

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION (CRC)

In the matter of:
CRC BUSINESS MEETING

TUESDAY, JULY 13, 2021

4:00 p.m.

Transcription By:
eScribers, LLC



APPEARANCESCOMMISSIONERS

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

STAFF

Alvaro Hernandez, Executive Director
Ravindar Singh, Administrative Assistant
Marian Johnston, CRC Legal Counsel
Anthony Pane, Chief Counsel
Marcy Kaplan, Director of Outreach

TECHNICAL CONTRACTORS

Kristian Manoff, AV Technical Director
Katy Manoff, Public Comment Moderator

VRA Counsel Strumwasser & Woocher

David Becker, Counsel
Salvador Perez, Counsel
Fredric Woocher, Counsel

Also PresentPUBLIC COMMENT

Karen Lawson
Dylan Johnson, SEIU California
Sandra Barreiro, California School Employees Association
Efrain Mercado, California Teachers Association
Morgan
Karina Diaz, Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights
Alejandra Ramirez-Zarate, Advancement Project California
Jessica Panduro, InnerCity Struggle
David Bane, San Diego County Independent Redistricting
Commission
Kristin Nimmers, Black Census and Redistricting Hub

PUBLIC COMMENT (Continued)

Rosalind Gold, NALEO Educational Fund

Alejandra Ponce De Leon, Advancement Project California

Renee Westa-Lusk

Veronica Carrizales, California Calls

Julia Marks, Asian Americans Advancing Justice

Peter Cannon

Deborah Howard, California Senior Advocates League

James Woodson, Black Census and Redistricting Hub

Jonathan Mehta Stein, California Common Cause

INDEX

	<u>PAGE</u>
Call to Order and Roll Call	5
Public Comment	8
VRA Training	18
Closed Session	61
Public Comment	66
Government Affairs Subcommittee Update	82
Public Comment	106
Government Affairs Subcommittee Update (Cont'g)	110
Public Comment	137
Government Affairs Subcommittee Update (Cont'g)	144
Public Comment	151
Government Affairs Subcommittee Update (Cont'g)	156
Vote on Motion re: Request to Supreme Court	163
Discussion: Statutory Comment Period	165
Language Access Committee Update	167
Discussion: Statutory Comment Period (Cont'g)	172
Vote on Motion re: Statutory Comment Period	175
Adjournment	178

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 July 13, 2021

4:00 p.m.

3 CHAIR YEE: Good afternoon, California. And welcome
4 to a business meeting of the California Citizens
5 Redistricting Commission. I am Commissioner Russell Yee,
6 and I'll be chairing today's meeting. Ravi, could we
7 have the roll call, please?

8 MR. SINGH: Yes, Chair.

9 Commissioner Ahmad?

10 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

11 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Akutagawa?

12 VICE CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Here.

13 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Andersen?

14 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here.

15 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fernandez?

16 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Presente.

17 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fornaciari?

18 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

19 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Kennedy?

20 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

21 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Le Mons?

22 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here.

23 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sadhwani?

24 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.

25 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sinay?

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.

2 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Taylor?

3 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Presente.

4 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Toledo?

5 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Here.

6 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Turner?

7 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.

8 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Vazquez?

9 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Here.

10 MR. SINGH: And Commissioner Yee?

11 CHAIR YEE: Here.

12 MR. SINGH: You have a quorum, Chair.

13 CHAIR YEE: Thank you, Ravi. For today's meeting,
14 the published agenda has our usual full line-up. But
15 because it's a shorter meeting, we're going to select out
16 just some of those items. I have an estimated schedule
17 for you, which is in today's -- it is or will be in
18 today's handouts. We'll also share a screen with you
19 right now. So we're going to start off after we open
20 with our usual opening public comments.

21 We'll start off with some VRA training. We will
22 then be going into closed session. After that, number 4,
23 Government Affairs Subcommittee will lead a discussion
24 about our timeline and possible decision about landing on
25 a final map timeline. And we know that's an item of

1 great interest to many people. So that will be
2 happening, we estimate around 5:45. After that, Line
3 Drawing Subcommittee has some items to report.

4 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That -- it'll be a very
5 short item today.

6 CHAIR YEE: Oh, okay. So less than half an hour?

7 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Definitely.

8 CHAIR YEE: Okay. After that, whenever a line
9 drawing is done, then we'll have Language Access to
10 update us on language interpretation for upcoming
11 community of interest meetings. Then if there's time,
12 we'll go to Public Input Design Committee for a
13 discussion on considering whether or not to have group
14 input at input meetings. Okay? So that's how things are
15 looking.

16 Again, this is in the handouts for today and these
17 times are estimated, especially the timeline discussion.
18 We know that's of great interest to many people. And so
19 if it does go on longer than we're estimating here, we
20 are prepared to go as late as 10:30 p.m. We're
21 definitely hoping not to go that way, but staff is
22 available to go that late if the discussion calls for it.

23 Okay. Any other announcements or for today's
24 meeting? If not, let's go ahead and go to opening public
25 comments.

1 And we have Katy here. Hi, Katy.

2 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Hi, Chair.

3 In order to maximize transparency and public
4 participation in our process, the Commissioners will be
5 taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the
6 telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is
7 877-853-5247. When prompted to enter the meeting ID
8 number provided on the livestream feed, it is 95977110538
9 for this meeting. Once you -- when prompted to enter a
10 participant ID, simply press the pound key.

11 Once you have dialed in, you'll be placed in a
12 queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press
13 star 9. This will raise your hand for the moderator.
14 When it's your turn to speak, you'll hear a message that
15 says, the host would like you to talk, and the press star
16 6 to speak.

17 If you would like to give your name, please state
18 and spell it for the record. You are not required to
19 provide your name to give public comment. Please make
20 sure to mute your computer or livestream audio to prevent
21 any feedback or distortion during your call. Once you
22 are waiting in the queue, be alert for when it is your
23 turn to speak. And again, please turn down the
24 livestream volume.

25 And again, for those that have called in at this



1 time, I see raised hands and I'd also like to advise
2 those that have not raised their hand, to please press
3 star 9 indicating you wish to comment. But right now we
4 will start with caller 7554. If you will please follow
5 the prompts to unmute.

