cycle, the bill needs to be read
14 before the end of April. And we don't have any meetings
15 scheduled in April right now. So it's either we do it
16 now, or we skip this whole legislative cycle and it would
17 go on to the next cycle. And if that's what the
18 Commission chooses to do, again, we do have an advantage
19 right now or a positive that there's an assemblyperson
20 willing to author the bill for us.

21 And yes, we were looking at -- and if there's items,
22 as I mentioned earlier, if there's items where the
23 commissioners feel there is general consensus in moving
24 them to A or moving them from A, that's a possibility, as
25 well. And as Commissioner Akutagawa mentioned, once we

1 come up with the language, we will forward that to the
2 Commission and receive input. And there's an entire
3 months of going back and forth where we'll have the
4 opportunity to make amendments to that language as a
5 Commission if we need to.

6 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I was just going to
7 jump in on what Commissioner Fernandez said. I think,
8 yes, there are things that some people would have
9 thought, oh, this should have been in A. But as we
10 learned the last time we tried to just give the whole
11 list, things that we thought were easy ones were not
12 quite as easy. And so Commissioner Fernandez and I just
13 tried to identify the lowest of the lowest hanging fruit
14 so that we can at least get something moving in this
15 cycle. Otherwise, as she said, if the will of the
16 Commission, the entire Commission is to not move forward,
17 it is just with the knowledge, then, that we are going to
18 miss this cycle. And that's what we were just trying to
19 avoid, is we wanted to at least forward at least a
20 couple, three, four of the lowest of the low hanging
21 fruit. So that's one.

22 We knew that what may seem like obvious to one may
23 not seem so obvious to others. The constitutional ones,
24 to be honest, we chose not to put that forward as part of
25 the group A because the work on it that's required is

1 significant. Whether it's having the legislature vote to
2 agree or if they choose not to and they don't want to,
3 then that means we have to go out and gather signatures.
4 There's a whole big process and in the timeframe that we
5 have -- and to be honest, I mean, we have 15 minutes for
6 our report. And we thought, okay, we don't have 15
7 minutes to go through everything and debate everything.
8 So we were we were just trying to anticipate like what is
9 the lowest of the low hanging fruit so that we can move
10 on. And then we could have continued conversations on
11 everything else because we knew that we would need to.
12 But while we can, we were just trying to see if we could
13 just move even just a few things along.

14 However, again, this is all up to the will of the
15 Commission. We just want it to be clear that if we miss
16 this opportunity because we don't have a meeting
17 scheduled at least in April right now, the earliest is
18 we're looking at mid-to-late April. And that likely,
19 from our understanding, what we were told, is going to be
20 too late for us to take advantage of this legislative
21 cycle. So we just want you all to know like what all the
22 parameters are and then make an informed choice in that
23 way.

24 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: And I'm going to time check us.
25 We're at 10:46.

1 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Yee?

2 COMMISSIONER YEE: Two quick thoughts. One, yeah,
3 really thanking the subcommittee's good work on this.
4 And a reminder that we did give the subcommittee full
5 discretion to choose what they wanted to put into our
6 first package with it, what seemed feasible, not
7 necessarily everything that seemed to have consensus
8 behind it. So just appreciate the work they put into
9 making those choices.

10 For A6, I want to suggest that we phrase that in
11 terms of three months before the map deadlines. And
12 since we found out, map deadline can be a moving target.
13 So to make that a period of time rather than hard
14 calendar dates. Thanks.

15 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

16 So --

17 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: We need a motion.

18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I believe we'll need
19 a motion. But it appears that at least one commissioner,
20 Fornaciari, A5, we may need to move that one out. We can
21 move A5 out.

22 Are you good with that, Commissioner Fornaciari, if
23 we move that and move it to area C?

24 And again, if we do end up moving forward with
25 something and we do in future meetings there's items in C

1 that we've decided and if it's still going through the
2 process (indiscernible) --

3 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Did you lose your audio? Did I lose
4 my audio?

5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh.

6 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: It may be me.

7 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Was it me?

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think it's you.

9 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

10 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yeah.

11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I forget what I was saying.
12 See, that's what happens. Oh, if we do move forward with
13 something, and if there are items in our future meetings
14 and we decide, oh, we're good with moving C5 or C12 or
15 whatever it is forward, we still have the opportunity to
16 amend that until it is actually finalized. So it's
17 just -- the goal is, and maybe it's not going to be our
18 goal, which is fine, the goal is to try to get this
19 information read by the end of April to get into this
20 cycle. And if the Commission decides not to move forward
21 in this cycle, then that's what the Commission decides.
22 I hope that made sense.

23 Commissioner Andersen?

24 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you. On that,
25 A1 and A2, that's the reallocation and putting that into

1 our existing language, that is the reason why D1 makes
2 total sense, which is change the final map date, add an
3 extra month, because that takes an extra month. I would
4 like to sort of tie those together.

5 Now, if the legislature, then, comes back, goes
6 well, let's just put it in there, and then we can go,
7 well, because we need to do that, we need the extra month
8 and do it that way, I'd say yes. But in our proposal, I
9 would like to add that into A1. Like D1, I'd like to add
10 that in.

11 And I like Commissioner Yee's idea about A6. I
12 would like to move ahead with fully functional. I mean,
13 because this is work with the state auditor. So this
14 isn't say exactly what we're going to do, but I think we
15 should get that ball rolling.

16 The one I said about A4, exempting from state
17 procurement and contracting regulations, I don't think
18 you need to necessarily exempt, but there's an item where
19 we need to somehow address the timeframe of that.

20 And so I'd like us to move along on -- talk to the
21 right person about what we do there, what we can do
22 there. So I'd like to include that, but I don't believe
23 that's amending our language. I think that has a lot of
24 discussion involved in it with the appropriate people.

25 So I would like to, if we're going to do a motion

1 and say, hey, these are the items we want to start moving
2 on now, I would like to add I'd keep some of A4 in there,
3 and I would like to add D1 into it. I would also like to
4 add C12, because I think that's like a duh. And C8. Oh,
5 also C5 into that -- in which case I would even go ahead
6 and start the motion if -- I'd wait until other people
7 say things before, but then if you want someone to do a
8 motion, I would be happy, I would do that for you.

9 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

10 Commissioner Fornaciari and then -- or Chief Counsel
11 Pane, did you want to --

12 MR. PANE: Yeah. If I could just --

13 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

14 MR. PANE: -- briefly just clarify one quick point.
15 We've mentioned it in the past. I just want, just as a
16 refresher for the Commission, as you'll note in section
17 A, there's A1 and A2, both referring to the elections
18 code. As a reminder, the process that Commissioner
19 Fornaciari talked about earlier, it obligates the
20 government code in 8250. And since the election code is
21 not part of the Commission's statutes, it technically
22 doesn't have to go through a more rigid, particularized
23 process the way that the other government statutes will
24 need to. Just wanted to clarify that.

25 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fornaciari?

1 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: So just to follow up on
2 that, Anthony, so any changes to 8252 are completely and
3 wholly up to us in what the language says and what we
4 submit. I mean, we're --

5 MR. PANE: Well, not -- I mean, somewhat. So any
6 changes to the Commission statutes have to be agreed upon
7 in the exact language by the Commission. But of course,
8 it takes two. It's not just the Commission. The
9 legislature has to also be interested in that.

10 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Right.

11 MR. PANE: And so the language that the legislature
12 ultimately wants to go with has to be the exact language
13 the Commission thinks and agrees to. So what I think is
14 easily foreseeable as a process is right now the
15 Commission decides on recommended amendments. Then the
16 Commission with any of those goes to the legislature and
17 says, how many of these are you interested in? We're
18 interested in these topics. And they say, we're
19 interested in a certain portion of them or we're
20 interested in all of them.

21 And they help to craft some language together and
22 say, this is what we're thinking is in the bill.

23 And then comes sort of back to the Commission to
24 say, what do you all think about the language? So that
25 portion, where it says, what do you think about the

1 language is a requirement for changes to the Commission
2 statutes in government code sections 8250 et seq. That
3 part isn't required for elections code or changes to
4 Bagley-Keene or something that falls outside of the
5 government -- the Commission statutes.

6 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Right. Ultimately, we would
7 approve those -- the language that would change 82 --

8 MR. PANE: You would -- the Commission would have to
9 agree with that language. And if they do not, then it
10 cannot take effect.

11 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Right. In the election
12 code, the A1 and A2, the legislature could just do that
13 on their own without us.

14 MR. PANE: Correct.

15 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. And so a little bit
16 more on the process. I kind of got lost in Commissioner
17 Fernandez's explanation, and so I want to make -- see if
18 I understand. I mean, so this -- this bill, proposal,
19 whatever, has to be read into by April, but we can change
20 it? I mean, what -- what does that all mean?

21 MR. PANE: So as best as I can understand -- I'm not
22 exactly a legislative expert, but my understanding is,
23 right now, there's what's referred to as perhaps to as
24 a -- and perhaps the Chair will probably do a much better
25 job of this than I will. I hope I don't butcher it too

1 much, Chair Vazquez. But there's a spot bill, which is a
2 placeholder. And there's a certain period of time when a
3 spot bill needs to actually have content in, real
4 content, specific areas before it moves out of the
5 committee. If it doesn't move out of the committee, it's
6 dead.

7 So there is, I think, the info -- probably
8 formal/informal time frame in which there needs to be
9 actual content to this spot bill is end of April is what
10 we're hearing. And so that is the reference that I think
11 Commissioner Fernandez and Commissioner Akutagawa are
12 referencing.

13 So if we are successful in getting the Legislature
14 to agree with the Commission on these particular topics
15 and that topic has language and that language goes in the
16 spot bill, now it's no longer such a spot bill anymore as
17 it is actual, quote, a real bill, and it has content to
18 it. That language is what the Commission is going to --
19 again, assuming it -- that what's in the bill is
20 referring to the government -- in the Commission statutes
21 is language that the Commission is going to have to adopt
22 and be okay with by a supermajority in order for it to
23 take effect, if that helps.

24 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: So --

25 MR. PANE: How'd I do, Chair?

1 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: You did pretty good. I will just
2 say that there's still going to be -- and I'm sensing
3 what maybe some of the angst is. There will -- once the
4 bill is live, we go through the process of amending it
5 should we want to continue to wordsmith it.

6 So we can continue to have conversations and go, oh,
7 that's not really -- we thought this was what we wanted,
8 but based on questions from the committee, questions from
9 the public, et cetera, like, we think we should actually
10 word it this way. But we need sort of original -- we
11 need a starting point set of language written up, but
12 that is not going to be the final -- we're not stuck with
13 our first draft, but we need to decide that we want a
14 first draft for us to move forward with any of these.

15 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: So can we -- so, I mean, it
16 sounds like, conceivably, if we decide to go through with
17 all of the A's, let's say hypothetically, and we decide
18 we keep -- we're really not happy with the language for a
19 couple of them, we could take them out or whatever.
20 Could we add ones that we didn't start with if we feel
21 like we're at a point where we're ready to pull the
22 trigger?

23 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: It -- that may be more difficult,
24 especially --

25 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

1 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: -- because it's easier to take stuff
2 out than add stuff, especially substantive pieces, to
3 different sections of the code. And I'm not even sure
4 that that's allowed if we would, you know, sort of bring
5 in other pieces of the code in a particular bill. Yeah.

6 Commissioner Fernandez.

7 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

8 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Actually -- actually, it
9 can be done. I've actually seen -- what did you call
10 them? Spot bills, placeholders, Chief Counsel Pane?
11 That they started out in one subject and complete -- by
12 the time at the end, it was something completely
13 different because someone needed some language change,
14 and so they added it to that bill because it was an
15 active bill.

16 So you could theoretically add to it and amend to
17 it. So -- and what's important about that is we need to
18 make sure we track it so that no one's adding to our
19 language or our bill. I hope that made sense.

20 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Friends, we are at 10:59. We
21 haven't had a motion; we haven't had a vote. We also
22 have times that are in for our closed session and then we
23 have a panel when we reconvene. So I think,
24 unfortunately, we're going to have to move these -- the
25 rest of these subcommittee updates to our afternoon

1 session and eat into some of our next steps conversation
2 in the late afternoon around 3:30 is what that is looking
3 like.

4 So thanks, everyone, for the conversation. We will
5 pick this conversation back up at 3 o'clock or 3:15. And
6 then, yeah. Let's go to break. And commissioners are --
7 take a quick break so that we can begin our open session.
8 Let's say, let's take a five-minute break, so let -- or
9 sorry. Commissioners will reconvene closed session at
10 11:05. The public, we will see you at 11:45. Am I doing
11 that right? Yes. Great. Thanks, everyone.

12 (Whereupon, a recess was held from 11:00 a.m.
13 until 11:47 a.m.)

14 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Welcome back, everyone. I think
15 this might be a historic moment for the Commission that
16 we have (indiscernible) no action was taken, and on time
17 and on schedule. So (indiscernible) much.

18 As a reminder, we did not complete (indiscernible)
19 director updates or subcommittee updates and
20 (indiscernible) those discussions until later at 3:15.
21 And so with that, we are going to continue our lessons
22 learned, and I got a few guests, I guess, now.

23 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Angela, your audio is really
24 breaking up. Are you -- okay. Sorry. Commissioner
25 Vazquez.

1 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Sorry. I have to use headphones
2 because I'm in a not private space.

3 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: You sound good now.

4 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Now? Okay. Great. So we did not
5 take any action in closed session and we will be moving
6 into our lessons learned conversation for today. So
7 first up, we will have -- I believe we have our guests
8 ready for our discussion on our Statewide Database
9 support.

10 So with that, I think I would love to welcome -- I
11 see Karin. I see Jaime, Linus, and Seth. Great. Okay.
12 I will hand it over to the Statewide Database team.
13 Thanks so much.

14 MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you so much, Madam Chair, and
15 hello, Commissioners. It's really great to be here.
16 Really appreciate the invitation. So your Chair has
17 already done a great job introducing everybody, of
18 course. The Statewide Database team that is present
19 today consists of Jaime Clark, who you all know very
20 well. And then also some of you have met Linus Kipkoech
21 and Seth Neill, and I'm really glad that they could join
22 us today.

23 We watched your presentation a few days ago, a
24 couple of weeks ago, about Statewide Database, and we
25 know that there are some questions about Statewide

1 Database. So what we did is we took those questions, we
2 divvied them up based on the person that is best suited
3 amongst our team members to address those questions. And
4 so I'm going to start by talking a little bit about the
5 Statewide Database relationship with the Legislature, and
6 then I'm going to move things over to Jaime, and then
7 we'll just kind of go down the list, if that's okay.

8 So again, I'm going to start with the Statewide
9 Database relationship to the Legislature. So as you
10 know, we are part of the University of California, and
11 we're also part of the University of California at
12 Berkeley, and we're part of University of California at
13 Berkeley School of Law. And I'm just saying this because
14 it seems like every time you add something onto that we
15 are part of, there is a set of documents and bureaucracy
16 that goes along with it.

17 I bet you there's somebody at Berkeley who is really
18 upset that they did not invent bureaucracy, but you know,
19 it is what it is, but they're doing a pretty good job
20 with bureaucracy. So I think Seth and Linus both will be
21 addressing part of that because it makes it very
22 interesting to work in that space.

23 But it also means that it addresses how we're
24 funded. We are funded through the allocation that the
25 University of California gets from the State Legislature.

1 So basically, it first goes to the University of
2 California. They then parse funding out to the campuses,
3 and then the campuses, they parse the funding out to the
4 various schools or departments. So that is how the money
5 gets to Statewide Database.

6 So being part of the university situates us behind
7 academic firewalls. So that means that we operate
8 independently of the Legislature just like many other
9 programs that are also funded via the same mechanism.
10 And we, however, also, of course, do have a relation -- a
11 relationship with the Legislature because we're
12 fulfilling the mandate for them to build and make
13 publicly available the redistricting database for the
14 State of California. So that's basically, in a nutshell,
15 how that works.

16 The legislature asked Statewide Database at some
17 point through the decade, and I think it was maybe around
18 2017 or 2018 or so to look into options to provide public
19 access for redistricting software. And the reason for
20 why they asked us was, you know, we do a lot of things
21 that nobody else kind of wants to do. And we are also --
22 that's also how we get stuck with a lot of the census
23 programs.

24 But we're also well-situated to do this because,
25 obviously, we are one of the very few organizations aside

1 from the CRC that deals with redistricting on an ongoing
2 matter -- on an ongoing basis just because we're building
3 a redistricting database. And because of that, we're
4 also in the loop with whatever tools are provided, what
5 is developed by -- by others, what other states are
6 doing, and so forth. But also because we are independent
7 and we have good relationships with people that use
8 redistricting data.

9 And you know, generally, familiarity with the
10 subject matter -- and I could talk for hours about my
11 history, of course, with communities of interest and my
12 quest to build a COI tool which actually started in 2008
13 when I started to ask, you know, various funders whether
14 they might be interested in building a COI tool. When I
15 reached out to various software developers to see -- you
16 know, redistricting software developers to see if there
17 was any kind of interest in this. And when I reached out
18 to -- finally, in 2010, to Google to try to get Google to
19 perhaps integrate a COI tool or COI input tool into
20 Google Maps, and I struck out.

21 And so this is how far the COI tool development goes
22 back, and anybody who knows me has probably gone to sleep
23 at some point when I talked about the need to, you know,
24 develop tools -- develop input tools and make it easier
25 for people to participate and kind of getting rid of,

1 like, reams and reams of paper.

2 So of course, the 2011 -- your predecessors, the
3 2011 Commission, also put into their report that there
4 was a need to look into this and to, you know, perhaps
5 look into creating some sort of a tool. So this is
6 basically just been an evolution. And you know, we
7 started talking to the Legislature about this when they
8 asked us to look into it and started to do a bunch of
9 research just to make sure we weren't dropping the ball,
10 just to make sure that nobody else was working on
11 something like that, and essentially just struck out all
12 along.

13 And then in around 2019 or so, I think, the -- we
14 talked to the Legislature about funding. So they
15 basically reached out when the Commission funding came
16 up, and we talked to them to try to figure out whether
17 this -- this, you know, idea to actually develop
18 something ourselves since nobody else was doing it was
19 consistent with the State mandates. And they asked us
20 for budget estimates. Then they included some money in
21 the state budget. And I just think it's really important
22 to understand that they don't have a contract with us, so
23 there's no contractual relationship with the State
24 Legislature. This is basically part of, again, funding
25 for UC and we're fulfilling a mandate.

1 And they also did not provide any input about what
2 specifically we were doing. Like, for example, what kind
3 of, you know, functionality is in there and so forth.
4 They also don't have any access to the data. Basically,
5 everything -- and you know how hard it is to get data
6 about anything that you're collecting from the University
7 of California, so this is just part of this.

8 We started to develop in earnest in 2019. And you
9 know, once the Commission was seated, we reached out to
10 transition staff about the mandate to coordinate with you
11 all, and you may remember starting to see us on a more
12 regular basis at that point. Generally, Jaime and I were
13 present, and we did a, first, really formal presentation
14 on the COI tool on September 25th and talked to -- also
15 about the multiple levels of tools and access that we
16 have planned to provide access to redistricting data.

17 And you know, the best laid plans, of course, COVID
18 happens. We had this fantastic idea about providing
19 access through libraries and library computers, and Jaime
20 spent more time than she will admit on, you know, running
21 up and down the State of California and talking to
22 libraries about repurposing census-used technology and
23 then swapping over to making the tools available. And
24 then COVID happens, and you know, things have to change
25 very quickly.

1 So with that, I'm going to just move it over to
2 Jaime, and she can tell you a little bit about more --
3 about this. So thank you.

4 MS. CLARK: All right. And hi, commissioners. Good
5 to see you all. I'm going to talk about just the process
6 of developing all of the tools, and there will be an
7 emphasis on the COI tool because that's kind of what you
8 all had talked about most in your lessons learned
9 discussions last couple weeks.

10 So the tools themselves were developed really with a
11 focus on getting input from stakeholders, huge input
12 from -- coming from organizations and groups. For
13 example, the Black Census and Redistricting Hub,
14 Disability Rights California, MALDEF, Advancing Justice,
15 NALEO, Common Cause, League of Women Voters just to name
16 a few. Apologies to anybody listening who I'm leaving
17 out.

18 And also, we worked with a number of smaller
19 regional community organizations, so not just, like, the
20 big national or statewide organizations but also smaller
21 organizations serving more local populations. And
22 really, this collaboration began years before the COI
23 tool was eventually released and became publicly
24 available.

25 In terms of developing the tool itself,

1 organizations had direct access to the COI tool for at
2 least six months in advance of it being made publicly
3 available. Throughout that time period, we requested,
4 and when possible, incorporated their feedback on an
5 ongoing basis throughout development.

6 As Karin mentioned, we also developed the COI tool
7 and all of the tools kind of with an eye on making them
8 available in what we were calling redistricting access
9 points in libraries throughout the state. As Karin
10 mentioned, a lot of resources really went toward working
11 with libraries to get these points sort of set up in --
12 at least one in every county in California, and we were
13 working on training library staff on assisting their
14 patrons with using the tools. And of course, those plans
15 were uprooted due to the pandemic.

16 In beta testing, and again, specifically with the
17 COI tool, we also got feedback from your predecessors,
18 the former commissioners, to see what they thought would
19 be the most effective for members of the public and sort
20 of what they -- you know, what they wished they had had
21 in 2011. We hope that this Commission can be a resource
22 for us in developing future tools for 2030 both before
23 and after your terms end.

24 So again, kind of with our time line of the COI tool
25 specifically, once this Commission was seated, we gave

1 multiple public presentations throughout the fourth
2 quarter to get feedback on the functionality of the COI
3 tool as the COI tool was the most urgent, the most
4 immediate tool that we knew was going to be released.