6 Caller 7554, the floor is yours.

7 MS. LAWSON: Good afternoon. My name is Karen
8 Lawson, spelled K-A-R-E-N, L-A-W-S-O-N. And I am
9 volunteering as an organizer in the Southern California
10 area, urging individuals and community groups to
11 participate in public input. We've been unable to access
12 a repository of the emails and the COI tool submissions
13 that have been received to date.

14 The purpose of my comment this afternoon is to
15 request that the Commission please post the process and
16 access point so that we can gain visibility to the input
17 public information hopefully organized by zone, if that's
18 possible, and also to please provide this access in a
19 timely manner before the end of the current cycle of
20 input hearings. Thank you very much.

21 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Chair, you're
22 on mute. Looks like you're --

23 CHAIR YEE: Thank you, Ms. Lawson. We empathize
24 with your frustration, and you're not alone. We are
25 still working on the Airtable presentation software that

1 will enable us to post those community of interest input
2 items. And does anyone on staff or any Commissioners
3 have an update for us on where that's at and when the
4 caller can look forward to making access to inputs?

5 Perhaps Director Hernandez.

6 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. I was going to
7 defer to the subcommittee, the Data Management
8 Subcommittee, to provide some information.

9 VICE CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Ahmad?

10 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Would you like for us to share
11 that information now or during our report out?

12 CHAIR YEE: Now, if it can be done so briefly.

13 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay. It can be. We do have
14 exciting news that the contract has been approved and
15 gone through with Airtable. And that was the last piece
16 that was holding us back. As I had mentioned in previous
17 meetings, it's not as simple as putting in a credit card
18 number and clicking buy. So our team has worked
19 tirelessly to get this process in place. So now we have
20 a contract in place and we're ready to move forward with
21 Airtable.

22 CHAIR YEE: Very good.

23 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Trena -- or Commissioner
24 Turner, do you have anything else?

25 COMMISSIONER TURNER: I'm expecting more than very

1 good. I was looking for that little thing emoji that
2 goes [woo]. But yeah, we don't have one of those.

3 CHAIR YEE: Very exciting. Obviously. You know, we
4 would have wanted to have this all in place for even the
5 first input meeting, but we just -- it just didn't work
6 out that way. So we appreciate your patience, Ms.
7 Lawson. And we hope you will find Airtable very useful
8 once it's up and running soon.

9 Commissioner Akutagawa?

10 VICE CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: I think for the purposes of
11 Ms. Lawson as well as any others who are listening, can
12 you give us a time frame as to when it will become
13 available?

14 Commissioner Ahmad or Turner?

15 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. Thank you. For -- of
16 course, everything that was processed through the
17 community of interest tool, we believe that will be -- it
18 will be, like, a two-pronged approach. So that will be
19 more of an automatic process. And we can probably give
20 you a better update once everything is finalized,
21 complete, people are in place.

22 The other is a matter of, just like the transcripts
23 and what have you, it has to be input and that will take
24 a little bit longer before we'll actually see those. But
25 at the moment, I don't want to give a false date. The

1 moment we have a definite date, we can let you know a
2 little bit better, but it'll happen in two different
3 phases.

4 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Kennedy?

5 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I just
6 think it's important for us to clarify to the public that
7 we do not currently have access to the data. It's not
8 that we are sitting here making use of the data and not
9 giving access to the data to the public. We, the
10 Commission, do not currently have access to that data.
11 And we don't expect to have it before the public. Thank
12 you.

13 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Commissioner Andersen?

14 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And with the one exception
15 of videos of the public input meetings that we have been
16 having, the COI input meetings, those are on our website.
17 So that is available to the public just as it is to us.
18 But the bulk of it we do not have, as Commissioner
19 Kennedy just said.

20 CHAIR YEE: Okay. So we can take our next caller.
21 Katy?

22 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. And caller
23 with the last four 5405, if you will please follow the
24 prompts to unmute. Go ahead. The floor is yours.

25 MR. JOHNSON: Hello, Commissioners. This is Dylan

1 Johnson from SEIU, California. I participated in the
2 labor panel and I've testified previously on the timeline
3 item. So my common theme throughout is that there has
4 been too much focus on the number of days for the end of
5 the process and too little on how to set yourself up for
6 success from the beginning. So could the Commission use
7 more time, of course.

8 You know, I've never met a college student with a
9 term paper or a homeowner with a renovation, or Dylan
10 Johnson with a Mai Tai on vacation who couldn't use more
11 time. The question is, as we see it, not, do you want
12 more time? It's do you need more time, right? So when
13 voters passed Prop 20, they said four and a half months
14 after the release of census data was enough.

15 So we encouraged the Commission to be absolutely
16 sure before asking a court to say Californian --
17 California voters were wrong in that. So unlike the 2010
18 Commission, you are going to finish the input hearings
19 before the redistricting database is released. Once
20 those hearings are done, we will recommend you give
21 direction on which communities of interest to prioritize
22 so line drawers can start drawing maps as soon as they
23 have the numbers. We would also encourage you to get
24 your racially polarized voting analysis --

25 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

1 MR. JOHNSON: -- or RPV done now, so you know where
2 the line -- the landmines are. If you can prioritize
3 outreach funds that were unavailable ten years ago, it'll
4 help you seek feedback on drafting map over the holidays.
5 So none of this is --

6 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

7 MR. JOHNSON: -- new testimony, but I hope this will
8 contribute to this evening's discussion. Again, thank
9 you so much for your continued work and for allowing us
10 to participate.

11 CHAIR YEE: Thank you, Mr. Johnson. Next call?

12 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. Next caller
13 is caller with the last four 5691. If you will, please
14 follow the prompts to unmute. Go ahead. The floor is
15 yours.

16 MS. BARREIRO: Good afternoon. Good afternoon.
17 This is Sandra Barreiro with the California School
18 Employees Association. That's S-A-N-D-R-A, and B as in
19 boy, A-R-R-E-I-R-O. You have a late start and a long
20 agenda. So rather than having ten people call in, I will
21 simply reiterate points made previously.

22 First, we encourage the Commission to move past the
23 all-or-nothing narrative. It is clear you can provide
24 some relief from the holidays while preserving the
25 traditional primary date, and you can preserve both

1 robust public input and on redistricting and robust
2 public outreach for election.

3 Second, we believe you do not need to reinvent the
4 wheel. The path for compromise has already been laid
5 out. On June 29th, the San Diego Commission wrote a
6 January 15th deadline that worked for their county. On
7 July 1st, Michigan's Commission published a roadmap with
8 a December 31st deadline for their states. And on May
9 13, the Commission Government Affairs Committee described
10 a January 7th deadline titled Scenario Four.

11 Third, in seeking compromise, we strongly encourage
12 you to ensure solutions work for all counties, regardless
13 of size. As a reminder, in 2011, every county over half
14 a million people was split in at least two plans. While
15 it works for Los Angeles and San Diego with their large
16 GIS departments, may not work for San Joaquin and Sonoma
17 with their considerably smaller resources. Thank you for
18 your time and your ongoing, thoughtful deliberation.

19 CHAIR YEE: Thank you, Ms. Barreiro. Next caller,
20 please.

21 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. Next caller
22 is caller with the last four 2962. If you could please
23 follow the prompts to unmute. Caller 2962, the floor is
24 yours.

25 MR. MERCADO: Thank you. Efrain Mercado from the

1 California Teachers Association. That's E-F-R-A-I-N,
2 Mercado, M-E-R-C-A-D-O. My colleague Tony Trigueiro
3 called in April and May with statistics from the last
4 gubernatorial primary. Respecting your time and the long
5 agenda for tonight, I will just quickly provide her
6 testimony. 3.7 million Latinos did not vote in the last
7 primary. 1.2 million Asians did not cast a ballot. 4.4
8 million registered voters under thirty-five did not show
9 up.

10 More voters skipped the last gubernatorial primary
11 than are registered in outreach zones A, B, C, D, E, F,
12 and G combined. We recognize that you face a significant
13 challenge engaging Californians in drawing the line, but
14 please do not underestimate the challenge that will
15 follow. Redistricting does matter, but it's not the only
16 thing that matters. Thank you for your ongoing service
17 to the people of California. Thank you.

18 CHAIR YEE: Thank you, Mr. Mercado.

19 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

20 CHAIR YEE: Next caller?

21 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Next caller is caller
22 with the last four 7435. If you will please follow the
23 prompts to unmute. Go ahead. The floor is yours.

24 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Hi. Thank you. My
25 name is Morgan and I am a resident of the Inland Empire,

1 and I was wondering whether I should be following the
2 handout that is provided for today's meeting with the
3 schedule, or if I should be following the website under
4 the meeting timeline. There are discrepancies and I'm
5 not sure which one is the accurate one. Can you please
6 advise? Thank you.

7 CHAIR YEE: Let's see. The schedule that I showed
8 at the beginning of the meeting today, that's our best
9 guess at the items we will actually get to today out of
10 the full agendized agenda that was published fourteen
11 days ago. So those are the two documents, I think. I'm
12 not sure where the confusion is, though, is the one
13 person today that will guide you most accurately to what
14 we will actually discuss today.

15 Commissioner Sinay?

16 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think she's referring to
17 the -- to the agenda for the COI -- for the COI input
18 meetings. We might want to clarify.

19 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Those are for different dates
20 then, so there should not be others for today's date.

21 Commissioner Fernandez?

22 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I just wanted to
23 clarify that we will be presenting hopefully the final
24 schedule today, which is why there might be a discrepancy
25 between the schedule and what's posted. What's posted

1 right now is what has been approved by the Commission,
2 and if we approve something differently tonight, that
3 will change. And so she's probably looking at the
4 handout for tonight.

5 CHAIR YEE: I see.

6 COMMISISONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

7 CHAIR YEE: For the COI -- upcoming COI meetings.

8 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, correct.

9 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Very good. So Ms. Morgan, if you
10 would simply hang on, we will get that schedule updated
11 and further finalized. Okay. Any other callers, Katy?

12 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: That was all of our
13 public comment at this time, Chair.

14 CHAIR YEE: Very good. Let's move on then to item
15 4-D, which is VRA training. And let's see -- I'm on the
16 VRA Subcommittee and I'm going to defer to my colleague
17 on the VRA Subcommittee, Commissioner Sadhwani, to
18 introduce that.

19 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. Great. Thank you so
20 much. So as has been promised, we have some additional
21 training, or a VRA presentation, at minimum, today. We
22 have with us today our VRA and litigation counsel,
23 including, of course, Fred Woocher and David Becker. And
24 I see a couple of other members of the team, so I'll let
25 them all introduce themselves. Commissioners, we've had

1 several VRA trainings in the past, but it has been a
2 little while, so we wanted to make sure that we refresh
3 our memories about what's at stake for the VRA, what
4 compliance with the VRA entails, as well as charting out
5 sort of the next steps of thinking about the VRA when it
6 comes to redistricting for this cycle. So with that, I'm
7 going to hand it over to David and Fred to please
8 introduce the rest of the team and to take it over. Take
9 it away.

10 MR. BECKER: I am David Becker. I am a longtime
11 voting rights and election attorney. I'm based in the
12 Washington, D.C. area now, but I'm a Californian. I've
13 introduced myself before, so I won't go too far. Fred,
14 do you want to introduce the rest of the team members
15 that are here?

16 MR. WOOSER: Sure. I think the only other team
17 member right now that's here is Salvador Perez. I think
18 you may have met him at the last meeting, but he's been
19 working closely with us in actually all aspects of both
20 the VRA work and the deadline issues that we've been --
21 we'll address later today. So Sal, if you just want to
22 say hi, that'd be great. And otherwise, we're going to
23 turn it back to David.

24 MR. PEREZ: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Happy to
25 be here.

1 MR. BECKER: Great. Thanks. Commissioner Sadhwani,
2 should I go and proceed and share my screen?

3 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, please do.

4 MR. BECKER: All right. Excellent.

5 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think that'll be great.
6 Thanks so much.

7 MR. BECKER: Let's hope this works. It's always a
8 little bit of a risk. Okay. Is everyone seeing that
9 screen?

10 CHAIR YEE: Excellent.

11 MR. BECKER: Excellent. Okay. So I know you've had
12 some previous trainings. This is going to be a pretty
13 quick overview with kind of a practical overview,
14 particularly with what might be -- what you might be
15 thinking of doing in the next several months in
16 particular, and how the Voting Rights Act impacts that.
17 And obviously, I'll have -- I'll have this presentation
18 to give, but I'm happy to answer any questions as well
19 after I'm done. Let me see if I can get this. There we
20 go.