5 In October of 2020, we spent time with each of you,
6 each individual commissioner, getting feedback on what to
7 incorporate in the COI tool. And we worked closely with
8 the COI tool subcommittee from then on. We implemented
9 your feedback as much as we could, given the development
10 of the tool itself took over two years and the Commission
11 was seated around four months before the tool was
12 actually publicly available.

13 Your feedback was really valuable to us. We
14 implemented -- you know, for example, we implemented more
15 language access. You asked us to make the tool and all
16 the associated materials available in 16 languages total,
17 which we did. Also, some of the input we were able to
18 incorporate from all of you is what information should be
19 collected from users about their communities and also
20 about themselves.

21 On that last point, by the request of the
22 Commission, we collected more personal information about
23 users than we had sort of built in initially when we were
24 developing the tool. And you know, Seth and Linus will
25 go into this further in detail. But ultimately, that did

1 end up impacting the time line of when the Commission
2 could receive submissions from the COI tool, and all of
3 that was ironed out, of course, for the tools later on,
4 the online redistricting tool and QGIS.

5 Kind of leading into that, part of the feedback we
6 got from the Commission was to open up public
7 participation through the COI tool as early as possible.
8 So the tool went live in early January 2021. And at that
9 time, Statewide Database was ready to start delivering
10 all of the data we collected from the COI tool to the
11 Commission.

12 And of course, also at that time, your data
13 management team wasn't yet hired and your data management
14 system, Air -- which ended up being Airtable, wasn't set
15 up, and so the Commission wasn't able to accept the data
16 at -- in 2021 when we were -- you know, when the -- when
17 the tool went live and members of the public started
18 using it and submitting their COIs to you.

19 So with that, I'm going to pass the mic to Linus,
20 who will talk a little bit more sort of about that time
21 line and the details around Statewide Database being able
22 to transmit data to the Commission.

23 MR. KIPKOECH: All right. Thank you very much,
24 Jaime. And thank you, commissioners, for inviting us to
25 today's meeting. I'm going to go directly and talk

1 about, you know, Statewide Database training the USDR
2 members and also discussing the data turnaround and
3 helping set up Airtable.

4 As Jaime mentioned, you know, we started working
5 with USDR late in December 2020. We trained them on
6 multiple areas, including we talked with -- trained them
7 on, you know, the GIS layouts and all the redistricting
8 process and -- and the kind of BIOS format we were going
9 to produce, you know, the submission were going to be in
10 different (indiscernible) formats, so we trained them on
11 those field. In particular, you know, the person we
12 wanted in more, and Phil ended up being the CFC data --
13 on the CFC data management.

14 So we work with Phil who was really great at setting
15 up Airtable so that, you know, provide a helpful way for
16 the members of the public to access the submissions. So
17 we had to change how we were sending data to Phil,
18 because one, initially when we developed the tool, we did
19 not have any information on how the CFC is going to
20 accept the submission.

21 So Jaime also mentioned that initially, when we
22 deal -- we got feedback from the CFC, we collected
23 information that were, you know, PII information that
24 were private. And so we ended up having to remove those
25 before they put -- we put it in Airtable.

1 Also, we send Phil, or to the CFC we sent another
2 copy of that data that contain all the information
3 without removing any personal identifiable information.
4 So -- and also, we worked with (indiscernible) storing
5 these data, as -- I think Jaime also mentioned that
6 working at UC Berkeley, or being part of UC, there's a
7 lot of bureaucracies, and some of these bureaucracies
8 that I think they use for, given the kind of error where
9 cybersecurity is a big issue, and we don't want to be a
10 victim or, you know, I don't know, data being leaked out,
11 or people are accessing information that they do not have
12 the right to access. So in every step for our sending
13 data to CFC, we have to make sure that all the security
14 protocols and policies were met and satisfied before we
15 can send the data.

16 So we send data to CFC. We send share files, PDF,
17 and (indiscernible) files. And those are the data that
18 we already removed the personal identifiable information,
19 and send them at the database, which contained all the
20 data that we, you know, we collected from the tool. And
21 so on our end, we send every -- everything that we
22 collected to CFC.

23 One thing we don't know is what amount of -- if the
24 commissioner had -- what kind of view they had Airtable,
25 because we send everything to CFC data management team.

1 So that is it. We send everything we had on our end on a
2 timely manner, and we have a few things that we learned
3 during this process.

4 One, it would be nice if in the future, we know what
5 kind of a format or how the CFC is going to accept this
6 data, so we can build into the process, because when we
7 are already in the development and then halfway. Or like
8 at some point, we hear what the CFC want the file, what
9 format they want, it's hard to sometimes adjust because
10 we were already in the development.

11 So in the future, if -- you know, at the beginning
12 that becomes part of the process, it will make it easier
13 for us to send data and go through all these required
14 standards. You know, getting all the security clearance,
15 making sure that all the policies and all the security
16 requirements are met before, you know, we have to send
17 in the other ways. We may have another delay.

18 All right. And then with that, I'm going to pass to
19 Seth who is going to talk more about -- he might end up
20 touching a few of the things that I said, and others.
21 Thank you.

22 MR. NEILL: Thank you, Linus, and hello,
23 commissioners. Thank you again for having us here to
24 talk about -- about the -- the access tools and the data.

25 So as Linus mentioned, all I'm going to talk about

1 the ownership of the tools and the data. A lot of the
2 points I'll be touching on have been addressed a little
3 bit by Karin, and Jaime and Linus, but I'm going to focus
4 a bit more on the ownership questions.

5 So to reiterate Statewide Database as part of
6 Berkeley Law, and so our work product is owned by UC
7 Berkeley. That also means, as Linus mentioned, that we
8 have to comply with rules and regulations, including
9 security measures around data, and in our work in
10 general.

11 In the development of these access tools, our access
12 was, of course, on functionality, and also, on making
13 sure that the data that we were gathering could be
14 transmitted to the Commission. Ownership was not a
15 question that we were actively looking at development
16 since from our point of view, the dataset was always
17 something that was going to be a publicly available one
18 that would be shared and handed off from us and made
19 public. And so that could certainly be a lesson learned
20 to add a bit more focus or consideration into these kinds
21 of questions.

22 For -- so as I mentioned, we are -- we follow the UC
23 regulations around the -- any data that we collect or work
24 with. So that would apply to the data we transfer, as
25 well as the security on both our servers, and any other

1 servers that we are sending data with personally
2 identifiable information included in it. So because of
3 that, we did have to work with the Commission to make
4 sure that the data storage setup met the different
5 requirements from the University of California and
6 Statewide Database. That we also have to follow when
7 working with that kind of data.

8 There were some other requests along the way that we
9 weren't able to fulfill, because of the same
10 requirements. Things like, for example, earlier on in
11 working with USTR, one of the members of their team asked
12 for access to our servers, which was not something -- the
13 kind of access we're able to provide just due to the
14 different security issues. And that's a level of access
15 that not everyone on our team has, either.

16 So but in general, or just going back to the data
17 that we were collecting, CRC did receive all the data
18 that we collected with the tools. We did not withhold
19 any data. And as Jaime mentioned, we collected some
20 specific pieces of data at the request of the Commission.
21 For example, those IP addresses. And if there were
22 commissioners who didn't have access to all parts of that
23 data, maybe including personally identifiable
24 information, that may be a matter of policy or of the
25 functioning of the Airtable or the different views of

1 Airtable. But that data was transferred whenever it came
2 in.

3 Also, there are no other outside groups or
4 individuals, including the legislature, had access to any
5 data until they were transmitted to the Commission and
6 then made public. The CFC owns all the data that they
7 have, or that you have, with which is the same data
8 that -- the same the database has. And it remains true
9 that no other outside individuals and groups, including
10 the legislature, have access to the data in any way other
11 than through the Commission's website.

12 The redistricting tools are still available online,
13 so that data is accessible to the users through their own
14 accounts. And is also archived securely in accordance
15 with UC policies that cover all Statewide Database data.
16 And we are not using that data for any other purpose and
17 sending it to the Commission for the redistricting.

18 UC, University of California, does own the tools,
19 which means that we at Statewide Database can maintain
20 them. Members of the public have been using them to
21 participate in local redistricting processes, and the
22 tools will continue to be available for people who want
23 to participate in CVRA District things, and/or to learn
24 about redistricting in general for educational purposes.

25 One other note is that open source software is a

1 separate question for making the data that's captured by
2 tools publicly available, or management of that data,
3 that may be collected. And of course, we'll continue to
4 evaluate other opportunities to bring transparency to
5 these kinds of access tools or in future cycles.

6 In terms of overall recommendations, as mentioned by
7 Linus, it could be very valuable to have the data
8 management team earlier in the process, so that issues
9 around data management and storage can be worked out,
10 communicated around, so that the Commission can securely
11 receive data in its preferred format as soon as possible.

12 And to that end, Statewide Database could also
13 identify infrastructure needs and time lines for the CRC
14 to be able to receive data to allow for easier
15 coordination with that team. And along with that, of
16 course, technology can also change a lot over the course
17 of a decade. So there may be other opportunities to
18 revisit these kinds of questions, and look at them in
19 terms of the technologies that may -- that we might not
20 be expecting, or thinking about, or planning for, that
21 might enter the scene between now and the next decade.

22 So thank you, and I'll hand it back to Karin at this
23 point.

24 MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah, thanks so much, Jaime, Linus
25 and Seth. Really appreciate you guys. And just wanted

1 to wrap up by saying that from our perspective, we think
2 it's been really beneficial for the State of California
3 to have our two independent redistricting organizations
4 with, you know, you obviously fulfilling your mandate.
5 And congratulations again to redraw the federal and state
6 lines while Statewide Database ensures access to data,
7 not only for you, the Commission, but also very
8 importantly to the general public, local jurisdictions
9 who are really heavy data users, and then, you know,
10 everybody else, really. Lots of researchers, and you
11 know, academics, students and so forth.

12 I think that from our experience, the ongoing
13 collaboration between our two groups has been great.
14 It's -- you know, it ensures transparency, and it ensures
15 that transparency remains a cornerstone of the process.
16 You know, the fact that Statewide Database was able to
17 bring in decades of experience on how to make the data,
18 you know, complex data as accessible as possible while
19 the CRC really pushed to put an emphasis on, for example,
20 expanding language access. I think that really benefited
21 everybody.

22 And you know, again, as database and software
23 development is obviously a multi-year, very complex
24 process. And we're looking forward to your feedback on
25 what tools and functionalities we're most helpful, and

1 what ended up being less important than anticipated. And
2 you know, we're looking forward to the lessons learned.

3 And that's it for us. Thank you. We're here for
4 questions.

5 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you. And again, I'm going to
6 try to keep us going on time. So if commissioners could
7 keep their questions direct and brief, and same for
8 responses for our guests. I want to make sure that we
9 get to our other two presentations before 12:45. We may
10 extend into 1 o'clock.

11 Commissioner Fornaciari, Andersen, and Yee?

12 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So as far as PII goes, was
13 that a bottom? I mean, is there a lesson learned that we
14 should consider? I mean, I don't -- so I don't know if
15 you guys know the answer to this, but I'm just throwing
16 it out there for the lessons learned team. That maybe
17 we ought to look at the PII that we asked to capture.
18 Did we use it all? Is it -- did we need it? And is it a
19 bottleneck to our challenge for you know, working
20 together with the Statewide Database? So I don't know
21 if you have a comment on that or not, but --

22 MS. CLARK: Sorry to interrupt you. Thanks so much
23 for that question. And, Seth and Linus and Karin, I'm
24 happy to answer that one.

25 So when we were initially developing the tool, we

1 weren't really planning on capturing that much PII. And
2 then at the request of the Commission, we ended up, of
3 course, capturing more of it. And sort of due to that,
4 there was a UC policy that -- or a UC -- yeah, a UC
5 policy that needed an agreement that we had to work with
6 the Commission on. But also, there were some bottlenecks
7 just in terms of the way that the Commission's data
8 storage was set up. So for example, initially the way --
9 and I think maybe, yeah, I think the way that the
10 Shapefiles were being stored on your server was sort of
11 private by obscurity. So in the same way that your
12 documents in Google Drive are private, because nobody
13 knows the URL. It was something similar to that. And so
14 we couldn't send you, for example, our Shapefiles with
15 all of the attributes that were collected. So all of the
16 IP addresses, and people's email addresses, and their
17 names. We couldn't just send that to you, and then have
18 them posted where it was planning to be posted. So we
19 then, you know, developed stripping all of that PII out
20 of the Shapefiles before it was sent to you.

21 Additionally, we did do a huge database dump every
22 time that we exported any of the submissions to you. So
23 that was on a daily basis. So the Commission itself,
24 like the California Redistricting Commission, has all of
25 that data, and I don't know the extent to which

1 commissioners ended up actually using it, or that
2 individual commissioners even had access to that
3 information, or have access to that information at this
4 time. So to my knowledge, Commission didn't end up
5 actually using that data, but we did collect it at your
6 request.

7 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you.

8 Commissioner Andersen and Commissioner Yee?

9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, thank you for that
10 explanation, Jaime. That was very good. And I
11 personally like that I don't have access to that, to my
12 knowledge of it, but again, and I do recall the whole
13 conversation of it was to check -- the reason why we
14 asked for it all was to check, you know, are these real
15 people? You know, are they coming in from other
16 countries, all this sort of stuff. And then we didn't
17 really use it to my understanding. But I have other
18 questions.

19 Number one is - and Karin, this goes back to the
20 budget, and how Statewide Databases gave their money. So
21 when the Legislature wants you to do the tools, and they
22 said, okay, great. So they put extra money for this in
23 the statewide budget. But if you are getting your money
24 from the UC system, then did they allocate that to UC to
25 go directly to you, or did that go into kind of this -- a

1 general UC overall, and eventually you might have seen
2 something kind of trickle down eventually, or -- you
3 know, I'm wondering how that how that happened.

4 MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah, thank you for that question.
5 Commissioner Andersen, I could probably write a book
6 about that topic, honestly. So the answer is it's a
7 mixture of both. So some of it was actually earmarked,
8 and usually like permanent allocation is not. That's
9 just part of the UC budget. And then, you know, you just
10 kind of have to keep your fingers crossed, and make a lot
11 of phone calls, and send a lot of emails. Sometimes it's
12 easier to get funding through that process than others.

13 So for this one, because it was a mandate, there was
14 actually a line item, I think, items in there. I'd have
15 to look it up. I can send it to you.

16 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: All right. Thank you.

17 MS. MAC DONALD: But that's not usual. That's not
18 usually how we get funded. Yeah.

19 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you. I have
20 two quick questions. One is, you know, we talked about
21 the archival. UC's archival policy, and all this data,
22 that is in perpetuity. Is that correct? There was no
23 purge involved at UC, you know, as far as the data that
24 you have collected that Statewide Database collects.
25 That is -- there's no -- at no point does that get

1 dumped?

2 MS. MAC DONALD: I think that's a question, perhaps
3 for Seth. I will just tell you that for us, the most
4 important thing was just to make sure that there was a
5 backup in case something goes wrong on your end. Just so
6 that these data are even there. So you could rebuild.
7 Because you remember one of the lessons that we learned
8 that was not in the report from the 2011 Commission was
9 that their website failed. You know, they lost all of
10 their data. So we're like, okay, we're just going to
11 make sure that there's a backup just in case, because you
12 just don't know, you know?

13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, that's why I'm
14 wondering if Seth wants to --

15 MS. MAC DONALD: Yes.

16 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- answer that about as you
17 know, we heard there was a lot of information that went
18 in from the 2010 Commission to get to us, but it got
19 dumped in seven years. So we didn't get it. So I'm just
20 wondering about any of that. Is that an issue?

21 MR. NEILL: Yeah, thank you for the question. I can
22 respond to that. The University of California has a data
23 retention schedule. And so, for example, for most
24 documents, I think would be two years or something along
25 those lines. And so it is not in in perpetuity a

1 retention schedule.

2 MS. MAC DONALD: And having said that, that those
3 are minimum standards, if I may weigh in, Seth. And
4 honesty for us, it's not a big cost. We can basically,
5 if there was this Commissioner Fornaciari probably knows
6 this, there was this Amazon server thing called the
7 Glacier --

8 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Um-hum.

9 MS. MAC DONALD: -- where you really put things on
10 ice, literally, you know, it doesn't cost lot. So you
11 know, we can save things on Glacier, you know, for longer
12 than that. So yeah.

13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. The reason I'm saying
14 that is I'm assuming that Statewide Database, you know,
15 in terms of your, you know, you have to go back ten years
16 from the census. So I'm assuming that most of your data
17 is a ten or twenty year time frame.

18 MS. MAC DONALD: Our data, we have data back, you
19 know, to the early 90s. So yeah, because if you look at
20 the dataset, you know, the dataset actually spanned more
21 than ten years, we went all the way back. Yeah.

22 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay, thank you.

23 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you so much.

24 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Actually, sorry, I have one
25 last question to --

1 MS. MAC DONALD: Commissioner Andersen, can you
2 please keep your questions brief? We have two other
3 panels to get to in twenty minutes.

4 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, thank you. It's to
5 update the tools. Is that an ongoing process, or is that
6 something we would -- the Commission should maybe ask for
7 in budget wise to make sure that the CRC and the
8 Statewide Database can work on in like, two years before,
9 like the last couple of time frames to get ready for the
10 2030?

11 MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah, I think that will be a good
12 recommendation to maybe get together a couple of years
13 before and check in and see what the state of the art is
14 at the time, and what could be done. And then also
15 collaborate on potential budget items. That's a great
16 idea. Thank you.

17 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Commissioner Yee?

18 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, I'll pass for the sake of
19 time, but I really appreciate the Statewide Database.

20 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you. Appreciate you,
21 Commissioner Yee.

22 All right. Thanks so much to our Statewide Database
23 team. With that, let us move over to data management.

24 So I think Marcy, sorry. Director Kaplan, did you
25 have something?

1 DIRECTOR KAPLAN: I don't know if this -- whether
2 this is coming up or if this is later. I know the
3 prisoner reallocation that was done and the time frame
4 that that took. I know the Commission has talked about
5 the time line for 2030. I don't know if this is the time
6 to just hear a little bit more about that. If there's,
7 you know, just the time frame it took from when the state
8 got the census data to when the Commission was able to
9 utilize. And if there are recommendations or other work
10 that the Statewide Database does ongoing over the ten
11 years, or opportunities for the Commission to look at
12 additional support to expedite that process for 2030,
13 should there not be an opportunity to get a later
14 deadline if this is the time to talk about or not. So I
15 just wanted to flag that.

16 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: The Statewide Database team, do you
17 have any brief thoughts on prisoner reallocation
18 processes that you might make recommendations on?

19 MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you for that question. Could
20 I please -- I'm not really prepared for that. I have a
21 lot of thoughts on that topic, and it's going to blow
22 your time line for today. So if I may just get some time
23 and maybe come back to talk about that some other time, I
24 think there would be, I think, better -- better prepared.
25 Thank you.

1 MS. MAC DONALD: Great, thanks. Okay. Thanks so
2 much to our guests who are waiting. Let's move to data
3 management. I will hand it to Tony and Paul from our
4 data management team.

5 MS. ANTONOVA: Hello. Hi. It's good to see all of
6 your faces. Thank you for inviting us to speak. I
7 wanted to apologize in advance. I'm a bit sick, so my
8 voice might be a little weak.

9 But yeah, I'll just -- I'll jump in with a quick
10 introduction. I'm Toni. As you all know, I'm the data
11 manager for the CRC on staff for the CRC. And Paul will
12 also be joining us, and he's the data analyst also on
13 staff at the CRC.

14 Our team was quite a bit larger. We had some
15 students that helped us, and contractors as well, and
16 have the size of the team and who worked on what kind of
17 varied throughout the whole process. I guess I'll give a
18 little bit of a high-level overview of how we collected
19 and ingested a couple of different data types. And then
20 I'll jump into some thoughts about the future.

21 Yeah. We had a couple of different, you know, kind
22 of categories of data. I think as a team, we typically
23 thought of the spatial data as its own category. So
24 that's everything that came from the Statewide Database,
25 from the (indiscernible) community tool, the district map

1 drawing tool, QGIS, and so on. And occasionally, you
2 know, attachments sent directly to the CRC that contained
3 Shapefiles.

4 I'd say a second category of data was nonspatial
5 data that we received digitally. So it's emails, form
6 submissions. In one case, we got an entire file of
7 YouTube videos. So things like that.

8 And I'd say a third bucket, basically analog
9 formats. So any letters, or the paper COI that we
10 received. We handled each one of these differently, and
11 the process for ingesting it, and it changed and
12 stream -- to be more streamlined throughout the months
13 that we worked. You know, when we started, we had in
14 office staff essentially upload all the data to some tabs
15 on the website. And then my team pulled all of that semi
16 manually, you know, with some maybe automations to make
17 it quicker. We pulled all of that into Airtable.

18 We also did some, kind of like, manual downloading
19 of spatial data that we received from the Draw My
20 community tool at the very onset to pull that into
21 Airtable. You know, and as we worked throughout the
22 months, we could have optimized each one of these
23 processes.

24 So for spatial data coming in from the tools, we had
25 the help of Phil, who was a contractor and I think

1 initially worked with the CRC for you -- from the
2 organization USDR. He was mainly in charge of kind of
3 like automating the ingestion of data from Statewide
4 Database on Amazon into Airtable. And he worked on
5 creating some programmatic scripts that I could run
6 manually. But every day that would just bulk upload
7 everything that people had submitted on the websites into
8 Airtable.