21 So first, there's obviously a lot of considerations
22 in drawing the lines. These are some of them. These are
23 consistent with federal and state law, obviously, things
24 you're going to be balancing out. We're going to be
25 focusing on that second bullet point today, race and

1 ethnicity, which is what Voting Rights Act covers
2 primarily.

3 But it's going to be very important that while
4 you're considering compliance with the Voting Rights Act,
5 what districts may be required to be drawn, you're also
6 balancing them out and at the same time, simultaneously
7 considering all of these other very, very important
8 considerations, so that race doesn't predominate over
9 traditional redistricting principles.

10 So I don't expect you all to read this or memorize
11 that. There will be no quiz. But this is what Section 2
12 of the Voting Rights Act actually says, this is 52 USC
13 10301. The important part here for you all is Section
14 (b), which says that "a violation of Section (a) is
15 established if, based on the totality of the
16 circumstances, it's shown that the political processes
17 leading to the nomination or election" of the -- I'm just
18 moving it so I can read it -- "leading to the nomination
19 or election in the State or political subdivision are not
20 equally open to participation by members of a class of
21 citizens protected by subsection (a)" -- in other words,
22 a group defined by race or color -- "in that its members
23 have less opportunity than other members of the
24 electorate to participate in the political process and to
25 elect representatives" of their -- "of their choice."

1 So that's the key element here. I'm going to try
2 to -- all right. So what Section 2 is talking about with
3 regard to totality of circumstance has been defined
4 pretty well in the law, and it includes a whole bunch of
5 things. One, the history of official voting related
6 discrimination in the state or political subdivision.
7 Two, the extent to which voting in the elections or of
8 the State or political subdivision is racially polarized.

9 Three, the extent to which the state of political --
10 state or political subdivision has used voting practices
11 or procedures that tend to enhance the opportunity for
12 discrimination against the minority group such as
13 unusually large election districts; majority vote
14 requirements and prohibitions against what was called
15 bullet voting; the exclusion of members of the minority
16 group from candidates slating processes; the extent to
17 which minority group members bear the effects of
18 discrimination in areas such as education, employment,
19 and health, which hinder their ability to participate
20 effectively in the political process; the use of overt or
21 subtle racial appeals in political campaigns; and
22 finally, extent to which members of the minority group
23 have been elected to public office in the jurisdiction.

24 Now, don't spend too much time worrying about all of
25 these right now. They're going to come into play and

1 there's going to be ample time to consider them. But I'm
2 actually going to simplify this a great deal for you.
3 And that's because we have a case called *Thornburg v.*
4 *Gingles*, which you'll probably remember from previous
5 trainings.

6 And what *Thornburg v. Gingles* says is it lays out
7 three pre-conditions for the requirement that a district
8 might need to be drawn. The first is that the racial or
9 language minority group is "sufficiently large and
10 geographically compact to constitute a majority in a
11 single-member district." Two, that the minority group is
12 politically cohesive, meaning its members tend to vote
13 similarly. And three, that the "majority vote
14 sufficiently as a block to enable it usually to defeat
15 the minority's preferred candidate."

16 So this is really -- this is -- this is a little
17 more simple and it's a little more easy to understand.
18 And I'm -- we're going to -- we're going to talk about a
19 plan for looking at these things in the first place. But
20 this will tell you whether or not districts need to be
21 drawn, that you have a large minority group and it's
22 politically cohesive, and that the white community tends
23 to vote in a way that differs from it.

24 So the first pre-condition here is really, is there
25 enough of a minority population to form fifty percent of

1 the electorate in a district-size population? And then
2 the second and third pre-conditions are going to look at
3 this, our minority communities have distinct electoral
4 preferences. And then we'll look at a similar plotting
5 with elections for the majority community, the white
6 community, to see if those preferences differ.

7 And you might see, for instance, in this map, there
8 is a strong correlation between the -- this is just an
9 example map, by the way, or example plot -- there's a
10 strong correlation between as the Latino percentage grows
11 in a district that the percentage of particular
12 candidate's vote also grows, which means there's a strong
13 correlation, a strong cohesion in the minority community.

14 Now, I want to make a key point here, is that you'll
15 have to make determinations about whether to draw a
16 district and then how to draw a district. And those are
17 two different considerations. Whether it comes first,
18 how comes second. If you don't have to draw districts,
19 then you probably don't have to consider about how to
20 draw it.

21 So the "whether" is assessing the *Gingles* pre-
22 conditions, and the -- and the totality will tell you
23 whether Section 2 requires districts to be drawn. And
24 then once you've determined the districts need to be
25 drawn, drawing those districts, the "how", will require

1 more analysis and really an iterative process to make
2 sure you're balancing out not just the requirements under
3 Section 2 that it should be drawn, but all of the other
4 districting principles that we -- that we mentioned in
5 that first slide.

6 So really what it comes down to, this how we draw
7 districts, is can we design districts to give minorities
8 a fair shot? And this, again, is an iterative process.
9 This is going to be moving census blocks around, trying
10 to see what you can get to and balancing out all of the
11 traditional redistricting principles with the need to
12 develop, to draw districts in which minority voters have
13 an opportunity to elect their candidates of choice.

14 So you'll term -- you'll determine the localized
15 threshold for electoral effectiveness. This is really
16 important because while the *Gingles* pre-conditions, the
17 whether to draw district, requires that there be a
18 majority that could make up a district, it does not
19 require that that's the district that is drawn.

20 The district might have less than majority,
21 depending upon what the voting patterns are, and
22 particularly depending upon how the white community votes
23 and whether there's crossover voting or some kind of
24 coalitional voting between minority groups that could
25 result in the election of candidates of choice.

1 So you're going to see pockets of population
2 containing communities with effective electoral strength.
3 And then really important, all of the other criteria are
4 going to be considered at the same time. You're going to
5 be balancing these all out at the same time, and you'll
6 repeat this as you need to. You're going to -- it's
7 iterative. There's going to be a lot of process.