9 The end goal there was to have that be a fully
10 automated process that I didn't need to be involved in at
11 all. We never reached that point. I still had to
12 essentially press a couple of buttons every day to get
13 that bulk upload going.

14 For the second category of nonspatial data that we
15 received digitally, we at some point moved almost
16 entirely to using Airtable forms on the CRC website that
17 directly populated the public submission and Airtable.
18 And the more forms that were used and the more forms we
19 made available online, I think the more the public began
20 submitting through those forms as opposed to through
21 email. I think that was a big turning point for us.
22 That was the point at which we were able to essentially
23 make the Airtable, more or less, live, because the
24 majority of the input we were receiving was through these
25 forms that would automatically kind of filter into

1 Airtable.

2 The third category of letters and paper COI. Of
3 course, there's not much to do in automation there. We
4 had in office staff scanning those in bulk, usually
5 sending me a folder, which I would upload in bulk to
6 Airtable. Those pieces of data -- this data, or those
7 submissions were the hardest to process. You know, I had
8 staff essentially copy pasting the submission into
9 Airtable as much as they could, so that the commissioners
10 had like an easy way to read the text that didn't involve
11 opening the attachment. But for a lot of them,
12 especially handwritten ones, that was impossible.

13 To jump into just some thoughts I have about, I
14 guess, things that would have made the data management
15 process go more smoothly, I think something that was
16 mentioned earlier, also by Statewide Database, is just to
17 hire data staff earlier in the process.

18 When Paul and I came on board we already had kind of
19 a backlog of things to do, and the tools were already
20 largely chosen. That's Airtable and AWS. I think, like,
21 hiring data staff earlier and having that data staff be
22 involved in the actual structuring of the data management
23 process and processes would be super helpful.

24 I would even consider hiring data management staff
25 that is solely in charge in ingestion, and I guess, like,

1 data collection, data processing, and cleanup. And then
2 separately having a team in charge of analysis, because
3 our team was in charge of both, more or less, and often
4 we didn't actually have the capacity to do any meaningful
5 or useful analysis for the Commission to use. And by
6 analysis, like, you know, of course it could get really
7 complicated, but I mean even simpler things like
8 providing an overview of, you know, high-level topics
9 that are being discussed. You know, I think that's
10 something that we found hard to do with the rest of what
11 we were tasked with.

12 Yeah. A couple things I think, you know, that would
13 be helpful, if the data staff is involved very early on
14 is, one, just an understanding and fully automating the
15 ingestion process from the very beginning. We were
16 always improving things, and those improvements require
17 different levels in engineering knowledge.

18 I myself am an engineer, so it was very easy to take
19 contractor Phil's work and run it every day. I think had
20 someone on the team not had engineering knowledge, that
21 would have been close to impossible. And then that would
22 have been a huge bottleneck to actually getting
23 everything from the COI tool into their table, or
24 anywhere else.

25 I think, like, more clearly defining maybe the roles

1 of Statewide Database to line drawers to data management
2 at the very onset would have been really helpful. I
3 found that we -- we kind of toggled different
4 responsibilities that sometimes, you know, overlapped
5 with each of those teams.

6 Having like -- have, like, a data engineer on staff
7 working that were embedded with Statewide Database at the
8 very onset I think would help -- would help us architect
9 a more, like, automated ingestion process from the onset.
10 And maybe having an analyst, you know, that's on staff
11 and embedded with the line drawers would -- would allow
12 us to provide more meaningful insight.

13 And with that in mind, I think in separating those
14 two, and the Commission can think about hiring people who
15 have perhaps academic experience doing both of those
16 things, it's quite a -- it could be quite a -- like, even
17 just labeling topics that you find in the COI submissions
18 that are being discussed.

19 You know, we were doing that a bit freehand, but I
20 think someone with academic experience doing research on,
21 you know, a topic that's similar to redistricting would
22 be able to do that in a much more organized way from the
23 onset. And same with -- same with the data engineering
24 and ingestion aspects. There are people whose
25 professions, you know, are solely focused on that. And

1 so having someone responsible for that aspect entirely
2 from the onset I think would be helpful.

3 I'm reading my notes here.

4 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: If there are -- maybe I can start
5 the process of inviting questions for commissioners. As
6 a time check, we're scheduled to go to lunch in five
7 minutes. I am guessing that we might be able -- I think,
8 technically, we can go until 1:15, but that only gives a
9 15-minute lunch. So let's do this. Let's go until --
10 plan to go until 1 o'clock and -- yeah, let's go to 1
11 o'clock. Again, if I could ask commissioners to be -- to
12 be brief with their questions, that would be great, so we
13 can make sure that we get our line drawer perspective at
14 least part of this conversation.

15 Commissioner Fornaciari?

16 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: So yeah.

17 Toni, thank you so much. Thank you -- and Paul,
18 thank you for your hard work. And this is great
19 feedback. I'm hoping you're kind of capturing this,
20 like, in an outline for us, because I think some of this
21 is a little complex to just kind of digest.

22 But one of the things that I'd like, if you could,
23 you know, kind of think about and maybe give us, in a
24 narrative form somehow, is, you know, what -- what do we
25 need to hire -- you know, what skillsets need to be hired

1 ahead of time, you know, data skillsets right to work
2 with the Statewide Database, and then what can wait until
3 the next Commission maybe is seated? Because it sounds
4 like, you know, we probably need to get the data part of
5 it going sooner than certainly we were able to. So thank
6 you.

7 MS. ANTONOVA: Yeah, of course. Thank you for the
8 question. And I definitely have written kind of an
9 outline of notes that I can send and share with Alvaro,
10 and he can share it with you all.

11 I -- let me think -- essentially, at the onset, I
12 think -- I mean, it -- you know, the Statewide Database
13 and the line drawers did provide analysis and data
14 engineering to a certain capacity. So it's very possible
15 that they can take on some of these tasks themselves.

16 I'm not sure how, you know, the organizational --
17 how much the organizational structure allows for what and
18 where. But I think, for example, Phil provided data
19 engineering experience. I think having someone like him
20 on staff full time would be really helpful, with their
21 heads just focused on the data ingestion and collection
22 aspect, and building tools for that.

23 I think someone like Paul could have been also
24 focused full time essentially on figuring out ways to
25 summarize the data. You know, I think at the very

1 beginning it would have been helpful to hear from the
2 Commission, you know, what is the purpose of collecting
3 this data, you know, beyond providing public input. But
4 like, what does the Commission want to know, and you
5 know, we can start with that question and from there
6 figure out how to get those answers.

7 Something, you know, we, I think, as a team wish we
8 had more foresight to do earlier on is actually code the
9 data, which for us meant label it with different tags.
10 That's a really, like, easy way to just look on maps to
11 see what topics are being talked about in different
12 regions. But because we didn't start off doing that at
13 the onset, there's just such a huge backlog of it later
14 on, and so much work and time spent on just managing the
15 ingestion of this new wave of data that it was hard to
16 make -- to make that provide meaningful insights.

17 But if, you know, if Paul, for example, from the
18 very onset had just been focused on designing like a
19 hierarchy of labels that would provide the Commission
20 answers to their questions, I think by, you know,
21 November a lot of those questions could have potentially
22 been answered. And it -- yeah.

23 So I guess, like, that's kind of how the two
24 different responsibilities, I think kind of like
25 specialists could have been hired for. And the two teams

1 don't even necessarily need to work together. I think
2 typically -- I know typically in tech -- in tech
3 organizations and -- that those are kind of like separate
4 capacities.

5 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thank you. Toni, I know I
6 interrupted you as you were making sure that you had made
7 all of your points here, so I'll give you this
8 opportunity to say if there are any additional points you
9 want to make sure that we internalize.

10 MS. ANTONOVA: I guess -- I mean, I mentioned, you
11 know, coding. And I guess I just wanted to, like,
12 underscore the importance of that in my opinion. You
13 know, I think it -- during our processes, you know, it
14 ended up being on the Commission to largely read through
15 the data and ingest data from different regions of
16 California.

17 I really do think, at the very least, having someone
18 solely in charge of data categorization and labeling from
19 the onset, having staff doing that for every submission
20 coming in at the onset, would have provided, like, such a
21 clear view of what's going on with not too much
22 complicated work, you know, needed.

23 That's something that Paul and I started doing at
24 the end, and actually Paul has created kind of a very
25 interesting and detailed hierarchy of labels after the

1 Commission submitted the maps. And I -- yeah,
2 essentially, like, I think focusing on that piece, which
3 we really didn't at the beginning, would have -- would
4 have been really, really helpful for the Commission.

5 MR. MITCHELL: Can --

6 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Oh, sorry. Go ahead.

7 MR. MITCHELL: Yeah, sorry, Toni. I just wanted to
8 put a second underscore under what Toni was just giving
9 out, which was emphasizing, you know, basically, what is
10 this data? Because we can get it all into a, you know,
11 table and then you can see this table. But then the
12 fundamental question becomes, you know, very simply, what
13 is it? Like, is this a geographic comment? Is this a
14 social interest or an economic interest?

15 And within those three areas, more specifically, you
16 know, what is this applicable to? Is this spatial
17 comment about a contiguity issue, or a split community,
18 or something like that, et cetera? So there's lots of
19 very weedy examples that we could throw at you right now.

20 But that -- I think what, you know, we wound up
21 having here at the end was -- you know, we've got all the
22 data, and it's clean and very nicely put together, and
23 associated with attachments and spatial data, whether
24 it's COI or you know, map attachments that people assume
25 is graphics, et cetera. But the fundamental ability to

1 kind of mine the data I think is really where -- like, at
2 the very end of this, you know, we -- I think Toni and I
3 will be able to provide you with kind of a crosswalk type
4 table to try to explain what these attributes are.

5 And I think that that's something that I would
6 absolutely hand off to whoever the next, you know, data
7 analyst or data manager is coming into the job. It's
8 like, here's the kind of input you're going to receive,
9 and these are the kind of, you know, abilities and -- and
10 attributes that you can query, to then inform you, the
11 Commission, and -- and the public as to what exactly the
12 data is.

13 And Alvaro also here just pinged me something that
14 we should also mention, which was that we were running
15 the -- the map viewer, too. So this was kind of like an
16 ad hoc task that -- you know, for me it was, you know, a
17 first love, because I come from a GIS and a geographer
18 background.

19 So you know, sharing the work that the line drawers
20 were putting together, I think, is an imperative thing
21 that I would put on your list to, yeah, be something that
22 you guys -- and think it's very crucial. And there are
23 great tools now that don't necessarily require, I think,
24 a lot of very specialized people. You know, you can
25 bring the data -- spatial data into a viewer. And we're

1 updating this on a -- on a nearly daily basis through
2 December.

3 So that was another, yeah, I think very important
4 contribution that we're making, which was totally
5 different, you know, obviously than processing data.

6 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great.

7 MS. ANTONOVA: Just to -- I know we're --

8 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Can we make it a quick comment?

9 MS. ANTONOVA: Yeah. I know we're really running
10 out of time, but just a quick comment. I do think
11 though -- and I don't have an answer to how this would
12 happen, but just like collaboration between the line
13 drawers, Statewide Database, and data management staff,
14 to the point of perhaps providing a single tool would be
15 something I think that future Commissions should
16 consider.

17 The forms that we provided to the public to submit
18 their input are something that -- that essentially could
19 have merged with the COI tool and the district drawing
20 tool to be one digital place for a member of the public
21 to submit anything that they would like. We spend a lot
22 of time in the weeds trying to figure out how to handle
23 data from all of these different sources, when I think,
24 at least on the digital front, it all could have been
25 one. And I -- yeah. And that's the --

1 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great.

2 MS. ANTONOVA: -- last comment.

3 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you so much. Yeah, thanks so
4 much.

5 Commissioner Yee, did you have a quick question?

6 Great. Thanks so much. Make sure you get first in
7 line -- I'll make sure you get first in line for our line
8 drawers if you have questions.

9 Thanks so much to our data management team.
10 Appreciate it. And I know this probably will not be the
11 last time we ask for your reflections on this process.
12 So thanks again.

13 Okay. So nine minutes, we're going to do a
14 rapid-fire download from our line drawers.

15 So Andrew, Karin, and Jaime are wearing their line
16 drawer's hat. Yeah, let's -- let's jump in and we'll see
17 how far we get in nine minutes.

18 MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. Thank you so much again,
19 Chair. Jaime and I received a long list of questions
20 from Commissioner Yee. Thank you so much for sending
21 those questions over. I think we could be very efficient
22 just reading through our answers. And we can try to do
23 that in, like, five minutes.

24 So I'm just going to start with the first one, which
25 was general feedback. And I think our general feedback

1 will be that this is an -- this was an interesting, all
2 encompassing, and sometimes overwhelming process, and I
3 think that in the future, and as happened in the past,
4 anybody who takes on this job just really needs to
5 understand that that's going to be their life. And if
6 they have a lot of other clients hanging around on the
7 periphery, something is going to have to give, because,
8 essentially, I think, California redistricting, you have
9 to live it as a consultant, because it's just really --
10 it's all encompassing.

11 I think the CRC needs to understand that if you want
12 a certain level of service, you need to be able to pay
13 for it, and really put that into the budget. One of the
14 strengths of the '21 RFP, as compared to the one 2011 was
15 that it was focused on more than just the lowest cost.
16 And I think that may be more important even in '31 to
17 consider that so that you get somebody you really want to
18 work with, or the next Commission will. And you probably
19 should build in some assumptions into the contract that
20 you ask for additional deliverables, even though you may
21 not know what they are by the time you're, you know,
22 drafting the RFP. And with that, over to Jaime.

23 MS. CLARK: The next question was around whether
24 three rounds of visualization was the right number, or if
25 there should have been fewer or could have been fewer.

1 One idea is perhaps to start on the visualization process
2 after the census data is released but before the official
3 redistricting data set from Statewide Database is
4 released.

5 Although, of course the Commission -- everybody
6 would understand the data wouldn't necessarily be -- it
7 wouldn't be the final data, and it might necessarily be
8 accurate, depending on where incarcerated people are
9 assigned in that initial data set that's released by the
10 census. The Commission could get a sense of how many
11 people live where, especially in around the
12 visualizations that might include things like just
13 understanding how many people are in different
14 communities as opposed to try to draw district-sized
15 visualizations.

16 It would also give the commissioners a chance to
17 kind of get comfortable with how population is
18 distributed throughout the state without kind of eating
19 into their main -- to your main line drawing time, could
20 potentially give you enough -- or give the next
21 Commission enough wiggle room to do a second set of draft
22 maps, if that's the wish of that Commission.

23 MS. MAC DONALD: The next question was about whether
24 direction for visualization revisions could have been
25 given more clearly. And we think maybe better consensus

1 early on about the purpose of each round of
2 visualizations would have been helpful. Like, for
3 example, this week we want to get the sense of how big
4 the COIs are, and next week we want to start dividing the
5 state into regions, and so forth.

6 Also, perhaps having some Commission discussion and
7 consensus on visualization requests when there's
8 obviously contradictory directions. Like, for example,
9 one person will say, I want to see phase A and B
10 together, and the next persons says, I want to see B and
11 C together, but all of this cannot be accomplished. So
12 yeah.

13 So line drawers become better at identifying those
14 as they come in -- or later in the process, once they've
15 drawn the areas over and over, of course. But anyway,
16 next. Back to you, Jaime.

17 MS. CLARK: Okay. The next question was around
18 mapper work load and how to avoid sort of extreme mapper
19 work load. An idea would be to make sure there's really
20 a clear sense of direction and consensus from the
21 Commission on what is to be done or certain goals before
22 line drawing even begins. That would allow for more
23 efficient use of line drawing time.

24 For example, some of the discussion or decisions
25 around section 2 were sort of late to be implemented in

1 terms of where section 2 districts were, how section 2
2 districts were to be implemented. And you know, even
3 just thinking about LA County, sort of like what the
4 overall shape of the districts would be, or overall goals
5 of the Commission. That was -- sort of ended up being
6 more clear later, and identifying that ahead of line
7 drawing would have been, I think, a big timesaver, and
8 probably a workload saver as well.

9 MS. MAC DONALD: The next question was about
10 generating PDFs and how that -- how that seemed to be a
11 lot of work for not a lot of benefits. And we agree
12 wholeheartedly. And we're hoping that there will be
13 better technology available in 2031 -- oh, my gosh, in
14 2031. Though, you know, one always has to obviously be
15 aware of options to avoid the digital divide.

16 MS. CLARK: And next was around mappers working with
17 Commissioners offline to develop ideas being very
18 helpful. We're glad that was helpful for you. How to
19 make such offline work more accessible to commissioners
20 and more efficient.

21 We think that building that process -- or building
22 that concept of, you know, small groups, like one
23 commissioner or one or two commissioners working offline
24 with mappers, sort of building that in as an assumption
25 rather than something that evolves over time. And then

1 that will allow issues -- or you know, decision points
2 even to sort of be surfaced in advance -- basically, to
3 be thought through in advance or -- and for individual
4 commissioners also that understand certain, for example,
5 population constraints in advance.

6 MS. MAC DONALD: Next question is about how the
7 mapping phase might have been different if you'd required
8 all the commissioners to learn and use GIS -- QGIS. And
9 we assume that the technology is going to be even more
10 friendly in the future and barriers are going to be
11 lower. But having said that, I really doubt that every
12 commissioner is going to want to learn QGIS. I think
13 it's asking a lot. And you're already being asked for a
14 lot. And you know, that will be an additional skill, I
15 guess, that you would have to incorporate in Commission
16 selection processes.

17 It would be helpful toward the end, I think, to be
18 able to do a little bit of GIS when you're trying to
19 identify some specific solutions to some of the
20 tradeoffs. And the risk, of course, is if you have QGIS
21 or something available to everybody in the beginning,
22 that everybody has, like, their perfect map, and then
23 you're starting to defend your own map. And we,
24 honestly, on the line drawing, we've all been there.

25 So it's like you have a map, it's the perfect

1 solution, and then you start to defend your map, rather
2 than, you know, maybe being openminded and -- and
3 actually working with everybody else on a solution.

4 MS. CLARK: Next question is should the Commission
5 have taken a week early in the process to run a full,
6 hands-on practice mapping exercise. Pardon me. Sure.
7 Our answer was, sure. We did do that one back in
8 training pretty early on, but certainly, you know, more
9 time could have been spent preparing for line drawing
10 during those initial couple months rather -- yeah, I
11 think, sure.

12 MS. MAC DONALD: And the next one was, is there a
13 better -- more clear and consistent approach to naming
14 the draft districts, maybe counties and letters. And
15 that will be -- our answer is that it depends on whether
16 you think it's important to have some record of the
17 evolution of the district over time, or whether the
18 simplicity of naming it is more important.

19 You'd also need to ensure that any system doesn't
20 bias Senate numbering or the (indiscernible). So that
21 needs to be kept in mind. And also that a district that
22 starts with county and then a letter may not end up as a
23 district that is even touching that particular county.
24 So just a little FYI.

25 MS. CLARK: And the next question was around clarity

1 up front, around what non-census data the mappers had
2 available. For example, the submitted COIs. We did all
3 have all of the COIs in our areas loaded onto the map and
4 could have pulled those up at any time per Commission
5 request.

6 So -- and also having the COIs delivered to us in
7 GIS layer. GIS format was a huge step forward for the
8 individual mappers versus 2011. And certainly figuring
9 out how to make that data as useful as possible for
10 discussion for commissioners, I think, would also really
11 be part of sort of that evolution for 2031.

12 I think some of -- some of these questions also
13 could have been probably flushed out with the line drawer
14 subcommittee and communicated to the whole Commission
15 that way also.

16 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Team, I'm --it's 1:01. I
17 also have to step away shortly, so I -- I need to go to
18 lunch. What do we want to do? We can, technically, go
19 until 1:15. That gives us a 15-minute lunch. So how do
20 we -- how do we want to -- yeah, Commissioner Sinay?

21 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I was just curious to hear from
22 Andrew, since I don't think he wants to come back on the
23 back side.

24 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yeah. But I just want to know what
25 folks want to do, because I need to step away. Do we

1 want another 15 minutes, or are you -- is everyone okay
2 doing a 15-minute lunch? Okay. With that, I need to
3 hand this over to my Vice Chair.

4 Thanks, Phil.

5 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Thanks. Okay. Yeah,
6 did -- are the -- carry on with -- do you have more
7 questions to answer?

8 MS. MAC DONALD: Yes, we have a few more. Thank you
9 so much.

10 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

11 MS. MAC DONALD: And then we can hand it off.

12 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

13 MS. MAC DONALD: So the next one is -- and thank you
14 again to Commissioner Yee for this very thorough list of
15 questions.

16 So how about having further data visualizations, for
17 example, ACS, and income data, and so forth. So
18 reasonable people can disagree on more visualizations.
19 We heard you about, you know, maybe these visualizations,
20 there were too many of them. Honestly, the ACS data are
21 going to tell us less and less because of privacy issues,
22 and the data don't necessarily inform the criteria.

23 We could perhaps, you know -- or you could perhaps
24 look into types of informative maps for areas with little
25 public input. But you know, generally speaking, you have

1 to just be clear that you're looking at estimate data and
2 want to make sure that estimate data that are nongranular
3 and range data, that they don't speak over the public
4 testimony of a, you know, neighborhood group or community
5 group, because there may be some tension, and you know,
6 the data may not correspond.

7 Next. Over to you, Jaime.

8 MS. CLARK: The next question was around adding
9 printed large scale wall maps of drafts and final maps to
10 the contract. And is probably apparent to everybody, the
11 redistricting software is not built for this purpose.
12 It -- the features in it -- you know, it's a lot more
13 difficult than other software to create maps that are
14 really pretty, legible, easy to understand.