8 There's not some magic path where the first time
9 through you're going to get this exactly right. No one
10 can do that. It's impossible. There's going to be time
11 where you work through balancing out all of these
12 different considerations to get this -- to get as strong
13 a set of maps as you possibly can.

14 And then it's also important because of a case -- a
15 line of cases that started with the case called Shaw v.
16 Reno in the early '90s. That race, although it has to be
17 considered under the 14th and 15th Amendment and Section
18 2 of the Voting Rights Act, it cannot predominate over
19 all other redistricting principles. You can't throw all
20 of the redistricting principles out the window.

21 So it's fine to consider race and ethnicity. In
22 fact, it's required. But you want to set out not to
23 overpack, you want to set out not to divide and
24 splinter -- I'm going to talk about that in a second.
25 And then you want to make sure that you're always

1 balancing out these other considerations: communities of
2 interest, geographical and political boundaries, and
3 compactness at the same time.

4 So we were talking about concentrating too much of
5 the minority population in a district or dividing it up
6 too much. And those, you probably heard these terms, are
7 called cracking and packing. And these are both things
8 you want to avoid. Cracking is the practice by which you
9 take a community that might otherwise form a majority in
10 a district and you divide it up so it's a minority in
11 every single district, essentially.

12 And that's the left illustration, where you've
13 got -- I should have counted these up before -- seven,
14 twelve -- sixteen of these thirty-six, which I think is,
15 like, forty-four percent; does that sound right? Forty-
16 four percent of the population is a minority, but they've
17 been divided up so that they don't form majority in any
18 of the districts, and that's definitely a violation of
19 Section 2, assuming that they're voting cohesively.

20 But on the other hand, another way to minimize,
21 dilute minority voting power would be to pack them. In
22 other words, create a district in which 100 percent of
23 the district is essentially minority. And that's the
24 packing illustration on the right, where they have one
25 district and one district only, when you could probably

1 draw at least two there.

2 So these are things you're going to want to avoid as
3 you're looking at the maps. It's never going to be this
4 straightforward. It's always going to be a little -- a
5 little less clear. But you know, for instance, if there
6 is a district in which forty-five or fifty percent
7 minority population is all that's necessary for the
8 minority voters to be able to elect candidates of choice,
9 if you were to draw a district that was perhaps seventy
10 percent, you might severely minimize the -- the ability
11 of minority voters in a neighboring district to elect
12 candidates of their choice.

13 And that's something that that would be a
14 consideration under Section 2, something to be very much
15 aware of. So this kind of gives you a roadmap for the
16 right approach. You've probably seen these slides
17 before. Is there a history of discrimination? Do they
18 already have a proportional opportunity? And very
19 importantly, the proportionality is not a requirement.
20 You do not need to create an exact number of districts
21 that represent proportionality for minorities. We're
22 really looking primarily at those three *Gingles* pre-
23 conditions that are going to govern this process.

24 What's the appropriate local minority concentration
25 that gives a reliable and practical opportunity to elect?

1 And again, this might be below fifty percent. It might
2 be a little bit above fifty percent. It might be
3 significantly above fifty percent. It depends really on
4 what the -- what the racially polarized voting patterns
5 look like.

6 And then as I've really stressed before, looking at
7 the other factors as well, communities of interest,
8 boundaries, and compactness while this is going on so
9 that race doesn't predominate over all of them to the
10 exclusion of all else.

11 So really important in this, we're getting to the
12 stage now, start early with the data. We don't have the
13 census data, but I'm going to talk a little bit about a
14 plan going forward that I think can get us a pretty good
15 head start to be ready to go when the census data
16 actually arrives. Make sure we have time to consider
17 blocks of multiple minority groups. And while we're
18 actually drawing the lines, while you're actually drawing
19 the lines, take time to try different combinations and
20 see what might work best.

21 So I think this is my last slide, and this is
22 kind -- this is a plan that we've discussed and we'd
23 suggest to go forward up until the time when a Statewide
24 Database is ready to use with the census data, and we've
25 probably got a couple of months of time for -- with

1 regard to that. I know the timeline is going to be
2 discussed today.

3 First, begin assessing that first *Gingles* pre-
4 condition, looking at concentrations of minority
5 population using census estimates that we have. The
6 census estimates aren't going to govern redistricting,
7 but they're going to be very instructive to kind of paint
8 a picture or plant a flag as to areas we might want to
9 look at more closely, areas where it's very likely
10 there's going to be a concentration of minority voters
11 sufficient to form a majority in a district consistent
12 with Section 2.

13 Then we can create visualizations of those
14 concentrated minority population areas and identify
15 elections that we might want to look at in those areas.
16 Then working with a racially polarized voting
17 consultant -- and we're in the process right now of
18 seeking racially polarized voting consultant, we hope to
19 have one on board perhaps as soon as in a month -- within
20 a month, with the Commission's approval and
21 authorization.

22 Beginning assess -- begin assessing those second and
23 third *Gingles* pre-conditions. We're going to identify
24 the areas in which minority concentrations appear high.
25 And then we're going to identify, based on that,

1 elections that we can look at over the course of some
2 period of time, probably going back around a decade, and
3 start looking at the precincts in those areas to see
4 whether we can determine that the minority population is
5 voting cohesively for candidates of their choice and that
6 other voters are voting in a way that would defeat, them
7 in an opposite way to defeat those candidates of choice.
8 And those are -- those two, the second and third *Gingles*
9 pre-conditions.

10 Whoops. And we expect to have examples of these
11 analyses to present probably at the August 10th meeting.
12 So we're hopeful -- that's what we're shooting for. It
13 will not be the full state. We won't have all of the
14 analysis done, but we'll have -- we'll have some examples
15 to show you to get feedback on.

16 It's really important that from the perspective of
17 the line drawers, from the perspective of the lawyers,
18 that that we provide you tools that are useful to you,
19 that help you visualize what you need to do to comply
20 with the law. And so we expect to have some of that
21 done.

22 That will put us in pretty good stead in advance of
23 when the census data is expected, so that once the census
24 data comes through -- which is going to govern that first
25 criteria, which is equal population -- that we'll have

1 already identified areas that we want to start looking at
2 as potential Section 2 districts. So with that I will
3 stop sharing, and I'd be happy to answer any questions
4 you all might have.