15 So if you wanted to add that into the contract, then
16 certainly, and who know where redistricting software is
17 going to be in ten years, but I think, you know, with the
18 caveat that the maps might not be beautiful.

19 MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. And then the final question
20 was, does it make sense to add post maps consulting to
21 help the counties with the parcel splits into the CRC
22 line drawer contract, or should this be left to the
23 secretary of state. When we think that that would be a
24 very important piece, actually, to add as an optional
25 thing in case it comes up. Hopefully the census

1 geography will continue to improve, so it's not
2 necessary. But I think the CRC could either do it
3 yourself with your data management team, I don't know, or
4 you need to be very explicit to seating that
5 responsibility to someone else and then really getting
6 somebody to take that on. Just to clarify that SOS is
7 actually not responsible for that particular piece. I
8 think they're responsible for some other pieces.

9 But also, anyone within the state bureaucracy is
10 going to be pretty hesitant to look like they are
11 modifying the CRC's adopted lines or to, in any way,
12 interpret them. So I think that would be best left to
13 the CRC. And that's what Jaime and I have and yeah,
14 please, go ahead.

15 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thank you.

16 Andrew?

17 MR. DRECHSLER: Hi, thank you, commissioners.

18 Thank you, Vice-Chair.

19 Just a couple of additional comments on, you know,
20 just was thinking about thoughts and observations. Going
21 back to Toni, I really want to heap a lot of praise onto
22 her for everything that she did from the time she started
23 to the time she got a lot, a lot, a lot of data up and
24 running. It was a huge task and just going -- in talking
25 about that just for a little bit, having her or that

1 position hired earlier on, I think would have been
2 beneficial to the overall project.

3 She and Paul and the rest of the team did a great
4 job getting all that data up and running. And map
5 viewer. I think map viewer was very beneficial for the
6 commissioners, for the public, for everybody involved in
7 the process to be able to go in, click on the map, and go
8 look at the previous lines, the current lines. So that
9 that was something that was very beneficial to the
10 overall process.

11 And Airtable. Airtable, I think, provided a great
12 benefit to the Commission, was able to be able to
13 categorize, look up data quickly. I think technology's
14 only going to get better in the next ten years. So
15 something having the next Airtable, whether it is
16 Airtable or the next version of Airtable, I think will be
17 beneficial. Because I think that was something that
18 would move that up on the timeline as well.

19 I know the data subcommittee had worked on that and
20 looked at different options. But even if you could move
21 that up sooner, I think that would be beneficial for
22 everybody involved. So those were -- and one last
23 comment I thought -- or just observation was making the
24 Native American reservations as a COI. I think you, at
25 one point, gave us direction across the board to treat

1 those as COIs and try to not split them where possible
2 was helpful. And we paid close attention to that. I
3 know in the southern part of the state, specifically
4 where a vast majority of them are, that was helpful in
5 giving us that direction early on in knowing not to do
6 that. So that was helpful. Yeah. And with that, I
7 mean, we're into your lunch. So if you have any
8 questions available to answer them.

9 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thank you.

10 Thank you all for that.

11 Let's see, so we do have a few minutes. I'm going
12 to, being the generous chair I am, we're actually going
13 to take a half hour for lunch and come back at 1:45 so.
14 You know me, nothing but generosity in the chair seat.

15 So with that, let's go ahead and ask any questions,
16 if you have any follow-ups for our line drawing team?
17 And I hope it's okay that we're keeping you all late,
18 too, so sorry about that.

19 Commissioner Sinay and then Andersen.

20 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm kind of still on the fence
21 on commissioners working one-on-one with the line
22 drawers, just because on the one hand, it is more
23 efficient and effective. But on the other hand, is that
24 working outside of the public eye.

25 And I know you mentioned it a little bit, but not

1 necessarily with that kind of lens of how -- anyway. If
2 I could hear from all three of you, because I know each
3 of you probably have a different perspective on how that
4 worked.

5 MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. I'm happy to start with
6 that.

7 Thank you so much, Commissioner Sinay. It's nice to
8 see you. And thanks for that question.

9 I think absolutely it's efficient. And I think that
10 as long as you keep things transparent in terms of coming
11 back and then reporting fully to the entire Commission
12 what just happened, we tried something out, this does not
13 work and here is why, I think that particular piece can
14 be integrated very effectively, perhaps, into the overall
15 process.

16 I just think it's that eye on transparency and
17 reporting back to everybody to bring everybody up to
18 speed. And so to make sure that everybody's on the same
19 page.

20 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Jaime?

21 MS. CLARK: Yeah. Thank you.

22 And if I can just piggyback off of that, I think
23 it's also really helpful just from like a being a mapper,
24 right, like a mapper perspective to then also be able to
25 have individual commissioners come back to the full

1 Commission. And when there's a question like, well, how
2 come you did it like that? Why didn't you try these two
3 cities or moving the line here, then the commissioner can
4 sort of say, we did look at that, and this is the reason
5 why for the population it didn't work, or this other COI
6 ended up getting split, or whatever the reason would be
7 can be really helpful just as a mapper who's also a human
8 trying to remember a bunch of stuff, remember a bunch of
9 moves you tried to make. Having somebody else to help
10 keep track for you.

11 But also I think it can help to -- yeah, I don't
12 know. I think it can just sort of help in terms of
13 building trust amongst commissioners with the public to
14 commissioners. And yeah, we also really appreciate, I
15 guess, all of those interactions too. Just wanted to say
16 that as well.

17 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thanks, Jaime.

18 Andrew?

19 MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. I really agree with Jaime and
20 Karin, everything they said. And I think there are some
21 nuances that I think when the mappers were working one-
22 on-one with the commissioners I think helped overcome
23 some of those nuances. But emphasizing the need for
24 transparency, coming out of those sessions talking about
25 what was done and why it was done, I think is, of course,

1 very important.

2 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

3 Commissioner Andersen, just have a couple of minutes
4 left. So --

5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah.

6 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: -- go ahead.

7 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Just a couple
8 idea -- I'd like to, again, everyone sort of put their
9 comments in. We heard from, I don't know if you guys
10 were on to hear this, but Toni sort of mentioned moving
11 ahead, the idea of forward, 2030, trying to get this
12 involved with the data management system, the Statewide
13 Database, and also line drawing ahead of where it was
14 before.

15 And with that in mind, they actually mentioned about
16 one, how long do you think that should happen ahead of
17 time with developing tools also then in terms of working
18 with the line drawer. And in the embedded, she actually
19 mentioned about like having from the CRC, like a data
20 engineer quote embedded with the Statewide Database in
21 terms of getting the access flowing back and forth to the
22 Statewide Database.

23 And then a data analyst kind of quote embedded with
24 the line drawers who are actually like, yeah, we need
25 this, this, this, and this what don't have. Could you

1 guys kind of comment on that idea, the pros and cons?

2 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: So we don't have the
3 Statewide Database with us right now. We have
4 (indiscernible) with us right now. But we can get --

5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: True.

6 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: -- that question to the
7 Statewide Database and get some feedback on that. We
8 have --

9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay.

10 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: -- I mean, we have to be
11 crystal clear on this --

12 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah.

13 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: -- right? They're not --

14 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: They --

15 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: -- representing the
16 Statewide Database right now.

17 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: True. And that's -- yeah.
18 But so for the line drawer, then, straight line drawer --

19 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Straight, yeah.

20 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- let me modify my
21 question, in --

22 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah, no, I think the
23 question's clear from what the lines drawer part of it
24 is, Jane.

25 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

1 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Or Commissioner Andersen.

2 Okay.

3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, okay. The reason I'm
4 saying this is because we have the benefit of both, a
5 little connection with Statewide Data and line drawing.
6 And I don't think -- I mean, there's a chance of that not
7 happening in the future.

8 And in terms of writing a proposal for a straight
9 line drawer, one of the things you think, wow, they
10 really need to know ahead of time, because otherwise the
11 CRC could be really out of luck. So I would think the
12 embed question --

13 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Okay. Well, we'll go
14 in reverse order.

15 I'll start with Andrew this time.

16 MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. I'll publicly say that I
17 think more collaboration between all sides, data, the
18 tools, and the mapper, I think makes sense. I think more
19 collaboration is always better so. Whether or not that
20 that person is embedded or not, that's a question, I
21 think, for the Statewide Database.

22 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Jaime?

23 MS. CLARK: I hope I'm understanding the question
24 correctly. And in terms of analyzing the data, I
25 believe, Commissioner Andersen, you said having a data

1 analyst embedded with the line drawers. I guess the
2 question is sort of like what exactly did you want to be
3 analyzed? Is that about grouping the data? Is it about
4 finding sort of holes in the data? I think that a lot of
5 that could potentially be accomplished with, again, sort
6 of like using the map viewer. Maybe having a map viewer
7 that instead of points had area so then there's more --
8 you can like see exactly where there's overlap and where
9 there's not overlap.

10 And then it also kind of brings up this question the
11 Commission maybe is dealing with around how do you
12 balance the basically having like a form that's sent in
13 with the same comment over and over and over again versus
14 a single comment from one person who might not have
15 capacity or their community doesn't have a ton of like
16 advocacy infrastructure built in.

17 So I think that the collaboration that we did have
18 with the data management team was successful. Definitely
19 the data management team was awesome, had a mammoth task
20 and did it very well.

21 And yeah, aside from that, I'm not sure that I
22 necessarily understand the question, but that is my
23 response.

24 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: So we are overtime on our
25 break.

1 So Karin, if you could just be super brief, that
2 would be awesome. I expect that we will have more
3 opportunity to interact with our state -- our line
4 drawing team, sorry, and the Statewide Database too.

5 MS. MAC DONALD: So thank you.

6 And Jaime answered for both of us. And just wanted
7 to say that Toni and Paul were heaven-sent, and we really
8 appreciated working with them. And Toni, I just, if that
9 wasn't clear before, let it be clear now, you guys were
10 great. It's very difficult, I think, for a data
11 management team to come in; they don't usually know
12 anything about redistricting. So for the line drawers,
13 they need to bring the data management team up to speed
14 on what is needed. And basically just getting that data
15 management team in early, making sure that the roles are
16 clearly defined, making sure there's good communication
17 and plenty of opportunity for communication is going to
18 just make this whole thing run even smoother than it did.

19 And again, Toni and Paul, thumbs way up. You guys
20 came in and you had an incredible amount of work. And we
21 really appreciate you. So thanks for coming up to speed
22 so quickly.

23 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Well, thank you all for all
24 your hard work and your team. Thank the team for us. We
25 thank you for being here. Sorry to cut this off, but we

1 are late for our break.

2 And so we'll be back, we'll take lunch, take a half
3 hour for lunch, and we'll be back at 1:49. Take care.

4 (Whereupon, a recess was held from 1:18 p.m.
5 until 1:50 p.m.)

6 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Welcome back, California.
7 Thank you for joining us. We are into our afternoon
8 session -- after lunch session recapping next steps.

9 We have a special guest, a 2010 Commissioner Ancheta
10 has joined us to give us some of his -- well, I think I'm
11 stealing Ray's thunder -- or Commissioner Kennedy's
12 thunder. I'll turn it over to him.

13 Sorry about that.

14 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: That's all right,
15 Commissioner Fornaciari.

16 Yes, we're very fortunate to have with us
17 Commissioner Angelo Ancheta from the 2010 California
18 Citizens Redistricting Commission.

19 Commissioner Ancheta had responded quite quickly to
20 my initial invitation. Unfortunately, we were in the
21 midst of the email switchover, and his timely reply to me
22 ended up in our junk mail box that I didn't find for a
23 couple of weeks.

24 So we unfortunately weren't able to make
25 arrangements to have him with us earlier in this lessons

1 learned process. But he's been gracious enough to join
2 us today.

3 We've asked him to kind of focus his remarks on the
4 differences that he sees between the 2010 process, the
5 2020 process, and how lessons learned from both might
6 benefit the 2030 Commission.

7 But I've asked him to feel free to address any other
8 issues. We shared with him the list of topic prompts
9 that we had prepared for the lessons learned discussion.
10 So I am happy to turn it over to him.

11 Commissioner Ancheta.

12 MR. ANCHETA: Well, good afternoon. Thank you for
13 inviting me. So a belated congratulations on completing
14 the map. I haven't had a chance to talk to anybody from
15 the Commission or the staff since doing the map, so great
16 work.

17 And I think it's also great that you're going
18 through those lessons learned process. We did various
19 things on Commission (indiscernible) sort of postmortem
20 analyzes, developing legislation. But we didn't really
21 go into it as thoroughly as you have been doing, sort of
22 looking at ways to help the next Commission.

23 We did do a set of surveys and produced a
24 compilation of recommendation, but was not quite as
25 structured as well as you're doing it. I think it's

1 great that you're (indiscernible) process.

2 So just a couple of disclosures. So I'm also
3 speaking as a former commissioner. Some of you may know,
4 I was sort of helping with the Commission as the last
5 chair of the 2010 Commission.

6 But starting in May of last year, I was working with
7 (indiscernible) census and redistribution of the -- as a
8 legal advisor. So I kind of went radio silent at that
9 point, more of a background person helping that coalition
10 so.

11 Today that representation is (indiscernible). So
12 today I'm just sort of speaking on my own. And I'm not
13 trying to represent all the former commissioners, but
14 wanted to sort of give you a flavor and some sense of
15 what I've been watching.

16 And I do have a pretty good background in terms of
17 what you did between the line drawing process. And I've
18 been paying attention to some of the lessons learned
19 discussions. So I'm pretty much up on a lot of the
20 stuff. But I'm certainly not saying that I know
21 everything that's going on or has been going.

22 So what I wanted to do is just sort of quickly just
23 remind folks of what happened in 2010, just over a
24 calendar. You're going through a multi-track process it
25 seems like now where you looking at both legislation,

1 lessons learned, things to sort of put together for the
2 next Commission.

3 So one thing I would just suggest upfront is that
4 you not try to rush any legislative stuff through. You
5 do have a spot fill that's available to you. That's
6 great to have because it moves legislation fairly
7 quickly.

8 But particularly if you're still sort of working
9 through some of the priorities and trying to find out
10 which ones are the ones you really want to get behind,
11 and especially if you're looking for Constitutional
12 (indiscernible) which are a whole other animal, I don't
13 think you need to rush it. I wouldn't worry that you
14 happen to have a spot (indiscernible). You can certainly
15 work it through. And you certainly want to work with
16 some of your potential supporters and you want to check
17 with the auditor's office in terms of their scheduling in
18 those (indiscernible).

19 So again, sort of a reminder, I'm not trying to
20 replicate what's available in the League of Women Voters'
21 report from 2013 or those recommendations that the
22 Commission put together, this sort of frame where we were
23 in terms of the work we did. And I think it seems to be
24 interesting because the question seems to keep coming up
25 is, how did you guys do it in less than seven months? I

1 think that's a kind of -- how in the world did you do it?

2 And the short answer to that is, well, we did it
3 because we didn't have a choice, right? Those are the
4 (indiscernible), right?

5 So when you work with that set of deadlines, you try
6 to figure out what can we actually accomplish in this
7 very tight period, and you try to scale appropriately.

8 Now, that doesn't mean we didn't make a lot of
9 mistakes or that we didn't, at least initially, be
10 overambitious. We set a lot of really wild goals upfront
11 because we didn't know what we were doing a lot of the
12 time, because we were setting up the Commission for the
13 first time. We didn't know how much input we were going
14 to get. We knew we had to finish some maps.

15 And we decided to do some draft maps in the interim
16 so. And at the time, that wasn't actually in the
17 statute. So you didn't have to draw a draft map.

18 So the calendar is pretty tight and we set up the
19 infrastructure and the hiring in January. The full
20 Commission was seated at beginning of January.

21 The ED, the executive director, actually happened
22 the RFP -- not the RFP, but the job announcement had
23 actually been out earlier by the Secretary of State's
24 Office. Secretary of State was dealing with the
25 transition, not the (indiscernible) case.

1 And things moved pretty briskly in terms of hiring,
2 establishment of committees, various kinds of structures
3 (indiscernible) place.

4 And as you're well aware, lots of different
5 (indiscernible) contract getting things started. So
6 that's not something unique to any one commission.
7 They're all going to be dealing with that start up
8 problem.

9 And really a lot of rookies. You're talking about
10 state government, right? I think Commissioner Fernandez
11 has been with the state government for a while; that
12 helps a lot. None of us had a lot of experience with
13 state government. We did have a lot of experience with
14 federal and local.

15 So if you look at the calendar, we set up input
16 hearings. Census data came out in March. Very ambitious
17 set of hearing, well over twenty hearings initially.

18 If you look at some of the transcripts, crazy
19 numbers we put out initially. Eighty hearing was
20 actually broached as a target, one for each assembly
21 District. Obviously not a feasible process.

22 But we put in quite a bit of time and quite a bit of
23 effort to have them spread across the state. Now, that's
24 obviously a big difference given the COVID constraints,
25 if you've dealt with that, you weren't able to go out and

1 actually meet people. And that's a lot of fun. That's
2 really one of the big fun parts of the job is going to
3 places and traveling and actually meeting.

4 So part of what you have to figure out is, well, how
5 is the next Commission going to process all of that in
6 terms of live meetings, in-person meetings, and hybrid
7 meetings, okay?

8 So we did contracting for the VRA attorney, the VRA
9 consultant. We saved a little bit of time because we use
10 an interagency agreement for the RFP, or rather the RPV
11 analysis. We had Dr. Barreto, who was at the time at
12 University of Washington (indiscernible). So we saved a
13 little bit of time there in terms of contracting.

14 We made the mistake, in my opinion, of releasing a
15 first draft map without sufficient RPV analysis. And we
16 got called on it. That's something no Commission should
17 do. All right. Don't release a draft without getting
18 the VRA districts together.

19 And then we proceeded to, at that point, to try to
20 get a second draft going at some point in July. We
21 didn't get to that point, but there was actually a second
22 draft. But we did put together a lot of visualization.
23 So there was an iterative process similar to what you
24 did.

25 And we had to finish our map basically by July 31st,

1 since we had a 14-day posting (indiscernible). So it is
2 around six months after terms of finishing the map and
3 then getting the report to them.

4 We had extra requirements. We had pre-clearance
5 requirements under the VRA. So we had to submit the maps
6 and the report to the DOJ. And that was ultimately
7 certified January of the following year.

8 We were sued multiple times. There were two
9 lawsuits in state court going to the maps themselves.
10 One in federal court. One lawsuit dealt with the
11 referendum, use of the Senate maps. All of those were
12 dismissed.

13 And then there was a referendum in 2012, which was
14 approved by about seventy percent with twenty-eight,
15 twenty-nine percent (indiscernible). So that's the
16 completion of a map in a nut shell.

17 Now, we did go through a process of analyzing
18 inflation(indiscernible). We had a bit more time after
19 certification to work that through. So you're actually
20 pretty far ahead of us in terms of thinking about
21 legislation, which is why I would suggest maybe slowing
22 down a bit and thinking about the package that you want
23 to produce for the legislature.

24 We did started doing postmortem analyses. And at
25 some point, you just come to the realization that you're

1 downsizing, right? And that's a big part of what you
2 have to figure out over the next few months is, well,
3 what are we going to do over the rest of the term, and
4 what can we do realistically in terms of actual
5 activities and staff (indiscernible). So it's a lot to
6 work through.

7 One of the things that happened, I think it's been
8 mentioned before, is we had a catastrophic website crash
9 in 2014. And I've been trying to re-create a lot of
10 stuff from my old emails and from old documents in terms
11 of figuring out what we did. Of course, memory is -- my
12 memory doesn't work very well at this point, going back
13 that far. And there's some things there, and there's
14 quite a bit that we lost so that's a big problem.
15 Because, other than the fact that that we severely
16 downsized, went to a much lower budget, there's not a lot
17 of activities that are sort of -- you can track very
18 easily. Particularly in 2013 and 2014.

19 You know, there was -- there was some litigation
20 that we got involved in. There was a challenge to the
21 Arizona Commission structure. We got involved in that
22 Commission. That went to the Supreme Court. There was
23 another rather frivolous lawsuit we dealt with later in
24 the term that kind of went away pretty quickly. We had a
25 barebones staff. We had one, there less than a 1.0 FTE,

1 which one of the staff that worked with us in 2011 stayed
2 in that position for quite a while. She left in 20 --
3 end of 2018. And we had two retired annuitants come in.
4 And I think they were part of your transitions, Patrick
5 McGuire (ph.) and Cynthia Dai were helping the
6 Commissions.

7 And that's sort of the formal work. The only thing
8 that sort of picked up later was the work with the
9 auditor's office in terms of transitioning, you know,
10 getting folks to apply for the next Commission.

11 Now, the big extracurricular activity was something
12 we were able to -- we were able to do because of the
13 funding we got from the Ash Center at Harvard -- Kennedy
14 School at Harvard. And I list that as extracurricular
15 because that was not something that we had planned on
16 getting. We were able to get the award from Ash Center
17 largely through serendipity. I think, Gil Ontai, one of
18 the commissioners, had happened on a competition that the
19 Ash Center was sponsoring, and we went through a process
20 of applying, and we won. We won the competition.

21 So that activity, which was focused on out-of-state,
22 you know, promotion of the Commission model was from
23 basically 2017 through 2020. And ultimately it
24 transferred that out to Cynthia Dai's consulting firm.
25 So that's why it should be on the books anymore for the

1 state operations. But again, in extracurricular
2 activity, not -- not official Commission activity.
3 Not -- not all of us participated in some of that work.

4 So that's sort of the overall calendar over ten
5 years. We did have a stable chair for a couple of years.
6 Stan Forbes was a chair for a while because he's based in
7 the Sacramento area, and it was easier for a Sacramento
8 person to interact with the staff and, you know, sign off
9 on documents. But we did go to a rotational system, I
10 think in about 2017 or so, just to kind of take the
11 burden off of Stan and to allow him to participate in the
12 (indiscernible) grant. But you know, most of those years
13 were pretty dormant. We met maybe twice a year. And
14 there were periods where we didn't have any -- or we
15 voluntarily didn't take our per diems because we wanted
16 to save money. Some of our budget went up a bit,
17 midterm, so we were able to actually command some per
18 diem dollars.

19 But one think you sort have to figure out -- and if
20 you're able to get more money, that's great, but if
21 you're -thinking, what are you going to do over the next
22 four years, you have to make some serious decisions about
23 what -- what you're going to get for your budget and what
24 can and cannot. If a lot of you are really willing and
25 able to do it voluntarily, you can do quite a bit. But

1 you may not have a staff that's going to support you
2 because you won't have the money.

3 So you got to figure out, well, what -- what can we
4 do -- we're not going to have as much money in the next
5 couple of years. So you know, there's an unfortunate
6 reality, which is that for about a year or so you -- you
7 were among the most powerful people in California, right.
8 If you think about it, you -- you drew the lines for the
9 Congressional delegation and the State Legislature and
10 the Board of Equalization. And you had tons of money.
11 And you had everybody paying attention to everything you
12 ever said, okay. That has ended, right. You are no
13 longer the most powerful people in California. You were,
14 for a while. And that's going to be reflected in less
15 attention to your work, less dollars. That's just a
16 reality. How bad it gets, how precipitous the drop will
17 be is something you may have a little bit of control
18 over. But that's what happened, right. And it, you
19 know, having been a commissioner, it's a life-changing
20 experience. It was for me. A lot of the commissioners
21 will tell you that. But it's a very different experience
22 in years, you know, years two through nine, right. And
23 you have to figure out what -- what do we actually want
24 to do.

25 So a couple points. I think you have to kind of --

1 part of the job you have to figure out is what's normal
2 for a Commission, right. Because the 2010 Commission had
3 a much shorter timeline. Your Commission, it's hard to
4 figure out what's actually normal. Because you have
5 COVID constraints, deadline differences, a lot of -- lot
6 of great innovation, you know that may or may not be
7 adopted by the next Commission. Certainly a lot of, you
8 know, really pioneering work around, prisoner work,
9 working with prisoner inputs. Lot of great outreach.
10 Great accessibility work, you know, lots of different
11 languages being put forward. But you know, wild
12 timeline, shifting timeline.

13 So you know, I think you talked about different --
14 different starting dates and extending the -- the final
15 deadline for the maps. Obviously a lot of tough
16 questions. Particularly because they -- several of them
17 involve constitutional amendment. So that's a tough
18 political call. And it may not be appropriate for you as
19 commissioners, or as a Commission, to play a lead on
20 that. Some of you -- you're certainly the lead on
21 legislation, but you're not necessarily the lead on
22 constitution amendments, so you've got to figure out who
23 your allies are. What's a possible coalition. What do
24 you want to try to get forward.

25 Now, it's perfectly okay if you're sort of putting

1 out principles and putting out, you know, a wish list, an
2 ideal set of, you know, statutes or constraints on the
3 Commission, opportunities for the Commission, but you
4 have to make some political choices in terms of your
5 legislation. And I think it sounds like you're doing
6 some regulatory work, too, which is a little bit easier
7 to legislate than trying to do it on your own. Or at
8 least from the auditor's office.

9 So there's a lot of stuff you can -- you can think
10 through, but the hard thing, I think for you to figure
11 out is what -- what can we give to the next Commission
12 without putting our -- too much of our mark on the next
13 Commission, right. And that -- that's a dilemma that
14 every Commission has. We try to stay back and say, well,
15 if they want our help or if they want us to make us
16 suggestions, we'll, you know, we have a lot of Lessons
17 Learned from last time. But we'll let them figure it out
18 for themselves, and if they want our help, they'll call
19 us, right.

20 I think a lot of us know, you call us more than you
21 actually did. But that's your choice. You can make
22 those kinds of choices. And the next Commission has to
23 do the same thing, right. So as you're kind of creating
24 through and thinking through what you want to leave them
25 and what you -- what sort of mark you want to leave as --

1 for your cycle, that's a -- that's always a tough set of
2 questions. What do you actually want them to have
3 that'll make their job better and easier. But at the
4 same time, leave them some discretion to, you know, find
5 their own path. Find their own -- or to be their own
6 Commission. And I think that's a -- that a tricky
7 balance.

8 Oh, one point as I was thinking about this in terms
9 of your timeline. So there's a -- there's an adage that
10 pops up in Studies of Public Administration and
11 Bureaucracy. And it's called Parkinson's Law. I don't
12 know if anyone's heard that one, but this is sort of the
13 phrasing of Parkinson's law. So, "Work expands so as to
14 fill the time available for its completion." "Work
15 expands so as to fill the time available for its
16 completion." So there's a lot in there. So if you're
17 thinking about, well, let's give the next Commission a
18 year or a year and half, think about what it -- what does
19 it actually need in terms of giving them that much time.
20 Are they going to be as efficient as they need to be?
21 Will they try to do things that they're not really --
22 that are not necessary? How much of that is what you
23 wanted to do but you weren't able to do? All right, so
24 there are a lot of tough questions. But I think that's
25 an important one to think through as you working on, you

1 know, what time should we give. How much extra time do
2 we think they need.

3 You know, we made a calculation back in 2012 to say
4 well, we think four and a half months is good, four and a
5 half more months and we -- I think you can -- you can
6 certainly argue for more, but is that -- how much more?
7 Is a year and half -- is that too much. I would suggest
8 maybe a year and a half to two. All right, if you go
9 into 2019, notwithstanding the constitutional impact
10 that -- that may be too much time. You may not get the
11 most efficient work out of that Commission, if you give
12 them too much time, but you can certainly argue for three
13 months, even up to six months without too much problem,
14 if you don't up the budget, right. One of the issues you
15 have figure out, well, if we're saying they're going to
16 get some extra time, how much more money does that
17 entail. Because I don't know that the -- the legislature
18 is going to be very cooperative if you try to raise your
19 budget to accommodate that extra time. So that's just
20 something to think about as well.

21 And, you know, you had some discussion this morning
22 about your budget. You got to be careful about your, you
23 know, fiscal oversight, there have been some holes in it,
24 right, over the last year or so. And you've got to get
25 that, you know, figured out because you're not in a

1 strong political position. And you're not setting up the
2 next Commission very well if you can't say with
3 confidence, this is how much it costs to do it this -- a
4 cycle. So I'd really urge you to make sure that you got
5 everything kind of figured out as -- as you're going
6 forward in that area.

7 That's about it. And I'm happy to take a lot of
8 questions or go through some discussion.

9 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you so much. And
10 Chair, I'm going to rely on you to facilitate the
11 discussion because I've got just a telephone screen I'm
12 working off of.

13 VICE--CHAIR FORNACIARI: Very good, thank you. And
14 Commissioner Andersen has a question.

15 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, thanks for coming,
16 Commissioner Ancheta. We really appreciate it. I just
17 have a really quick question. About the budget, how did
18 our, the 2020 budget come around? Was it -- did they
19 just say, okay, this is what 2010 actually needed and
20 then bump it up for money, or what actually happened
21 there? Thank you.

22 MR. ANCHETA: Yeah, that was pretty much it. Now,
23 we had some say because it, again, straddled the
24 Commissions. So we were the ones who actually had to
25 formally put in the budget request. But, you know, it's

1 a negotiation process. But, you know, the legislature
2 and the government obviously have more power than you do.
3 They set the budget. That's -- that's what you get. So
4 they had anticipated this amount of money. And yeah, we
5 had told them, you know, I'll say that the Irvine
6 Foundation and other philanthropic sources were a big
7 part of the 2010 cycle. That wasn't going to be around
8 this time around. Again, deadlines have been changed and
9 timelines have changed.

10 So that's something that you can influence as you're
11 going forward. But, you know, you can't -- you don't
12 have veto power over budget. So if the legislature gives
13 it to you, that's what you get. As you're thinking
14 through, you know, if you're thinking about, you know,
15 shifting the seating of the Commission and, honestly,
16 (indiscernible) auditor's office, but if you're going to
17 do that, how are -- what are you doing with the budget is
18 an important question. And if it goes into another
19 fiscal year, that means you got to -- you got to look at
20 the '28/'29 budget. So again, it's under your watch.

21 So, you know, again, I think if you have some good
22 justifications that people can buy into, you -- you can
23 up the budget. You know, if you go too far, again, if
24 you go too far forward or back in terms of the Commission
25 calendar, you know, you're going to get asked, well why

1 you need that much time. And what are you asking for as
2 you as you're going into -- you're talking about going
3 into 2029, what -- what actually do you want to do? How
4 much money -- how much more money do you think you're
5 going to need? You might not get too much cooperation on
6 that.

7 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Other questions?
8 Well, I have a question. What would you -- what would
9 you have done maybe differently or what -- what changes
10 would you -- would you have liked to have made at the end
11 of your term that you weren't able to?

12 MR. ANCHETA: Well, you know, again, I -- I had the
13 luxury of being the last chair, so I could give you a lot
14 of stuff that -- some of which was my opinion. Right?
15 You know, I sent you a lot of stuff over several months
16 in 2020 and 2021. So you know, the biggest one, which
17 I've expressed and I think was acted upon, was the VRA
18 analysis, making sure that you started that early.

19 You know, I think you had some issues around
20 contract pay, you know, just getting that through the
21 pipeline. That came up. And we were -- we did adapt,
22 frankly, because we just -- we should have done that
23 before (indiscernible). You know, I was a -- as some of
24 you may know, I was a replacement commissioner. So I
25 didn't start until about a month in. So I know if I had

1 been on the Commission early, I would have pushed for
2 that to happen. I don't if it would have happened, but I
3 would've push for it. So I think you've got to make sure
4 that happens quickly because you want to get those VRA
5 districts locked in if you can. You know, obviously,
6 there's a lot discretion about what the districts
7 (indiscernible) options. But that's requirement number
8 two. And, you now, we had to deal with pre-clearance and
9 Section 5 districts, those were immovable objects for the
10 most part when we had to draw. And we knew that from the
11 beginning. That actually wasn't too hard because they
12 were already there.

13 Any Commission working on Section 2 compliance has a
14 lot of upkeep for how they want to -- how many districts
15 (indiscernible), how they're looking at different
16 combinations (indiscernible). So that's one.

17 The other area is around communities of interest.
18 And you guys had some comments, you know, way back in
19 2020. You know, communities of interest is not dependent
20 on census, decennial census data, and it's something you
21 can do pretty early. And because much of it is based on
22 subjective opinions of, you know, people's opinions of
23 what their neighborhoods are, what the communities are
24 can be fairly stable. They may have very -- in fact,
25 they may have very little to do with the actual census --

1 what the numbers may tell you in the census record
2 because they're just perceived, their neighborhoods -- as
3 they perceive. Some of that may be based upon, you know,
4 long histories. They may be based on what their
5 perceptions are of neighborhoods and where -- how far
6 they extend. And that can vary, you know. You had
7 Little Saigon -- who knows where Little Saigon actually
8 is, but you had a lot of different opinions on what
9 Little Saigon is, where it begins and ends.

10 So -- but you can get that information early. You
11 can get that before you get the census. And you know, we
12 didn't have that opportunity because it was just so
13 crunched. Everything came in all at the same time.
14 Census data came in, public input came in all at the same
15 time, so it was all mashed together.

16 You were able to, I think, to separate some of that
17 out. I think you could do more separation. I would
18 encourage any future Commission to try to get that data
19 as early as you can once you start hearings. And if you
20 can, try to map it itself. Because then you can say,
21 well here's our -- this isn't the final map, this is just
22 kind of a sense from what we've gotten from the
23 subjective information that we got from the hearings.
24 And, you know, this is certainly very malleable and you
25 understand that it's part of -- people disagree about

1 things and you want to try to resolve it. And
2 ultimately, the Commission has to resolve.

3 And I think it's better to do that early rather than
4 in the middle, which sometimes we had to do that out of
5 necessity. That's all we could do. You, I think, had a
6 little more time to do that, so you could have but I
7 think you got crunched into some -- and that just
8 happens. You know it's a reality, you don't know what
9 you're doing because you haven't done it before. I think
10 it's great to put in training but you, you know, unless
11 you've actually worked on the redistricting, you don't
12 get a sense of how hard it is until you're actually doing
13 it.

14 So that's -- that's something that's inevitably
15 going to happen with any Commission. They're going to
16 get crunched as they go into it. So I think one of the
17 important things I -- and I've stressed this before, is
18 you've got to find the right balance for the Commission
19 in terms of you have to set up the infrastructure.
20 You've got to do the hiring. You've got to the contract.
21 But there's a really -- you have to find the right
22 balance when you're talking about public education,
23 public input, how much you're looking at targeted
24 outreach. You did a lot of that, much more than we did.

25 And then, there's a really important reality which

1 is, it's hard to draw lines, really hard to draw -- until
2 you do it, you don't get a sense of how hard it is. And
3 that takes much more time that ever realized, right. So
4 one of the things you've got to do, and I think you did
5 some of this but you could have done it in a deeper way,
6 is you've got to figure out what all this -- what data
7 (indiscernible) consistent and incomplete (indiscernible)
8 community of interest data really means when you try to
9 put it all together. And you ultimately come up with an
10 independent, Commission-based analysis that was -- this
11 is what we think. Now, a lot of you may disagree with
12 that. A lot of you obviously, you said one thing, and
13 there was differing opinions, but you're the ones, you're
14 the Commission, you're the ones that have to kind of say,
15 okay, we've got to pan this out. We've got reconcile
16 inconsistencies and, you know, we've looked at public
17 opinion or the public input. We've looked at other, you
18 know, you didn't -- and we didn't either in 2010, we
19 didn't look at sort of other data sources too much. It
20 could be census data, ACS data, other kinds of, you know,
21 community reports, there's a whole bunch of stuff you can
22 look at, but you don't have to, and that's a choice for
23 the next Commission to make, but there's a lot of stuff
24 out there that helps you figure out subjective community
25 of interest data. Because, you know, it's very easy to

1 manipulate community of interest data. That's -- there's
2 a really difficult problem and even more so because you
3 had a really open (indiscernible), right? Which is
4 great; you had a lot of opportunities to give input. But
5 you don't know what's in there, you know, a lot of
6 stuff -- there's a lot of stuff in there that could be,
7 you know, sources could be partisan, you know, if it's an
8 anonymous -- you can submit anonymously, and any number
9 of things could happen. Not to say you should second
10 guess your maps and your analysis and what's in there.
11 And you want to presume that they're -- this is, you
12 know, honest, community-based, you know, from
13 individuals. Or that this is legitimate data. But a lot
14 of it is not. I mean, that's a reality. But how do you
15 figure that out. That's a tough question. Because, you
16 know, folks who have partisan interests or incumbency
17 interests, they're going to put stuff in there but, you
18 know, I think -- I think that recommendation letter from
19 Common Cause -- I don't know if you -- use the term
20 AstroTurf, right. It's in a footnote in that -- that
21 recommendations that, you know, it's sort of putting in
22 stuff that looks like it's community based, but it's not
23 really community based. It's actually something else
24 going on.

25 I don't have a solution for that, but that -- that's

1 something that if you have more time, you could kind of
2 take that and look at it. Because that's going to
3 happen. Because the more you open it up, the more -- to
4 subjective opinions from members of the public, the less
5 control you have over what, you know, what you have to
6 work with. And, you know, it may help to have other
7 kinds of -- and what that data is, is it's a choice. And
8 it may help to have other kinds of (indiscernible) based
9 on (indiscernible) statistical analysis or, you know, get
10 a geographer on board to help you with some of the
11 demographic analysis and geographic -- physical geography
12 kinds of questions that come up.

13 So there's a lot of stuff you can do and, you know,
14 not to second guess either of our Commissions. There's
15 always tons of stuff you can do if you can find the time
16 and you've got the resources to do it.

17 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah, thanks. That's great.
18 Yeah, we've been grappling with essentially all of that.
19 Appreciate your perspective on it.

20 Commissioner Yee, why don't you go ahead. I have to
21 take my dog out. So if I'm not back, you're in charge.

22 COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. All good. Thank you,
23 Chair.

24 Commissioner Ancheta, so good to have you here, and
25 thank you for spending your time, giving us a recap of

1 2010. Thank you also for the help you were to the VRA
2 subcommittee when we were looking for outside counsel.
3 That was really helpful when you were able to educate us
4 and help us learn on the job, and we can get that done.

5 I'm curious about the mapping phase and I've heard
6 that you -- 2010 did more work with one or two mappers --
7 one or two commissioners working off-line with mappers.
8 And didn't -- made that more of the process or central to
9 the process than we did. So I was curious to hear more
10 from you directly how that went and what you thought of
11 it, you know, and what you would recommend going forward.

12 MR. ANCHETA: Sure. Now, and with the
13 understanding, that's always advisory. So whenever you
14 have any committee, whether it's, you know two -- and we
15 use two persons more (indiscernible) than we -- whenever
16 you have any kind of two-person subcommittee or whatever
17 you want to call it, you have to be advisory. And you
18 have to run everything by the full Commission.

19 So we had a lot of two-person teams working with the
20 mappers, you know, directly, and just -- here's what we
21 think, given our understanding of these particular areas.
22 Because one of the things, and this may not be obvious
23 from, you know, whatever historical document you're
24 looking at, but we had two-person teams that were
25 assigned to different parts of the state, right. So one

1 person was from that area and the second person was from
2 outside that area. So for some balance and we tried to,
3 you know, we tried to have the (indiscernible) partisan
4 balance. So basically we had two experts, and of course,
5 you know, we're all Californians, so can always chime in
6 with what you think is going on in a particular area.
7 But we had two-person teams who we thought would -- that
8 would go through the data more carefully. They knew
9 the -- at least one of them knew the area pretty well.
10 And we built on that when we were trying to put in
11 segments or different sections of the draft map and later
12 visualizations so that some of that was delegated, but it
13 always came back (indiscernible) even though we trusted a
14 lot of what was going on. We, you know, people lived in
15 different areas of the state over their life and they
16 have different impressions and, again, there's a lot of
17 data coming. Yeah, you might miss something
18 (indiscernible) tons of stuff coming in. And one of the
19 hard things, of course, it keeps coming in; it doesn't
20 stop. It goes up until the last day. And even after the
21 last day you give for comment.

22 So I think that was helpful in terms of delegating
23 some responsibility, but we always made it clear that
24 those were advisory and everybody had, well, not every --
25 it wasn't always consensual. You guys did a lot of

1 stuff, which was amazing, the stuff that was consensual.
2 I was stunned how often you guys agreed on
3 (indiscernible). We could never have done that on our
4 Commission. We strived to (indiscernible), you know,
5 reach a consensus, but, you know, we split more often
6 than -- I suspect we split more often on the big
7 questions.

8 You guys managed to do it pretty much every time
9 (indiscernible), which I can't see as a realistic
10 expectation either. That's great that you did it, but I
11 wouldn't ever build that into any kind of system or
12 culture. That's rare. But congratulations for having
13 done that. It's great.

14 So in any case, yeah, having that kind of
15 delegation, you have to trust people and, with the sense
16 that, you know, we're not trying to hide anything. We're
17 trying to make sure that -- we're trying to be efficient,
18 right. And that's always a trade-off. You know, the
19 transparency norm is very strong, but you lose some of
20 that when you create two-person teams. You know, you've
21 gotten some flak for doing a lot of closed sessions. I
22 think, you know, that's a choice you made because you
23 wanted to discuss VRA compliance in closed session. But
24 you know, the next Commission might go the opposite
25 direction. Let's do everything out in the open. That's

1 within their prerogative to do that. So, you know, as
2 you go to delegate more things to the -- either
3 subcommittees or to the staff, you lose transparency.
4 And that's a choice you can make.

5 COMMISSIONER YEE: When you had splits on lines, did
6 you guys vote through those?

7 MR. ANCHETA: Yeah, yeah. Most of the, you know, a
8 lot of the state is pretty stable. Again, we had some
9 locked-in pieces. A lot of the northern part of the
10 state is fairly -- once you've (indiscernible). There's
11 just a little overpopulation, right. You know, we had a
12 lot of struggles over central Los Angeles County. A lot
13 of -- some tears were shed during some of those sessions.
14 It was a tough -- tough set of sessions. People got
15 emotional about where lines were drawn and about, you
16 know, minority empowerment was a big central issue.

17 But you know, when we disagreed, we agreed to
18 disagree, and we just moved forward. I think we were
19 trying to be very efficient about our discussions, our
20 deliberations, our voting. You know, I cast plenty of,
21 you know, dissenting votes on all the stuff. You know,
22 just accept that and move on.

23 You know, again, I -- even though you were able to
24 achieve consensus on so many things, that's a cultural
25 norm that you cannot pass off to the Commissions. It's

1 rare. Everybody will says that's great, but you got to
2 move forward because if you try to do that, you'll get
3 stuck. You just can't move forward. But it's -- it's a
4 wonderful idea. I'm not knocking it. And you -- you got
5 it. You did a great job with it. We would never have
6 gotten through it. We would have got stuck so many times
7 if we tried to do that. We couldn't have done it.

8 COMMISSIONER YEE: Thanks.

9 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: All right. Commissioner
10 Fernandez.