5 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Great. Thank you so much,
6 David. And I will just share, you know, behind the
7 scenes, the VRA Subcommittee and the Line Drawing
8 Subcommittee, we have been working both with our legal
9 team and with the line drawers to try and really sketch
10 out what some of the additional work will look like and
11 what some of this plan that David has laid out here, how
12 it's going to be worked on, at what points in time it's
13 going to be -- you know, there will be some work product
14 to share with the Commission.

15 And so as David mentioned, August 10th is really our
16 target date at this point in time. It puts us about a
17 month from now to at least have an initial analysis of
18 broad strokes of what our VRA work is going to be looking
19 like and hopefully some of that initial RPV analysis as
20 well completed. But with that, I'll open it up for
21 questions. Chair, do you want to moderate to the
22 question, the Q&A, or do you want me to do that?

23 CHAIR YEE: You can do that.

24 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think -- I thought
25 Commissioner Fernandez, did you have a hand up

1 immediately? Yeah, go ahead.

2 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. So thank you so much
3 for that presentation. It's a great reminder. And so
4 lots of big, complicated words and terminology. I mean,
5 fortunately, the fourteen of us have been on this
6 journey, so we understand. But let's say I wanted to
7 explain what racially polarized voting was to my uncle,
8 so what would be -- who is an immigrant. So how would be
9 the best way to explain it? I'm just trying to get
10 trying to get these terms to --

11 MR. BECKER: Yeah.

12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- the majority of the
13 Californians.

14 MR. BECKER: Yeah, that's great. So there are a lot
15 of places in the country where minorities tend to vote
16 for particular candidates. Often, but not always, those
17 candidates are from the same minority group -- there are
18 occasions where that's not true. And where white voters
19 have traditionally voted in exactly the opposite way to
20 defeat those candidates.

21 And you know, we can visualize -- I mean, honestly,
22 probably the easiest way to visualize this is -- is, you
23 know, thinking about the Deep South in the Jim Crow
24 period of time where African Americans in particular
25 would have to completely overwhelm the process in terms

1 of numbers and participation in order to defeat the white
2 voters' candidates of choice, who are almost always
3 white.

4 Now, it's not that cut and dried anymore in many
5 places. And in California, there are actually places, as
6 you all well know, there are places where racial groups
7 do tend to vote very cohesively and whites tend to vote
8 in an opposite way. And there are other places where
9 that's not true at all. It's -- California is an
10 incredibly complex and diverse state. And so that's why
11 it's going to be important to look at the election
12 results.

13 Now, one thing -- and I don't know if this is what
14 you're getting at, I'm going to get a little bit into the
15 weeds here. One of the questions I have gotten in the
16 past is, how can you tell? Because the ballot is secret.
17 How do you know whether people are voting in a racially
18 cohesive way or not?

19 And the way it's done, and the racially polarized
20 voting consultant will do this -- I'm fortunate to be a
21 lawyer, so I don't actually have to run these kinds of
22 analyses, but social scientists do this. But we look at
23 the precinct level results, and we know what the racial
24 composition of certain precincts is.

25 And there are a lot of precincts that we might call

1 extreme precincts that might have ninety percent of a
2 minority population in them, or other precincts that
3 might be ninety percent white. And those are very, very
4 instructive because we can look at those precincts and
5 say, wow, the voting patterns in this ninety percent
6 minority precinct are very, very different than the
7 voting patterns of this ninety percent white precinct in
8 these different elections.

9 And by the way, there might be differences in
10 elections, too. For instance, the higher up you go on
11 the ballot up to congressional, statewide, federal
12 elections, party preference tends to hold sway a little
13 more. And by the way, this is not always the case, but
14 it can hold sway a little more than racial identity, if
15 that makes sense.

16 But a lot of times in local elections, racial
17 identity is incredibly important. And so we'll look at
18 all of these things. And our job, with the racially
19 polarized voting consultant, is to is to tell you what we
20 found so that you can then apply that as you're drawing
21 the lines.

22 Does that help you, Commissioner Fernandez?

23 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I'm going to take a
24 shot at it with my uncle, and I'll let you know. How's
25 that?

1 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Commissioner Toledo?

2 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So just a quick question about
3 the line drawing criteria, you had a balancing of -- one
4 of the slides mentioned the balancing of communities of
5 interest and also the compactness requirements. And
6 those are, I believe, I don't think contiguity was
7 mentioned, but those are criteria under and after the
8 Voting Rights Act. And I'm just curious, you know,
9 because the Voting Rights Act comes before the -- these
10 other three, so how one weighs -- how one weighs that and
11 how it balances of these issues.

12 MR. BECKER: This is going to be a very fact-
13 intensive inquiry, which is not a very satisfying answer
14 for you, Commissioner Toledo. I'm sorry about that, but.
15 But what's going to end up happening is there are
16 priority considerations. Equal population is going to be
17 a very high priority, you know, particularly when you're
18 talking about Congressional districts.

19 Congressional districts don't allow for much
20 deviation at all beyond zero. So you've got to do the
21 best you can with that. And then look at the Voting
22 Rights Act considerations, and then look at the other
23 considerations that might be there. The -- it isn't like
24 we're going to be able to look at each area and check a
25 box and say, this is compliant, this is not compliant.

1 There's going to be some wiggle room with all of
2 these things. That's why it's such an iterative process.
3 There are going to be places where, you know, if -- you
4 know, they're going to be places where counties and
5 cities probably will have to be split to some degree
6 because there's no other way to do it. There's no other
7 way to maintain equal population, comply with the Voting
8 Rights Act.

9 But I think the goal that we have as we advise you
10 in this process is to try to minimize those hard
11 decisions as much as possible, try to figure out how,
12 where possible, you can comply with all of the
13 traditional districting principles, including Voting
14 Rights Act compliance, while to the degree possible,
15 maintaining compact districts, contiguous districts,
16 political boundaries, and of course, equal population
17 being above all.

18 Although with -- as we've mentioned, I think you've
19 heard before, the legislative districts, you do have a
20 lot more play in the -- in the equal population. You
21 could go up to plus or minus five percent deviation,
22 that's traditionally been determined to be a safe harbor.
23 But it might also be a good idea to try -- not shoot for
24 that. You might want to have a much more close to equal
25 population and it might be possible to do that.

1 It's really hard for me to give -- you know, one of
2 the things I very much empathize with you about is it
3 would be really nice to be able to give you a step-by-
4 step plan that if you do A, then B, then C, then D, then
5 E, then F, you will be fine and you will come out and you
6 will get the big prize at the end. But redistricting
7 doesn't work that way unfortunately. It's a -- it's a
8 really difficult process. It's why you all have really
9 taken on such an important role for the people of
10 California.

11 And balancing out all these considerations is not
12 easy. But I do think it's possible, and it's just going
13 to take really good data, a lot of time and iterative
14 process. And what I expect is we'll be having a lot of
15 conversations with you to help you all balance all of
16 these considerations where there's a requirement of
17 tradeoffs.

18 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think I saw --
19 Commissioner Kennedy, did you have your hand raised
20 previously?

21 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I did. And this may be more
22 for others, because I think I've -- I've made my way
23 through it. But I just wanted to ask David, you
24 mentioned precinct voting history, and now we're in an
25 era where more and more counties in California are opting

1 for voting centers. And I just want to make sure that we
2 all understand how that interacts with this. Thank you.

3 MR. BECKER: Yeah. That's a really good point,
4 Commissioner Kennedy. The -- we're going to do the best
5 we can with the data that we have available. That's
6 basically the short answer, which is that to the degree
7 that that political geography is maintained, it may be
8 that larger political geography creates a creates a
9 challenge because it's less likely to have extreme
10 precincts.

11 I know -- and I have to admit, I have to reeducate
12 myself on this. I know there was a time when all of
13 the -- all or most of the ballots were assigned at the
14 precinct level. And I think we can -- and I hope, is
15 that still the case? I'm seeing people nodding. I --
16 we'll --

17 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think so.

18 MR. BECKER: I think so too. So I think we should
19 be able to identify that. But I -- but we'll, you know,
20 get into that data in this in this next month. And I
21 think by the August 10th meeting, we'll have a definitive
22 answer for you.

23 MR. WOOCHEER: Yeah, I think (indiscernible) --

24 MR. BECKER: But let me -- go ahead. I'm sorry,
25 Fred.

1 MR. WOOCHEER: Though we now vote in a different
2 physical location through these centers, votes are still
3 tracked by precinct, that everybody is still assigned a
4 given precinct by their residence address. And that is
5 still the unit that the registrars use at the county
6 level to keep track and report their statement of votes.
7 So we will still have the same data that we would have
8 had in the past, even though people may physically vote
9 at a different location than in their local precinct.

10 MR. BECKER: That was my understanding. So I'm glad
11 you confirmed that. I was -- I was hopeful that was the
12 case. The smaller the political geography, the more
13 robust the data is on these -- on these kinds of issues.
14 So if we can get precinct-level data and we can identify
15 the racial composition of the precinct, which we can do
16 based on the data in the Statewide Database, we can -- we
17 should be able to determine -- we should be able to
18 compare the voting patterns with racial identity.

19 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I saw that Commissioner
20 Sinay, Andersen, Yee, and then Toledo -- oh, and
21 Akutagawa. Okay. We've got a lot of questions. So
22 first, Commissioner Sinay.

23 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I have two questions, and they
24 might not be answerable. The first one is, do we know
25 what percentage of the districts last -- in 2010 the VRA

1 was applied to? And the second question is, nationally,
2 the VRA is being gutted and it continues to be. Is that
3 going to increase our risk of being sued -- our maps
4 being --

5 MR. BECKER: So I'll -- the first question I don't
6 really have an answer to, but Karin Mac Donald might and
7 other Commissioners might as well. I'll say as to the
8 second, Section -- the Section 5 no longer applies to the
9 four counties in California that were covered under
10 Section 5 because the targeting formula was ruled on
11 unconstitutional in the Shelby County case in 2013.

12 I have my own opinions about the nature of that
13 decision that I will keep to myself for at least this --
14 the purposes of this call. But it makes -- it actually
15 makes your job easier in that regard because you don't
16 have to worry about Section 5. Section 2, I think most
17 of you are familiar with the case that just came down on
18 July 1st. Most of us call it the Brnovich case. I think
19 the official title was Arizona Republican Party v. DNC.

20 That case is not going to be applicable to your
21 work. It was a vote denial case, not a vote dilution
22 case. The vote dilution law is fairly well set and
23 there -- and it's -- it goes right straight back to
24 *Thornburg v. Gingles* in 1986 and the 1982 Voting Rights
25 Act amendments which still apply. So I don't think that

1 changes either increasing or decreasing the chance you'll
2 get sued.

3 But I think we all -- I think you all probably know
4 this. I mean, the likelihood you get sued is pretty
5 high. That doesn't mean you have done a bad job. It
6 just means someone's unhappy with the plans, right? I
7 mean, this is -- this is -- there's a lot at stake here
8 for people in the political sphere. And so it's very
9 likely that there will be a lawsuit. And we're going to
10 do the best job we can, collectively, to advise you to
11 make sure that the plans are as defensible and comply
12 with the law as much as possible.

13 MR. WOOCHEER: Just following up on the first part of
14 Commissioner Sinay's question, I do believe there -- in
15 the report that accompanied the last redistricting
16 effort, they had identified the specific districts that
17 they had selected as the VRA-compelled districts. There
18 were actually surprisingly few.

19 I don't have the number in hand, and I'm sure we
20 could check that for you before the day is over. But
21 there were -- they were identified, you know, as to which
22 of those districts were that they felt were compelled by
23 the Voting Rights Act and were treated as such.

24 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Commissioner Andersen?

25 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. I also have two

1 questions. One's a question, one's kind of a
2 clarification. I'll do the clarification first. As I
3 sort of see -- to answer -- it's more like what
4 Commissioner Toledo was talking about, the way you sort
5 of presented the -- looking at the VRA and then you kind
6 of walked through all the steps of redistricting. I --
7 as I sort of see it, is the VRA portion -- you know,
8 population for all the districts.