11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. And thank you,
12 Mr. Ancheta. This has been really good, very helpful.
13 And you got me to chuckle a little bit about the fourteen
14 of us, the consensus. It is true, and we have to remind
15 ourselves that it's a unique fourteen. Every Commission
16 is going to be a unique fourteen. And so we have to
17 remind ourselves to maybe step away and realize that not
18 every Commission will have the same build-up and the same
19 consensus-building. And not to say there weren't tears
20 shed. There were frustrations. Definitely were. You
21 know, I just -- I give it up to my fellow commissioners.
22 We just, we knew our mission and, you know, we just tried
23 to get there together. It's difficult though, as you
24 mentioned.

25 I did have one question though. You mentioned that

1 you got involved in the Arizona lawsuit. Was that -- did
2 they ask you to be involved or -- if you can give me just
3 a little bit more background on that, that'd be great.

4 Thank you.

5 MR. ANCHETA: Yeah. You know, I can't remember if
6 we were contacted by the -- I don't think we were, but --
7 it was up in the -- it was going to the U.S. Supreme
8 Court, right. And it went to the heart of having the
9 legality or the constitutionality of independent
10 Commissions. So obviously, we had a strong interest in
11 it because if it had gone the opposite way, then it would
12 invalidate the maps, at least the Congressional maps. So
13 obviously we had an interest. So we did file an amicus
14 curiae, a friend of the court brief, in that case. And
15 you know, it was a -- the right outcome for us. So we
16 still exist, you still exist as an institution. You can
17 do Congressional maps as part of your work. So yeah, I
18 don't remember if someone had contacted us directly on
19 that, but we had been tracking and, again, even if
20 Arizona had -- even if Arizona hadn't contacted us, we
21 would have worked it out. Oh, so just to note, you know,
22 we did have -- you know, Mary Johnson (ph.) worked with
23 your Commission for some time. We had her as a retired
24 annuitant to help us out. It'll be tricky if you guys
25 get sued at some point. You know, the Attorney General

1 worked with us on one lawsuit that would be the lawsuit
2 challenging the racial diversity on the Commission. They
3 sort of -- that was sort of a Prop 209 challenge saying
4 that you can't do that, because Prop 209 precludes that.
5 You know, as commissioners, you're not (indiscernible)
6 and so that was produced. But the AG representative was
7 there, so we didn't have to worry, and the outlay's
8 there. You know, again, once your budget goes down,
9 you've got to figure what you can spend, and you know,
10 Marion (ph.) was nice enough to help out as -- with not
11 much cost on (indiscernible).

12 And you know, there's still possibilities for
13 getting sued under the BRA (ph.) federal court pretty
14 much all through the end of your term, but it's highly
15 unlikely that will happen. But that can happen, because
16 of -- you know, it's just where the demographics are
17 (indiscernible) you know, of this vote division occurring
18 in a district, so that could happen.

19 Now, I think you'll get some (indiscernible) if that
20 happens -- in fact occurs, but yeah, that's unlikely.
21 And I think, you know, most of civil rights groups are
22 perfectly happy with your district. I suspect there
23 won't be any fallout.

24 But, you know, we had a rather frivolous lawsuit
25 filed against us, or we were named -- very frivolous

1 lawsuit in '20, so you still have to kind of deal with
2 that. That one's just a real waste -- well, yeah. It
3 was a waste of time, so didn't go -- and it didn't go
4 anywhere. But you have to deal with it when it comes up.

5 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Commissioner
6 Andersen?

7 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you. I've got
8 a question about -- I believe you said that the state --
9 well, we're dealing with the state auditor. You were
10 dealing with the state -- Secretary of State before
11 you -- the 2010 came on, and that they'd actually set up
12 a contract for your ED before you guys came on. Was that
13 correct? And where I'm going with this, so I'll just
14 sort of give you the whole thing up front, is the
15 Secretary of -- the auditor put together several
16 different contracts as a kind of example contract for us,
17 not that we had to use them, but it was the idea to try
18 to help us, move us along. And there was great blowback
19 about no, no, no, no, no. The Commission has to use
20 those. Because we're talking about items that maybe we
21 could help set up ahead of the 2030, and not
22 necessarily -- we're not necessarily talking about having
23 them hire certain people, but we are talking about data
24 and key (indiscernible), what systems are out there, et
25 cetera, et cetera. That you should opine about, you

1 know, what you would think about out in, and I'm sure
2 considered back -- both sides of that issue.

3 MR. ANCHETA: Yeah, so --

4 VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Just a second. I think you
5 meant job postings, right?

6 MR. ANCHETA: Right. That's what --

7 VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Did you mean (indiscernible
8 simultaneous speech) --

9 MR. ANCHETA: I think I may have said --

10 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Both --

11 MR. ANCHETA: I misspoke in (indiscernible,
12 simultaneous speech) --

13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Both that and other items.

14 VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah.

15 MR. ANCHETA: But there was a lot of blowback back
16 then, and that was part of the reason they were extending
17 the timeline for the subsequent Commission or
18 Commissions, was simply -- and again, this is just -- you
19 know, the Secretary of State well-intended, trying to get
20 things going and knowing that hiring doesn't happen --
21 you just pick somebody up -- go through the State
22 personnel system.

23 So they actually did post the -- you know, they did
24 a job description and posted the job. And mostly, you
25 know, Dan Quayful (ph.) had worked on the selection

1 process anyway with the auditors, so that was -- we had
2 sort of these to track.

3 But in any case, that was part of the reason we
4 wanted to stretch it out, so the Commission itself could
5 actually do that hiring. And you know, I was part of the
6 blowback this cycle, because we were part of the -- we
7 were still in office when the auditor had put out RFP,
8 and we just -- no way should she be putting out an RFP.
9 You're putting in stuff into that RFP that the next
10 Commission has to figure out itself, right? No, again,
11 we understand the intent was to get things going.

12 No, I don't think it's a problem if you sort of lay
13 things out -- here's what we think might be helpful, but
14 you can toss it if you want to, right? It's one thing to
15 put out the actual RFP, which is what the auditor did in
16 2020. It's another thing to say, well, here, you know,
17 we don't want you to have to reinvent the wheel. Here's
18 a bunch of stuff we think would be helpful, but again,
19 we're not too proprietary. It's not required for you to
20 do anything. You can make some choices here, and these
21 are things we thought about. We've talked to folks with
22 '10. We've talked to a lot of different -- the auditor's
23 office -- all these folks who are working on these, and
24 we want this venture to succeed. Here. But, you know,
25 if you folks don't like it, get rid it, right? You're

1 okay. So we wouldn't feel bad if you said, well, we want
2 to do it differently.

3 You have to understand that they have to kind of
4 chart their own path, and who these fourteen people will
5 be, we don't know, and they may have, you know, very
6 different values. There's some commonalities that cut
7 across all of our -- that cut across the law and
8 requirements and what we think our important values for
9 the Commission, but you know, how much they value
10 transparency, how much they value, you know, fairness or
11 equity or efficiency -- how they want to, you know, put
12 those maps together. There's a lot -- there's a lot of
13 wiggle room to do things, you know, much differently than
14 the 2010 Commission or your Commission. So you have to
15 give them that space.

16 But you know, as our commit -- we had some concerns
17 about transparency by the 2010 commissioner early in our
18 process. We were very specific -- you know, you're doing
19 too much stuff outside of the public eye. I think we
20 felt that can change with some of the (indiscernible)
21 closed session.

22 Now nothing illegal, nothing untoward, perfectly --
23 you know, those are policy choices he made, but again, if
24 you value certain things, you know, more than other
25 commissioners might, you will set up your structure with

1 importance. So if you really value transparency above
2 all else, you don't do too many subcommittees of two
3 people who don't get -- or who aren't having open
4 hearing. You don't do closed sessions, so that's -- but
5 you can do it. You can work it out. The directions can
6 still be fully transparent and comply -- keying in the
7 statute, if you value efficiency, really.

8 Or another example is, you know, if you really want
9 to help underrepresented groups and do something like a
10 grant program, which you weren't able to actually
11 implement, that compromises -- in my mind, that
12 compromises intent. So you know, that's something I
13 consistently during my term would oppose, which is to
14 have, you know, too close of a relationship with
15 community groups. But that's not a value shared among
16 former commissioners. A number of us were very, sort of,
17 purists when it came to independence. We didn't want to
18 look like we were too attached, whether we had the
19 appearance of any kind of favoritism. Others were
20 perfectly comfortable and recommended, as contained in
21 our compilation, working closely and maybe even funding
22 community-based organizations.

23 But those were differences of opinion, and that may
24 be something that may be a tension in the next
25 Commission, so you have to figure, well, wouldn't it be

1 great if you had a grant program, and we're going to give
2 you all these different options for grants. We did a lot
3 of research. And they'll say, nah, we don't want to do
4 it. And you just have to say, okay, great. That's your
5 choice, your option. Do what you think is right for your
6 Commission.

7 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Are there any other
8 questions or comments from the Commission?

9 Commissioner Andersen?

10 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'll throw one out there,
11 because it's been so helpful to hear from you. We really
12 appreciate it. The tools that we ended up with -- like,
13 specifically the COI tool, the redistricting tool --
14 those things were amazingly invaluable to us, and we
15 didn't know that they were really going on until, you
16 know, we all of a sudden go, oh, hey, we'll pull a
17 committee together and be, oh, okay. And unless you're
18 developing tools like that, you'd have no understanding
19 what is the head time -- the lead time on those items to
20 make them happen.

21 And you know, we've been sort of talking about -- I
22 don't know if you heard earlier -- is to update things
23 like that, you know, based on, you know, ten years, the
24 technology going be even -- who knows? And we've been
25 talking about actually kind of working, as the 2020

1 Commission, working with the people who were involved in
2 stuff to actually kind of get those up and running -- not
3 hard but, you know, kind of have them there, so they can
4 kind of turn that over. What do you think about that?

5 MR. ANCHETA: Yeah. Well, first, I mean, those are
6 fantastic tools. Like, those are really great -- you
7 know, very helpful to map a few arrows -- fantastic. You
8 know whether anybody is -- I don't know if it leaves GIS.
9 I don't know. That's a much more sophisticated GIS
10 system, you know. But at a certain point, folks who are
11 at that level are already using (indiscernible) or GIS
12 (indiscernible). So there's a lot of sophisticated folks
13 that have no problem already, so I don't know if you need
14 to concentrate on that subject.

15 It's the more basic kind of things, where people can
16 kind of figure out, where's my neighbor? What am I
17 considering to be my community of interest? Okay, how
18 can I get this onto paper or at least on -- or onscreen,
19 so that the folks on the Commission can actually use it
20 and take it seriously.

21 Yeah, and you know, I -- you know, I talked to Karin
22 about -- I forget when it was, because I mean, you know,
23 Karin and I are friends. I haven't talked to her
24 (indiscernible) because, you know, again, I was trying to
25 maintain a -- kind of a separation, because I was working

1 with (indiscernible). So you know, she and I talked a
2 lot over those many years about different things like
3 that, and I do recall having spoken to her about some of
4 the tools that the Statewide Database (indiscernible)
5 developing, which evolved into some of the tools you are
6 working with.

7 So yeah, I think it's fine to do that. I think --
8 and again, you know, I don't think it necessarily locks
9 in the Commission to use them, necessarily. I'll say I
10 think they would, and I think, obviously, if it's the
11 Statewide Database that's really developing them, you
12 know, I don't know if Karin, wearing her two hats -- we
13 don't know, but obviously, Karin's court is Karin's
14 court, but she's been with the Statewide Database
15 forever. You know, I was really surprised when she
16 decided to do the project, right? We didn't wear her out
17 entirely the last time we were in, so she was able to
18 able to, at least with a second team, put together -- to
19 work as your consultant. And no, if you had asked me a
20 couple of years ago if she was going to do it again, I
21 would've said you're nuts. There's no way she's going to
22 ever want to do it again.

23 But yeah, I think it's fine for you to work with the
24 Statewide Database on that, because again, that's the
25 official data source, and to the extent there are

1 tools -- and it's in the statute, right? The legislature
2 has control over that, but they essentially delegate that
3 to the Statewide Database to figure out the specifics.
4 Yeah, with the understanding that, you know -- make sure
5 that it's not something that's totally locked in. The
6 next Commission can't alter it, replace it, discard it if
7 they want to, but you can do that.

8 Now again, you've got to figure out how much time do
9 you have? You have a ton of money right now, but it's
10 going to go away real fast, right? That's your reality.
11 And again, if you're committed to it, and you know, you
12 maybe not be able to draw on the per diems. And you
13 know, volunteerism, if you're really dedicated to it, is
14 fantastic, but you know, you have your lives to lead too,
15 so and what do you want to do over the next couple of
16 years is -- yeah, I wouldn't certainly commit every
17 commissioner to spending so many times a month, you know,
18 and so many times a year going to meetings and doing a
19 lot of stuff. But if some of you want to really dig in
20 and work on it, great. I think that's fantastic, but
21 yeah, just with the understanding that the next
22 Commission can -- they can ditch everything you ever put
23 together, and it's their Commission. And don't take it
24 personally, right, because that's just how they get that
25 count.

1 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay, well, thank you,
2 Commissioner Ancheta. We really, really appreciate your
3 time and your wisdom, so thank you so much.

4 MR. ANCHETA: Yeah, and again, I'm now a free agent,
5 so I'm not playing with anybody in particular, so I'm
6 happy to just -- you know, call me if you either want
7 more background history or just want some friendly advice
8 on it. I will speak in my individual capacity just
9 moving forward. So happy to help in whatever way I can.
10 And thanks a lot for --

11 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: (Indiscernible, simultaneous
12 speech) --

13 MR. ANCHETA: -- letting me talk to you. Appreciate
14 it.

15 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah, we appreciate it.
16 Thank you. Take care.

17 I'm going to turn it back over to Commissioner
18 Vazquez.

19 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thanks, Commissioner Fornaciari.

20 All right, I think we are moving on to a recap of
21 our 2020 process. I'm not sure what the vision was for
22 this section of the agenda, so I might not -- I might
23 need some help in framing the discussion. Commissioner
24 Yee, it looks like you're --

25 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. So yeah. I think we can

1 actually skip this part today. I think Commissioner
2 Kennedy and I were thinking we might have things boiled
3 down more by today than we were able to, and besides
4 which, we're getting advice that maybe slowing things
5 down is not a bad idea as well. So you'll recall that
6 there are some outside reports being written -- Common
7 Cause -- legally, voters have a short-term, shorter
8 report coming out soon, and then a longer report later
9 this year. And some other inputs that'll be on the way,
10 and there'll be more time to boil things, I think. And
11 so boiling down, and so we can save that for today.

12 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: All right. Thank you.

13 Commissioner Sinay?

14 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to clarify, the
15 collaborative of redistricting organizations did submit
16 their report to us already. That was the shorter one,
17 and then in a year, there'll be another one from Common
18 Cause and League of Women Voters. So we have one, and
19 there's one coming in the future. And the one in the
20 future's the one where they'll contact us and contact
21 some of us and analyze the whole process.

22 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thank you. Okay, so I am
23 sensing some live reordering of our agenda. We did have
24 discussion of a potential motion, but we did not have a
25 motion on the floor for one of our subcommittee reports.

1 We also still need to discuss redistricting engagement as
2 well. Did we get to -- we didn't get to long-term
3 planning. Got it. So let's -- we did tell a few
4 commissioners regarding the vote that we would have a
5 time certain for that at 3:15, so maybe the best thing to
6 do right now is to start to hear from long-term planning,
7 to hear from redistricting engagement, and then,
8 hopefully, that will free up space for 3:15 to get back
9 to our discussion of a potential motion for legislation.

10 Great. Okay. So do we -- I think Commissioners
11 Fernandez and Akutagawa, do you have additional pieces
12 for us for long-term planning?

13 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I guess just continue on
14 from what we were talking about. I know there's been
15 different opinions, in terms of speeding up, slowing
16 down. Again, just the reminder that we do have an
17 author, and we were hoping to have the low-hanging fruit,
18 so that we can continue a relationship with the
19 legislature, instead of, you know, dropping off and then
20 coming back. So that's what we were hoping for with the
21 items in the A category, and again, I think Commissioner
22 Akutagawa and I, in terms of the constitutional ones,
23 which are on D, if the Commission -- our recommendation
24 would be if the Commission does want to go that route
25 with constitutional, that we should -- it would be one

1 bite at the apple.

2 Like, maybe we all agree to change the final map
3 date and extend it, but if there's other areas that still
4 need to be discussed, I would recommend that we wait
5 until we have discussed all of those Constitutional, so
6 that we do it all at once, because that is a huge effort.
7 It's either the legislature has to vote two-thirds, and
8 then it gets on the ballot, or we have to take that on
9 ourselves, which would be costly and time-consuming.

10 So to do it multiple times would be very
11 challenging, and especially as Mr. Ancheta just noted,
12 right now, you know, for a year, everybody knew about us.
13 They still kind of know about us, but the longer we wait,
14 they kind of forget about us until census comes again.
15 And as a reminder, these legislative changes cannot be
16 done in the years ending in 9, 0, and 1, I believe. So
17 it has to be in those middle years where, kind of like,
18 everyone's forgotten about redistricting.

19 So with that, we did have some feedback and some
20 conversations from some of the commissioners. So far, in
21 terms of those items in the bucket A -- how about I just
22 say bucket A? There was a comment about A5, which is
23 fully functional. We had one commissioner say we
24 probably need to discuss that further, another one saying
25 we're fine with it moving forward.

1 I will say that with defining fully functional, we'd
2 have to be pretty specific as to what we mean by that, so
3 I can see that one potentially maybe being moved off the
4 A list and put on -- I'm getting my list up -- and put on
5 the C category.

6 And Commissioner Yee did provide language for A6,
7 which was good, to make sure the language says it's
8 before the map deadline, instead of putting a specific
9 date, so that's a very good reminder that we don't know
10 what the future's going to hold, right? There could be
11 some other type of kind of task.

12 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Specifically, he said --
13 sorry to interrupt. He said three months before the map
14 deadline to be specific, is what I wrote down.

15 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. Yeah, thank you.
16 So anyway, open to comments. I see -- oh, or
17 Commissioner Akutagawa?

18 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I also wanted to note
19 that Commissioner Andersen also suggested that we also
20 include or move up to the A grouping or the A bucket, C5,
21 which is what constitutes a day; C8, which is about
22 starting the Commission earlier, although I think -- or
23 yeah. Just having an earlier start date for the
24 Commissioner. I think what we understand is that as long
25 as it's still within the same calendar year, even if the

1 Commission started a few earlier, that that would not
2 require a constitutional change. And then, she also
3 suggested adding to the A bucket, C12, which is about, I
4 guess, codifying that the Commission, and next
5 Commission, can choose to rotate the chairs.

6 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Okay.

7 Commissioner Andersen? And please, I'm hopeful that
8 everyone will chime in because we're trying to -- if we
9 don't get this through, we don't get this through, and
10 it'll be someone else's mantra to carry forward, but
11 really just trying to keep the momentum going.

12 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I have a process
13 question in this, and specifically, you know, we're
14 talking about different sections. Like, we're talking in
15 A1 and 2, our election code items. You know, 3
16 through -- you know, A3 through A6 -- that is also, you
17 know, government code -- A254 and A253, et cetera, et
18 cetera. At what point can we mix those is my initial
19 process question. You know, can you mix -- we want to do
20 this, you know, in one bill. Can we actually say, I want
21 to amend the election code section da da da da by saying
22 this and this and this, and I want to do government code
23 da da da da da. Can we mix those?

24 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I would have to defer. I
25 don't know if Chief Counsel Pane knows that, but it would

1 be something that we would take forward to the
2 legislative staff that we've been working with to see if
3 that's possible. I'm trying to -- Chair Vazquez, I don't
4 know if you've seen different code sections mixed. I
5 don't think I've ever seen that, but that doesn't mean it
6 can't be done.

7 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: I think probably Anthony is better
8 suited to answer that.

9 MR. PANE: Thanks, Chair. And so my thought is, if
10 I understand your question correctly, Commissioner
11 Andersen, could we, in one bill, amend the elections
12 code, as well as the government code? So I had some
13 legislative exposure. My thought is the answer is yes
14 because they're generally addressing sort of the same
15 topic. If all of a sudden, we wanted to amend the water
16 code, I think that kicks that bill probably into a second
17 and different committee, but as long as it could
18 topically fall in the same committee, my thought is we
19 can include various statutes. But it probably matters
20 more by the jurisdiction of the committee that it's in.

21 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yeah, that's a great way, because I
22 wasn't sure I understood your question, Commissioner
23 Andersen, and I think, in my experience, strategy-wise,
24 it may make sense to split -- sometimes it makes sense to
25 put different codes -- different pieces of codes together

1 in one bill, and sometimes that can complicate things,
2 because then your bill sort of lives or dies by what
3 could potentially feel very particular to a particular
4 code, so it's I think, in some ways, more of a strategy
5 question.

6 Commissioner Andersen?

7 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, thank you. That was
8 why. I have a follow-up, because my understanding, at
9 one point, it was at State level that basically, you
10 know, each bill's supposed to only deal with one topic,
11 essentially, you know, one item. I like the idea of
12 going to one committee, in which case, as I'm seeing, I
13 this what we're trying to do, even in our A's -- maybe
14 it's two different things? And if that is the case, what
15 committee -- the person we're trying to talk to, do you
16 have an idea of what committees they're looking at and/or
17 you know, what are they getting to run with for us? What
18 are they thinking? You know, former Commissioner Ancheta
19 was saying, you know, if you're going to wait, you're
20 going to do the actual constitutional amendment, get all
21 your asks in one basket, essentially. You know, is the
22 person -- they're no, I don't want to touch that. I just
23 want to touch these-type topics. If you could just get
24 us a little more information about that. Thank you.

25 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: That's kind of a convoluted topic --

1 and I don't know -- I don't know if I'm going to answer
2 it correctly, and I'm going to rely on -- or Linda, did
3 you want to address that one?

4 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I guess I was just going
5 to -- if understanding it correctly, what you said,
6 Commissioner Andersen, I think you're asking, you know,
7 what if the spot bill sponsor does not want to, you know,
8 include certain topics that we're putting forward? I
9 think that our understanding, based on the preliminary
10 conversation that we had with the representatives from
11 the legislature, is that that is possible, that the list
12 that we do put forth to them, if we do and whatever the
13 final list is going to be, they're still going to look
14 through that list, and they're still going to decide
15 which ones they want to carry forward and which ones
16 they're not. So that already is going to happen, yeah.

17 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Right. Right. And with our -- you
18 know, meeting that we did have with them, they just kind
19 of wanted kind of, like, a global understanding of what
20 we were for in the (indiscernible) at that point. It did
21 include everything from A, and it included some other
22 items as well. I mean, kind of what they really wanted
23 to know, they just wanted to know the understanding of
24 what we're asking and the background and why we were
25 asking for it.

1 I will say that the one for A3 and A4 that has to do
2 with grants and contracting and procurement, that's the
3 one where we've asked our chief counsel and his team to
4 review other agencies to see if they have that authority
5 because that was they specifically asked, you know. They
6 weren't aware, but again, you know, they can't be aware
7 of every single code language in California because
8 that's just very comprehensive. But they wanted some
9 background as to -- and once they understood what some of
10 these obstacles were, then they at least could appreciate
11 and understand why we wanted to go forward. It's not
12 something that we just, you know, off the top of our head
13 wanted to do.

14 And again, I just wanted to specify that if we do
15 move forward with the grants or the procurement or the
16 contracting exemption, it does not mean you have -- it
17 doesn't mean you can -- or what I should say is you can
18 still go through the RFP process. You can still go
19 through whatever process you want, but it gives you the
20 flexibility, if down to time crunch, like how we were
21 with the outreach and communications at the end. You
22 know, there was that delayed time trying to get some
23 contracts into place for some of these media spots, and
24 that would've been very helpful not to have to go
25 through, you know, the one- or two-month delay, because

1 we already knew --

2 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Oh.

3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- what we wanted to do.

4 And there was also a delay, too, when we did our language
5 access contracts. That was a delay as well.

6 Sorry Angela, or --

7 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Nope. That's okay.

8 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- Commissioner Vazquez.

9 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: No worries. It's hard to politely
10 interrupt via Zoom.

11 So it's 3 o'clock. We're going to take a break.
12 We'll be back at 3:15. If I could ask this committee to,
13 hopefully, take the 15 minutes to develop a motion that
14 this Commission can consider, so that we can take a vote
15 when we come back, that will be great. See you all at
16 3:16.

17 (Whereupon, a recess was held from 3:01 p.m.
18 until 3:17 p.m.)

19 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Welcome back, everybody. We will
20 continue our conversation around long-term planning and
21 hopefully have a motion ready to present.

22 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you, Chair.

23 One favor is if we can have an indication of those
24 that maybe aren't on video but are listening and will be
25 able to vote only because, you know, there may not be

1 a -- if we don't have enough to vote, we don't have
2 enough to vote. Thank you.

3 Commissioner Turner's there and Commissioner Le
4 Mons. Thank you for your hands up. And Commissioner
5 Taylor's there as well.

6 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Commissioner Taylor -- great. Thank
7 you.

8 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I don't even know if that's
9 enough, but sounds great.

10 Is Commissioner Toledo and Kennedy?

11 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think I saw Commissioner
12 Toledo turn his video on and off real quick.

13 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, Commissioner Toledo did
14 too. Okay. I think that's enough. Off the top of my
15 head --

16 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Me too.

17 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Honestly, that was one good
18 thing about our Commission, I never really memorized who
19 was what party, so I don't know if we're in the right
20 parties right now. I think that's probably a good thing
21 though.

22 At this point, we did take the break to kind of talk
23 about it, and what we would propose, unless -- you know,
24 willing to add some of Commissioner Andersen's, but that
25 would mean that everyone had -- was general consensus

1 with that, would be to motion to move forward with
2 legislative changes listed in group A, would be A1, A2,
3 A3, A4, and A6. So it would be all of them that are
4 currently in A1, and it's in the potential litigation
5 changes document that's dated March 30th, 2022.

6 Do we have any discussion? Any concerns?

7 Commissioner Andersen.

8 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, if Commissioner
9 Akutagawa, she very eloquently labeled those couple of
10 items from C that I thought we should add in there as
11 well, and add that to the motion --

12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay --

13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- please.

14 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So --

15 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So I'm going to go back and
16 forth with that right now. Because they all -- I mean,
17 okay. So the ones that Commissioner Andersen had, I
18 believe, was it --

19 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: C5. C8.

20 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: C5 --

21 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: C5, C8, and C12.

22 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And C12.

23 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Right.

24 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So C5 is clarify what a day
25 is in defining mapping deadlines. So what would be your

1 definition of that, Commissioner Andersen? Because I
2 just want to make sure that we're clear as to if we put
3 it in, the rest of the commissioners are clear as to what
4 we would be moving forward with. Does that make sense?

5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Could I answer that one?

6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.

7 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Yeah, I would go
8 with the calendar day instead of the 24-hour. You see
9 under the notes, we have calendar day, instead of 24. So
10 basically, it would be -- the difference would be if we
11 say, okay, we're doing something by noon, that means you
12 have until noon tomorrow. Now I think it would be -- you
13 would have a full calendar day. You know, if you do
14 something anywhere in a particular day, then you'd have
15 to wait a full another day as opposed to 24 hours.

16 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So right now --

17 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Like -- go ahead.

18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So right now, the
19 code section does read, that 8251(b)(2) says day means a
20 calendar day, except that if the final day of a period is
21 within which an act is to be performed is Saturday,
22 Sunday, or a holiday, the period is extended to the next
23 day that is not a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday. So right
24 now the day is defined as a calendar day.

25 And I believe the discussion is the past somewhere

1 indicated that maybe a 24-hour period from the time that
2 something's adopted or whatever the case may be.

3 So right now, it is calendar day, Commissioner
4 Andersen.

5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Great. Then --

6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So then --

7 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- I would leave it.

8 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: My item would be leave it
10 that way, which means we don't have to do anything.

11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

12 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So we would not add C5
13 then. Okay.

14 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct. Yes. Check it
15 off.

16 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: All right. And then the
17 next one would be C8, which is earlier start day for
18 commissioners also would impact start date of application
19 process. And on this one, I know that we did have quite
20 a bit of conversation last time where some commissioners
21 thought, you know, starting in the day and the year
22 ending in a zero earlier, like in January, that would not
23 require a change in the language. But if we wanted to
24 start prior to that, then that would require a change.
25 And I know that there were quite a few that wanted to

1 start prior to, like in the year 2029, right --

2 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, that's on --

3 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- Chair Vazquez?

4 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. On that one, I was
5 talking about just leaving it. Don't put that in the
6 constitutional amendment. But put that in the regulation
7 so we would be able to move it to, say, January without
8 having to do the heavy lift. That's my intent on that
9 one.

10 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. I think that this is
11 going to require further discussion, but that -- Chair
12 Vazquez?

13 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yeah, especially with your note
14 about wanting it to be a regulatory decision, I think it
15 would be cleaner if this motion encompasses only
16 legislative ideas that we want to put forward this year.
17 That doesn't mean we're pushing pause any of these other
18 conversations necessarily but that we are committing to a
19 particular strategy, in this case legislative, for the
20 named items in the motion.

21 And for those reasons, I personally am not
22 comfortable with including C8, because I think that
23 requires some additional deeper discussions before we'd
24 even have language to put together.

25 And then C12, I'm sort of agnostic. So would just

1 look for indications for folks as to whether you want to
2 include 12 in this motion.

3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That's (indiscernible).

4 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Commissioner Sinay.

5 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Andersen, you're
6 not on mute again.

7 I just wanted to check in on A6, is it as written or
8 are we talking about the three months prior to the maps
9 being due because we've said both languages.

10 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, great question,
11 Commissioner Sinay, great catch. We will need to -- we
12 meant to amend A6 to include language that Commissioner
13 Yee proposed, which is -- which would read as -- sorry,
14 I've got to scroll back up there: Three days public
15 notice for meetings held three months before the map
16 deadline in the year ending in the number 1. So it would
17 not be specific to a certain month; it would be then
18 aligned to what the map deadline would be.

19 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. No, because I think
20 one thing we've learned is in everything we do, it's
21 better to align it to a deadline than try to be specific
22 about dates.

23 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Exactly.

24 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So yes. Thank you. Okay.
25 That was -- I'm done.

1 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: So I think, if I can interject here.
2 We still do not have a motion. So we need a motion and a
3 second. We didn't get a second before we launched into a
4 discussion. So I need a clarifying motion then a second.

5 Yes, Commissioner Sinay, did you have a discussion
6 point? Sorry. No. Okay.

7 So sorry, Commissioner Fernandez.

8 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Did you have a motion
9 Commissioner Sinay or? No. Okay.

10 COMMISSIONER SINAY: (Indiscernible). I figured you
11 had the motion easier accessible.

12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So the motion was to
13 move forward with legislative changes listed in group A,
14 A1, A2, A3, A4, A6, but A6 would be amended to read:
15 three months before map deadline. So that's my motion.

16 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And to be specific, the
17 three days' public notice for meetings held three months
18 before the map deadline in the year ending in the number
19 1?

20 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Do I have a second?

21 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'll second.

22 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: All right. Thank you, Commissioner
23 Akutagawa. Beat you to it, Commissioner Yee.

24 Okay. Any discussion on the motion?

25 Yes, Commissioner Le Mons.

1 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: This is clarifying question
2 on the motion. I don't if we were looking at three
3 different suggestions that Commissioner Andersen had put
4 forward. It didn't seem like we closed a loop on C12.
5 And I'm just checking in to make sure we're clear. I
6 didn't hear it in the motion that we decided not to
7 include it. Where are we on the C12?

8 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you for that. And so
9 C12 is to add language to note nothing impedes the
10 Commission from rotating the chair. And what I will do
11 quickly is I will read what the -- how the language
12 currently reads. So it currently reads: The Commission
13 shall select by the voting process prescribed in
14 paragraph 5 of subdivision C of section blah, blah, blah,
15 one of their members to serve as a chair and one to serve
16 as a vice chair. The chair and vice chairs shall not be
17 of the same party.

18 So that's all it states. It doesn't state that you
19 can or you cannot have a rotating chair. And I believe
20 the purpose of this was just to clarify that the
21 Commission -- that nothing would impede the Commission
22 from rotating the chair, so that there is not confusion.
23 You could have the same chair and vice chair or you could
24 rotate them.

25 Are there any discussions regarding that?

1 Commissioner Akutagawa?

2 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. If I could just
3 perhaps maybe just -- I'll just state -- or maybe it's
4 also a question. It seems like the language as it reads
5 right now gives us the most -- gives the next Commission
6 the most flexibility. We opted to do the rotation. My
7 recommendation is instead of codifying it -- I mean, it's
8 essentially just writing what is implied in the language,
9 and I think that gives more flexibility, and I don't
10 think it's necessary to actually change the code for
11 that, but that's just the perspective that I have.

12 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: So I'm hearing that you are not
13 accepting of an amendment to add C12.

14 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I guess I would just, yeah,
15 not necessarily be in favor of it. I frankly think it's
16 somewhat unnecessary in a way because I feel like it is
17 already included in the language as it reads and to put
18 it in -- you know, it's essentially -- I guess it's -- I
19 guess if it's preferred to make the implicit more
20 explicit, I guess that's what the language does, but I
21 don't know if it's really necessary to go through that,
22 maybe the work.

23 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Okay. Commissioners Andersen and
24 Taylor. And then I want to be mindful of time because we
25 did have folks who need to leave, and I want to make sure

1 we get a vote on this motion.

2 So Commissioner Andersen, and then Taylor.

3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. Thank you. The reason
4 I thought we wanted to put it in there is because if
5 the -- it doesn't say that. It says you have a chair and
6 a vice chair. And unless we had actually heard that the
7 other Commission did rotate, I don't that would have ever
8 occurred to us, and we would have a chair and a vice
9 chair, period. And I thought it was extremely valuable,
10 the rotating.

11 Now how often, you know, how much it's done, I
12 thought just to give the next Commissions -- you know,
13 because say this next one doesn't, and then from then on,
14 all Commissions just assumed that's the way it is, you
15 just have a chair and a vice chair. I think it would be
16 a loss for future Commissions because I believe each of
17 our different perspectives added things, and also had us
18 all feel a little bit more sense of ownership and more
19 involvement in it, which I think was -- I thought was
20 extremely valuable, which is why I thought, you know,
21 just to be a little bit more explicit and I'm talking
22 about low-hanging fruit. Like, yeah. You know, it
23 doesn't mean you can't do it so I thought we should put
24 it in.

25 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Commissioner Taylor. Commissioner

1 Taylor. Did you lose me, or did we lose Commissioner
2 Taylor?

3 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Taylor. We can hear you.

4 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Got it. Great. Thank you.
5 Commissioner Le Mons.

6 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay. Yeah, thank you for
7 that, Commissioner Akutagawa and Commissioner Andersen.

8 I think if the committee who's putting forward the
9 motion is a little skittish about adding that, I would
10 suggest there would be no harm not to add it.

11 We decided to make the decision we made with the
12 language being the way it is. And I think future
13 Commissions will also have the benefit of the history
14 because it won't stop with us or 2010. So they can go
15 back and see what 2010 did, they can see what 2020 did,
16 they can see what 2030 did. And who knows where things
17 will be in 2060 and so on and so forth.

18 So that would just say that I support the committee
19 to keep the motion as they've written if they're not
20 comfortable including so we can move forward.

21 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons.
22 Commissioner Taylor.

23 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah, thank you. So I don't
24 see that as it's written as being restrictive. So I
25 don't necessarily see the need for the amendment. My two

1 cents, thank you.

2 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you. Okay. With that, let's
3 go to public comment.

4 Kristian, if you could help us read the
5 instructions.

6 MR. MANOFF: Sure thing, Chair.

7 In order to maximize transparency and public
8 participation in our process, the commissioners will be
9 taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the
10 telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is
11 877-853-5247. When prompted, enter the meeting ID number
12 provided on the livestream feed. It is 89487739062 for
13 this meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID,
14 simply press pound.

15 Once you've dialed in, you'll be placed in a queue.
16 To indicate you wish to comment, please press star 9.
17 This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it's
18 your turn to speak, you'll hear a message that says the
19 host would like you to talk, press star 6 to speak. If
20 you'd like to give your name, please state and spell it
21 for the record. You are not required to provide your
22 name to give public comment.

23 Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream
24 audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your
25 call. Once you're waiting in the queue, be alert for

1 when it is your turn to speak. And again, please turn
2 down the livestream volume.

3 And we don't have any callers at this time, Chair.

4 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Let's pause while we wait
5 for the livestream to catch up.

6 Commissioner Taylor, did you have anything else to
7 add?

8 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: No. I did a (indiscernible).

9 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Very well.

10 MR. MANOFF: And those instructions are complete on
11 the screen, Chair, and there is no one in the queue.

12 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Okay.

13 So do we have Director Hernandez or someone else on
14 staff who is ready to -- there we go.

15 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: I'll read the motion. The
16 motion to move forward with legislative -- oh, one
17 second. One second, Chair.

18 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: No worries.

19 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Chair, if you give me a couple
20 of minutes. I have to reboot here.

21 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Of course. The tech gremlins.

22 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yes.

23 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yes, Commissioner Andersen.

24 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes, thank you. I thought
25 while we're waiting, could the -- you know, we're going

1 to go ahead with this motion, and I'm just hoping that
2 the committee might submit all of our ideas to the
3 legislature because they might go, oh, you know what, in
4 their minds, it might make sense to add a couple of other
5 items with what we're proposing.

6 I'd hate for them -- I'd hate for us to itemize,
7 that they might think, hey, this really goes well and
8 want to champion it for us, not to be put forward because
9 we didn't actually kind of agree on it. They might
10 come -- you know, realizing it's an interim process.

11 I just hope that the committee would -- the
12 subcommittee would please, you know, show them at least
13 our full list. Particularly since all the time and
14 effort you guys put into making it and the discussions
15 involved in the items so far. Thank you.

16 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez and
17 then Commissioner Sinay. And then let's take the vote.

18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. And I was just going
19 to respond to Commissioner Andersen. Yes, we would share
20 the entire list with them. And I just want to also
21 reiterate that we will continue to come back to the items
22 in the other -- the Cs and the Ds to see if there's any
23 more that we want to move forward. So we're not done
24 yet. Thank you.

25 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Commissioner Sinay.

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm not sure I feel comfortable
2 showing them the whole list until we've all agreed and
3 asked to move it forward. I mean, obviously it's a
4 public list, so yes, you can share it with them. But I
5 would feel more comfortable if we actually have the
6 conversations, we come to an agreement before we just
7 hand it to the legislature for them, you know, to put it
8 in the -- I know it's an iterative process and all that,
9 but it's gets hard -- I don't know. I just -- I don't
10 feel comfortable doing it that way. That's not how we
11 discussed it up to now.

12 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Commissioner Akutagawa, do you have
13 a response specific to that point?

14 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So Commissioner
15 Sinay, I hear what you're saying. I think my first
16 thought is that it's a public document, so they're going
17 to see the whole list anyways, but I think in terms of
18 our follow-up conversation, it will be specific to the
19 specific things that we've all have an agreement on.

20 I was thinking that in terms of the whole list being
21 seen by them, again it's a public document so they're
22 going to see it anyways. But our conversation is going
23 to center around the very specific things that we're
24 voting on right now.

25 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thanks. Okay.

1 Director Hernandez, can you read out the motion as
2 you have it and then call for the vote?

3 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yes, Chair.

4 Motion to move forward with legislative changes
5 listed in Group A, that's A1, A2, A3, A4, and A6 of
6 potential legislation changes handout. A6 with edits,
7 three days' public notice for meetings. And this is
8 where we've added, held three months before map deadline
9 in the year ending in the number of 1.

10 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Committee, does this reflect your
11 motion?

12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It does. Just no end
13 parenthesis after 1, right, Commissioner Akutagawa?

14 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: All right. Thank you. Okay.

15 COMMISSIONER YEE: I think there might be a call,
16 Chair.

17 MR. MANOFF: There are no callers in the queue.

18 COMMISSIONER YEE: No? Okay. I'm sorry. My bad.

19 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: All right. So we'll go ahead
20 and start the vote.

21 Commissioner Yee.

22 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

23 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Ahmad.

24 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.

25 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Akutagawa.

1 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

2 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen.

3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Abstain.

4 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fernandez.

5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

6 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fornaciari.

7 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yes.

8 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Kennedy.

9 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Abstain.

10 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Le Mons?

11 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

12 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sadhwani.

13 Commissioner Sinay.

14 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

15 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Taylor.

16 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

17 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Toledo.

18 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

19 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Turner.

20 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

21 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: And Commissioner Vazquez.

22 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yes.

23 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: The motion passes.

24 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thanks, everyone.

25 Commissioner Andersen, did you have a comment?

1 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: You know, I did. And the
2 reason I want to quickly abstain on that one is I thought
3 it was just the three months, you know, before the maps
4 whenever that happened to be, because now ending in 1
5 means like, that wouldn't pertain to us when we actually
6 made maps. Well, I guess we technically didn't.

7 But if it got kicked like a few days, it wouldn't
8 pertain, and so I thought it was just ending in three
9 months, period. Not in the year ending in 1. I thought
10 that was a residual from the language that Commissioner
11 Yee -- I misunderstood that as the wording that
12 Commissioner Yee was adding until right at the end just
13 before we voted. So I think that could be a bit of a
14 problem.

15 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Counsel, could we get them advice
16 about the wording of the motion and whether we need to
17 have a new motion to reflect the intent of the committee
18 and the Commission?

19 MR. PANE: Chair, I don't believe you need a revote
20 on it. No. I mean, and again, the -- where we are in
21 the process right now is not the language stage. Right
22 now is just the amendment recommendation stage and then
23 language will be crafted and then it comes back to the
24 Commission to say do you agree with this language.

25 So we can probably work out any wrinkles if there

1 are any regarding the actual language when it comes back
2 to the Commission.

3 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Perfect. Great. Okay. Thank you
4 for flagging that, Commissioner Andersen.

5 All right. Thanks for those of you who hung on for
6 our vote. Appreciate it. With that, I think -- well,
7 first, does long-term planning committee have any
8 additional -- I'm seeing no. Okay.

9 Then let's move to our redistricting engagement
10 subcommittee. I don't know who that is.

11 COMMISSIONER YEE: It's Commissioner Sinay and
12 myself I believe.

13 Commissioner Sinay, did you want to --

14 COMMISSIONER SINAY: All right. Sorry, the gardener
15 is out there, and I couldn't hear you. And then when
16 it -- I could tell that no one else was talking, I was
17 like, oh, that's me.

18 So we are in the process of -- first of all, I
19 wanted to thank Commissioner Vazquez and Commissioner
20 Fornaciari, are working with the New Mexico Common Cause
21 to submit an op-ed there. And that -- basically they
22 were selected because Commissioner Fornaciari spoke to
23 the New Mexico Commission that -- when we were nascent
24 and they were nascent, and so as the chair and the vice
25 chair, we thought that that would be a good team. So

1 thank you for taking that on.

2 Commissioner Yee and I are drafting two documents.
3 One is a two-pager that just kind of outlines what would
4 be a -- you know, kind of our ideas and including some
5 the thoughts that are coming from League of Women Voters
6 and Common Cause on what a national conference for
7 commissioners of independent redistricting commissions
8 might look like.

9 And the argument being that a lot of people, a lot
10 of pundits, a lot of advocates, a lot of academia have
11 written about independent redistricting commissions and
12 redistricting, but because the IRCs are so new, there
13 hasn't been a lot of conversation across commissions like
14 we had at our last meeting. And there are some topics
15 that we are the only real experts on because we've gone
16 through it and it could be a unique opportunity to learn
17 from each other. So we're drafting that, and the idea
18 of -- that piece is really to get the buy-in from
19 potential sponsors and you know, kind of start
20 solidifying.

21 And then the second piece -- the second document
22 we're drafting right now is a simple proposal. Just for
23 funding for those items on our bucket list -- not bucket
24 list, but doc list, that falls outside of our mandate.
25 So if we are invited to speak at a conference or if we --

1 you know, a lot of the travel arrangements and all, all
2 the things that would come into play in kind of helping
3 promote independent redistricting commissions out -- you
4 know, that is outside of our mandate that we've
5 discussed.

6 And we are having conversations with Common Cause
7 about actually getting funding for them to have a staff
8 person who can help coordinate commissioners, not just
9 from California, but from other places for these type of
10 events. Our staff can't do that. And so it would be --
11 so we're drafting something that wouldn't be coming from
12 us. And the funding wouldn't be coming to the system
13 redistricting commissions but it would be, you know, kind
14 of a project in partnership with Common Cause and really
15 the money would be going there.

16 So those are just the two pieces that we're drafting
17 just to kind of starting to solidify some of the ideas
18 and some of the things that have come up.

19 Also with the idea that, as we were reminded today,
20 we're powerless now. You know, people are going to start
21 forgetting -- you know, right now -- you know, people are
22 still interested in the IRCs and we're still all together
23 and so let's talk to funders about getting the funding
24 now to do other work.

25 Any questions, thoughts, comments? Thanks

1 everybody.

2 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yep. Sounds like you have the
3 consensus. Great. Okay.

4 We technically have -- we're technically in the
5 portion of the agenda that is continue, recap, and next
6 steps. But since I think we are, you know, continuing to
7 extend this conversation, we're never going to be sort of
8 closing out lessons learned, at least not for the short
9 term. So maybe I will just open it up one last time for
10 any reflections, but I do think we're probably headed
11 toward calling for public comment at four and adjourning
12 shortly. So if you could please keep your reflections
13 brief.

14 Oh, we do need -- thank you, Commissioner Fernandez,
15 for the reminder.

16 We need public comment to close out our agenda item
17 3, subcommittee report, so if -- Kristian, if you could
18 help us with instructions, and then Director Kaplan, I
19 see your hand.

20 MR. MANOFF: Sure thing. The Commission will now
21 take public comment on agenda item 3. To give comment,
22 please call 877-853-5247 and enter meeting ID number
23 89487739062. Once you've dialed in, please press star 9
24 to enter the comment queue. The full call-in
25 instructions are read at the beginning of the meeting and

1 are provided on the livestream landing page.

2 And there's no one in the queue at this time, Chair.

3 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thank you.

4 Director Kaplan.

5 DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Thank you. I just wanted to -- I
6 know this is probably the last opportunity I'm going to
7 see all of you together. I just really want to thank
8 everyone for this extraordinary opportunity. I learned
9 so much from all of you. I also really just want to
10 acknowledge and thank all of the staff, particularly
11 Alvaro and others, just for how supported I was
12 throughout this whole process.

13 I think we were all thrown into something so
14 extraordinary. We kind of had the sense of what would
15 come, but really there was so many things that we
16 accomplished over the last year or so that I was on
17 board. So I just really want to acknowledge that and
18 thank you all for how supportive you were through this.
19 I learned so much from everyone. And really thanking the
20 public also. I really thought that this was such a
21 collaborative process.

22 And really just, you know, an opportunity for me to
23 continue my passion for civic engagement and I just feel
24 to lucky and fortunate to have had this time with all of
25 you. And I hope to stay in touch with you, and I look

1 forward to see what happens over the next eight years and
2 in 2030 and seeing independent redistricting expand
3 across the U.S. also. So thank you, everyone.

4 MR. MANOFF: And it looks like we do have a caller.
5 If called 0003 wants to make a comment, please press star
6 9. All right. We do have a caller with their hand
7 raised. Just a moment.

8 Caller 0003, please follow the prompts to unmute.
9 The floor is yours.

10 MS. NIMMERS: Hi. Can you hear me?

11 MR. MANOFF: We sure can. Go ahead.

12 MS. NIMMERS: Hi Commissioners. My name is Kristin
13 Nimmers, and on behalf of the California Black Census and
14 Redistricting Hub, I'm calling to express our thanks and
15 appreciation for your work over the last year, to engage
16 communities and redraw California's map.

17 In addition to distilling a significant amount of
18 testimony to make mapping decisions, you all faced
19 unprecedented challenges with shifting timelines, delayed
20 data, and working to engage California residents during a
21 pandemic. And despite these new challenges, you made
22 your deadline, delivered maps for the state that largely
23 upheld the principles of equity, inclusion, fairness, and
24 justice with no legal challenge.

25 And while we didn't agree with every decision, we

1 believe you had the best interest of Californians in the
2 decisions you made. And we appreciate the Commission's
3 effort throughout the process to uplift equity, listen to
4 black voices, and protect black communities of interest.

5 Thank you all so much for your work that you've done
6 over the past several months and look forward to
7 continuing to engage with you as you work to make the
8 process better and set the stage for commissioners that
9 will follow you. Thank you.

10 MR. MANOFF: Thank you. And that was all of our
11 callers, Chair.

12 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thanks so much. I'm also
13 realizing we technically need to call for public comment
14 for item 5, continuing lessons learned. Do we just need
15 to make an announcement? I'm not sure how this goes.

16 MR. MANOFF: We can certainly call for public
17 comment again.

18 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Anthony, do you have a --

19 MR. PANE: So Chair, I could -- I mean, my
20 understanding is all that's left is taking general public
21 comment; is that right?

22 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yes. I'm getting lots of messages
23 in the chat to add things to our discussion.

24 MR. PANE: Okay. Then just to cover our bases then,
25 Chair, then maybe we'll want to just proceed. My thought

1 was maybe we could just call for general public comment
2 but no, we'll just do agenda 3, item 3.

3 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Got it.

4 MR. MANOFF: So we did -- we just did item 3. Do
5 you want to do item 5?

6 MR. PANE: 5.

7 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Item --

8 MR. PANE: Sorry about that. 5, yes.

9 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yes.

10 MR. MANOFF: Okay. Item 5.

11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No, not 5. 5 is closed
12 session. We want 4.

13 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: I have --

14 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, on mine.

15 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yes. Item 5, we're calling for
16 public comment on item 5, continuing lessons learned.

17 MR. MANOFF: Got it.

18 The Commission will now take public comment on item
19 number 5. To give comment, please call 877-853-5247 and
20 enter meeting ID number 89487739062. Once you've dialed
21 in, please press star 9 to enter the comment queue. The
22 full call-in instructions were read previously and are
23 provided on the livestream landing page.

24 And for those in the queue, if you would like to
25 comment on item number 5, continue lessons learned,

1 please press star 9.

2 We have no raised hands in the queue, Chair.

3 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Okay. Thank you. Okay.

4 I had gotten some requests to add things. Could
5 I -- let's see. Let's do Commissioner Fornaciari, Yee,
6 and Fernandez. And then I will make a judgment call
7 about how much time we have left.

8 MR. MANOFF: I'm so sorry to interrupt, Chair, but
9 we do have a caller now with their hands raised, would
10 you like to take that call?

11 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yes. Let's do the caller first.

12 MR. MANOFF: All right. Great.

13 Caller with the last four digits 2829, if you could
14 please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

15 FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes. I would like to comment on
16 the legislative list. I guess that's part of the lessons
17 learned. But I guess item C1, allowing no party
18 preference to be represented as a political party, I
19 don't think that's a good idea.

20 There's, like, 15 million people that are
21 represented by the two most populous parties, and there's
22 only 6 million people that aren't registered in the most
23 populous parties. And if you start adding to the
24 Commission another seat for the no party preference, that
25 15 million will lose close to 5 percent representation on

1 the Commission. And I think proportionately 15 versus 6
2 million people that are not part of the two parties, that
3 the balance of population representation won't be fair on
4 the Commission.

5 So I think you need to keep the Commission at 14.
6 That's my comment for your lessons learned. Thank you.

7 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you so much for your
8 perspective.

9 MR. MANOFF: Thank you. And there are no further
10 callers in the queue at this time, Chair.

11 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thank you, Kristian.

12 Okay. Commissioners Fornaciari, Yee, and then
13 Fernandez.

14 VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: So as far as April goes, I
15 believe the plan is to have the meeting April 27th in
16 Anaheim? I think that is why Director Hernandez just
17 raised his hand.

18 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Okay. Any discussion Director
19 Hernandez? Anything to add?

20 DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: No. We're still working on the
21 location in Anaheim. We're very close to securing it.
22 But it is on the 27th. We'll have Sacramento and
23 Anaheim. Thank you.

24 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thank you. All right,
25 everyone, hold it on your calendars.

1 Commissioner Yee.

2 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. If there's time today, I'm
3 sorry for not managing our guest list closely, but we do
4 have Raul available today, and we had asked him to speak
5 to the question of contracting time lines, which, of
6 course, is such an issue in our experience and in our
7 lessons learned so if there's time today, he could
8 discuss that, but if not, then, you know, he's going to
9 be with us for a while, so. Thank you.

10 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thanks. Great. Thanks for
11 flagging that. Maybe let's -- we can dedicate 15
12 minutes, if folks are amenable to that piece of the
13 conversation and we'll get to him right after
14 Commissioner Fernandez.

15 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. And I will be
16 quick. Thank you for the April 27th date. I would like
17 to have the meeting scheduled out all the way until
18 August if possible. So hopefully at the next meeting --
19 because we really need to get the dates on the calendars
20 for individuals and then you go into the summer months.
21 And those tend to get a little busy.

22 I would recommend at least maybe one per month, and
23 maybe a half day. I don't know if we would need two, but
24 maybe just in case you could always cancel the half day.
25 That's just my request. Thank you.

1 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you for expressing your
2 preference. Okay.

3 Raul, if you are available, we would love to take an
4 additional 15 minutes of your time. Thanks for waiting
5 for us. If you're available, we would love to hear your
6 perspective on contracting timeline.

7 MR. VILLANUEVA: All right. Well, hello,
8 commissioners. Good to see everybody.

9 What I thought I'd do is I'd cover the three RFPs
10 and then all the marketing contracts because the
11 marketing contracts all kind of occurred at one single
12 bounce.

13 So we had three RFPs, the line drawer, the VRA
14 council, and the videography RFP. The line drawer RFP
15 took five and a half months. The development of the
16 statement of work and the RFP took approximately from
17 October to December of 2020. A large part of that was
18 attributed to work by the subcommittee and gathering
19 background information. And then a lot of work by the
20 Commission in eliciting public comment in terms of
21 drafts.

22 It was posted January 16th. It was reviewed -- the
23 bids were reviewed on February 19th, in other words one
24 month for the bidders to review the RFP and ask questions
25 and submit their bid. It was awarded by February 25th.

1 The contact team went from February 28th to March 8th,
2 which is basically going out and getting the contract
3 signatures. It went to all of us March 8th and was
4 approved approximately March 24th and started March 24th.

5 The VRA council contract took seven months.
6 Development of the statement of work took about two
7 weeks. Development of the solicitation took about two
8 and a half weeks. It went out December 18th and one and
9 a half months were provided for the respondents to
10 review, ask questions, and submit their proposals.

11 From February 10th to approximately March 29th, the
12 initial interviews were rescheduled. Part of that
13 because of trying to schedule it in the meetings and part
14 of that in terms of work with the subcommittee and the
15 CRC again making reviews, discussions, eliciting public
16 comment. And there was a big discussion at one point
17 over the conflict of interest disclosures as you may
18 recall.

19 April 1st through May 6th, there was further
20 subcommittee discussions and public comment taken. As
21 the contract actually was being put together, May 6th
22 through June 3rd, it was the gathering of signatures and
23 it took a while to get the response from the AG, AG's
24 office, to allow the Commission to get the outside
25 counsel. It was sent to OLS June 3rd and approved June

1 9th.

2 The videography RFP took two and a half months. The
3 statement of work and the RFP was put together between
4 February 9th and March 10th. It was put out March 16th,
5 giving two weeks for the bidders to review, ask
6 questions, and submit their bids. The bids were reviewed
7 March 30th through 31st. It was awarded April 10th. On
8 April 11th it went to OLS and was approved and returned
9 to us April 15th.

10 So if I may, a lot of the process of the RFP has
11 basic minimums in terms of how long something should go.
12 So in terms of minimums, how long it goes out to the
13 bidders, the process for whether or not there's a protest
14 period.

15 One of the things I think that was a hallmark for
16 this Commission which did add time to your RFPs, though,
17 was a lot of time really looking into developing
18 discussing, going back and forth between subcommittee and
19 the CRC. And also eliciting a lot of public comment,
20 which I think was a strength for you, and I think you had
21 much stronger results because of all of those discussions
22 even though it did add time.

23 The outreach contracts, they were requested I think
24 approximately June 14. 15th through the 21st, Fredy and
25 I worked to develop templates for the solicitations and

1 identifying prospective businesses to send it to. By
2 June 21st through 28th, we finished developing the
3 templates, a prospective budget, and identified the
4 potential bidders.

5 Between July 9th and July 24th, bid requests were
6 sent to all the different zones. And the first awards
7 were being made July 17th. July 26th, the first awards
8 were being made. And between August 1st and 15th,
9 various other contracts were being developed and being
10 sent for signature.

11 The first contracts were sent then August 10th
12 through 12th to OLS for approval and returned as early as
13 August 13. And we kept getting -- so you sent a lot of
14 the contracts in batches. So there was a total of nine
15 contracts, most of which were developed in two and a half
16 months and available for the Commission's use.

17 So I don't know if anyone has any questions on those
18 or?

19 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thanks so much, Raul.

20 MR. VILLANUEVA: You're welcome. I think the small
21 business route is really the best one for the Commission
22 to use when it's -- when it's a viable means. Obviously
23 for the line drawer and the VRA councils, it has to go a
24 different route. Things like videography where you're
25 going to see a large amount of expenditure related to it,

1 an RFP is probably more appropriate, as the small
2 business has a 250K cap to it. And that's really the
3 reason we went with the RFP for the videography.

4 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thank you.

5 Commissioner Yee.

6 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. Thanks, Raul, for that
7 summary. And what a trip down memory lane.

8 I was wondering if you could -- it looks like you
9 might have it already in writing. I'm wondering if you
10 could just send it to us so we could include the whole --
11 all those dates in our lessons learned report.

12 MR. VILLANUEVA: Sure. I have a -- I have an
13 overview that I can provide your executive director --

14 COMMISSIONER YEE: Right.

15 MR. VILLANUEVA: -- for him to send out to you.

16 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. Excellent. Thanks.

17 And you know, just being reminded how long the VRA
18 and line drawer contracts took and you know, if we had
19 not had the extra time, what a crunch that would have
20 been. You know, so I don't know, any quick thoughts on
21 how to expedite those processes next time?

22 MR. VILLANUEVA: You know, whenever there's a large
23 interplay between a subcommittee and the Commission, you
24 have to pair the two so that one occurs same day or
25 within a very close space of the other.

1 Otherwise, the subcommittees being given a task,
2 performing its work, they were waiting to notify the
3 Commission and get that agendaized for the Commission to
4 meet and discuss. The Commission meets and discusses it,
5 provides additional information or work to the
6 subcommittee. Now the subcommittee's got to meet -- the
7 legal advisory committee met live. And so being able to
8 schedule that and have the videographers and everything
9 ready to be able to do it live and agendaize it.

10 So it's those scheduling things and then the basics
11 of having the meetings that extends the time there.

12 COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

13 MR. VILLANUEVA: One of those necessary evils.

14 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Any other questions from
15 commissioners?

16 Commissioner Sinay.

17 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So we were caught off guard by
18 how long everything took. But you know, Mr. Villanueva,
19 were you caught off guard? I mean, you know, you've been
20 part of kind of the state bureaucracy and you were
21 trained in this. So were you caught off guard? And if
22 you weren't, then I don't think that for lessons learned,
23 we so much need to put in every single contract and how
24 long it took, but more guidelines around how long it can
25 take.

1 Because, Commissioner Yee, you were the one you said
2 let's keep the lessons learned document short and sweet
3 so people read it.

4 MR. VILLANUEVA: Right. If I had to respond, in
5 contracting, just as it is with hires, being able to
6 define the statement of work or what the person is going
7 to do is the critical beginning part of the process. I
8 put the two together because I think one of the
9 challenges this go around versus in 2010 was a lot of
10 additional discussion in developing statements of work,
11 for the line drawers especially, and then for contract
12 provisions for the VRA council.

13 That being said, I'm not saying that that was
14 necessarily a bad thing. There was a lot of thought put
15 into that statement of work for the line drawer, which I
16 think delivered a better product. But if I'm going to --
17 if I'm going to respond in terms of where I thought it
18 took longer, those would be the two.

19 As far as contracting goes, we contract pretty much
20 two to four times faster than the state does. That's how
21 long it can take if you have, say, DGS do it for you.
22 That being said, it's still a cumbersome process and
23 trying to meet the requirements of the state, protect
24 your interests, and protect the fact that we're working
25 with public funds and those requirements, those are kind

1 of musts that we have -- we just have to work with.

2 But I would agree with you, it is a cumbersome
3 process.

4 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Commissioner Andersen. And then I
5 have just a comment.

6 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I want to thank you,
7 Raul, for helping us in that, through all those time
8 lines, the process. It was a learning experience, I
9 think, for almost everyone involved. And there kept on
10 being surprises that at times we realized, looking back,
11 we probably did hear but didn't understand. And so I
12 think in that memo, if you could outline from your
13 perspective the items that are absolutely necessary
14 within the time frame.

15 Like, you know, just one example you brought up in
16 the line drawing, you know, there is the protest periods.
17 You know, certain periods of time have to be there. You
18 can't shorten it. And if you could kind of include that
19 in your review of those. That would I think be very,
20 very helpful for all of us.

21 But as a person who worked a lot on one of the
22 contracts, I really want to thank you and make sure the
23 Commission knows how much work you put in to help us meet
24 our goals. Thank you very much.

25 MR. VILLANUEVA: You're welcome. But that -- it was

1 a pleasure working with both subcommittees on the line
2 drawer and the VRA council. Great -- great processes.
3 Lengthy, but I think the results speak for themselves.

4 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: And I just -- I think Commissioner
5 Andersen, you put it very well. I do recall Raul in some
6 of our first meetings, you were very clear and explicit
7 that contracting could be a cumbersome, lengthy process
8 that would chew up a lot of the extra time that we did
9 have. And so just wanted to acknowledge that, you know,
10 again, heard that message but maybe as a whole we didn't
11 quite internalize what that meant because we don't have
12 sort of the right frame of reference or perspective in
13 the way that you do.

14 So I also just wanted to acknowledge that. I do
15 recall you talking about how lengthy and cumbersome the
16 contracting process was, but, simply, I think for many of
17 us not having that kind of perspective of what a long
18 time is in state speak, I think it's hard to
19 conceptualize until you are in it. But thank you.

20 MR. VILLANUEVA: Right. You're welcome.

21 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: All right. Any other questions for
22 Mr. Villanueva?

23 Okay. Thank you so much. Sorry to have kept you
24 waiting this afternoon, but thank you again.

25 MR. VILLANUEVA: No problem. You're welcome. Good

1 luck to all of you. Have a great day. Tomorrow is a
2 holiday. Please enjoy.

3 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you so much.

4 Okay. I think all we have left now is general
5 public comment. So Kristian, if you could help us out.

6 MR. MANOFF: Sure thing. The Commission will now
7 take general public comments. To give comment, please
8 call 877-853-5247 and enter meeting ID number
9 89487739062. Once you've dialed in, please press star 9
10 to enter the comment queue. The full call-in
11 instructions were read previously and are provided on the
12 livestream landing page.

13 And we have no callers at this time, Chair.

14 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Okay. We will give it a minute to
15 catch up with the livestream.

16 Commissioner Turner.

17 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I just wanted to quickly
18 say I was really glad to hear from Ms. Nimmers with the
19 Redistricting Hub that called in to give us a thanks for
20 the redrawing of the lines, and just wanted to
21 acknowledge that and say we appreciate the
22 acknowledgement of the hard work that we did to ensure
23 equity in this process. Thank you.

24 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you so much. I definitely
25 echo that thanks. And I'm glad that folks are still

1 following along. The maps are done, but the work
2 continues. And so thank you to all of our public
3 partners and community members who are staying engaged in
4 their own ways.

5 MR. MANOFF: Those instructions are complete on the
6 screen, Chair, and there are no callers in the queue.

7 CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Okay. Well, I think with that,
8 unless there are any objections, we will adjourn this
9 meeting, and we'll see everybody on the 27th in Anaheim
10 or Sacramento. Great. Okay, everyone, have a good
11 afternoon.

12 (Whereupon, the CRC Business Meeting adjourned
13 at 4:30 p.m.)

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 10th day of April, 2022.



JACQUELINE DENLINGER CET-797

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.

Michelle S. Walker

April 10, 2022

MICHELLE S. WALKER