9 And then the VRA portion sort of gives us an idea
10 of -- we can't just draw our districts wherever; there's
11 a few of them that are kind of locked into an area. And
12 then as we look at that and then consider the next
13 criteria, the next criteria, and next criteria, we go
14 back in adjust, you know, with those certain areas we
15 really have to consider VRA portion. So it isn't like
16 you do one VRA district and you go through all the
17 criteria. You know, is it compacted --

18 MR. BECKER: No, yeah.

19 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. It's --

20 MR. BECKER: The VRA applies to the plan and
21 districts within the plan as well, so. So it's -- again,
22 it's a challenge. What we -- one of the reasons we want
23 to start by looking at the census estimates and
24 identifying areas that might have a large enough
25 population is to kind of identify potential starting

1 points. And there's going to be more than one, where
2 there are concentrations of minority voters sufficient
3 that we're going to want to pay close attention to them.

4 And then likely when you're -- when you actually get
5 to the point where the census data is in and you're
6 drawing lines, we'll have already had the racially
7 polarized voting analysis to say, oh, yeah, here is an
8 area where the three *Gingles* pre-conditions apply. We
9 will be able to tell you that, I hope, by the time that
10 you're actually starting to draw the lines. And then
11 you're going to draw the lines in a variety of ways.

12 But you know, there are going to be --

13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: (Indiscernible).

14 MR. BECKER: -- many places where you don't just
15 draw one district and say you're done. There are going
16 to be whole areas where it might be multiple districts
17 that you need to kind of iteratively --

18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Um-hum.

19 MR. BECKER: -- draw in different ways to see if
20 you're accommodating all of the Voting Rights Act
21 considerations --

22 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right.

23 MR. BECKER: -- that might be there. And we haven't
24 really even gotten to the areas where you're going to
25 have multiple minority populations, some of which might

1 be cohesive with each other and some of which might not.

2 And so we're going to -- but the goal is, by the
3 time you start drawing lines, we'll have a really good
4 sense of that so that you'll be able to have -- take
5 those considerations into account.

6 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. And then that brings
7 up -- my second question is, could you go through what
8 criteria we're looking at for what are our areas? Is
9 that the ACS data?

10 MR. BECKER: Yeah. So right now what we'll have is
11 the ACS. That's what we'll have until the census data,
12 the new PL data comes out, which we'll get in -- in a
13 legacy format I think, in August. And I'm going I'm
14 going to set aside the issue of the timeline right now.
15 But when we get it, regardless of what that date is, that
16 will -- that will be more accurate and up to date, and it
17 will dictate the equal population criteria.

18 We will upload that and use that, but it's very
19 likely the areas that the ACS census estimates show us
20 the minority population is large enough, that first
21 *Gingles* pre-condition, it's very likely that there won't
22 have been so much change since the estimate was made that
23 we're going to have to, you know, deviate from that
24 substantially.

25 It's really a place to tell us, this is where we

1 should be prepared to start looking when the data comes
2 in. And we've already got the racially polarized voting
3 analysis because we used that first *Gingles* pre-condition
4 data to identify the places that we can start looking at
5 whether there's racially polarized voting or not.

6 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Perfect. Thank you.

7 MR. BECKER: Sure.

8 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Perfect. And I'll just add
9 on to that. So that first analysis of ACS data we're
10 targeting for August 10th. Fingers crossed.

11 I believe Commissioner Yee was next. And then
12 Toledo and Akutagawa I had next.

13 CHAIR YEE: Yes. Wondering if there would ever be a
14 situation in which white voters were the minority in a
15 district and therefore covered by VRA considerations.
16 Also whether two minority groups together would count as
17 a minority group for VRA considerations.

18 MR. BECKER: The answer to your first question is
19 there is no case where vote dilution was used to benefit
20 white voters. And if you look at the history of the 14th
21 and 15th Amendment, as well as the Voting Rights Act, it
22 would probably fly directly in the face of those -- of
23 those statutes and Constitution. With regard to multiple
24 minority groups, if I have your question right,
25 Commissioner Yee, there are absolutely areas where there

1 might be multiple minority groups that either
2 individually can each comprise a majority in a district
3 and satisfy all three *Gingles* pre-conditions, or maybe
4 don't individually, but collectively as a coalition, vote
5 cohesively together and could require a minority district
6 to be drawn.

7 That would be what some call a coalition district,
8 which is really just a minority opportunity district,
9 where the two minorities are voting in lockstep with each
10 other. And if -- those things have been rare in many
11 places in the past, past, but if there was anywhere where
12 that was going to happen, it would probably be
13 California.

14 And you know, I think -- I think I said this in a --
15 in a call with maybe a committee. I mean, many of the
16 things you're going to see during this redistricting
17 cycle are things that many states are going to see in the
18 redistricting cycle after this or the one after that.
19 California is really going to set the stage for the rest
20 of the country in many ways because of its diversity and
21 complexity.

22 And that -- that doesn't mean it's going to always
23 be easy for you, because there are going to be some hard
24 calls, potentially, at some point, depending upon what
25 we're finding in terms of the size and cohesiveness of

1 minority populations. But we know for a fact that there
2 are many areas in California where there are sizable
3 minority communities that are different but live in
4 proximity to each other.

5 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Commissioner Toledo?

6 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. So my question is
7 a little bit more policy than it is legal in nature. But
8 just there was -- recently, there has been op eds around
9 committees of interest and how they might or may
10 contribute to segregation across communities. Sorry, are
11 you able to hear me?

12 MR. BECKER: Yeah, now we are.

13 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Oh, sorry. Did you get my
14 question or should I start over?

15 MR. BECKER: I heard that there were op-eds about
16 communities of interest and how they might end up
17 segregating communities. And what -- I didn't hear the
18 next part.

19 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So just and I'm curious from a
20 policy perspective, how might -- how might the Commission
21 be able to take that into consideration from a policy
22 perspective, if -- and I'm not certain if communities of
23 interest do promote segregation or not, but how might the
24 Commission weigh that in our deliberations as we look
25 through these communities of interest and evaluate them

1 and make decisions around maps that have real impact on
2 communities of -- communities across the state.

3 MR. BECKER: Yeah. So I think first I'd say is the
4 law -- the law requires what the law requires. The
5 Voting Rights Act requires that districts be drawn that
6 give minority voters the opportunity to elect their
7 candidates of choice when they're large enough, cohesive
8 enough to do that.

9 If there was a disagreement about the policy behind
10 that, proper place for that is probably Congress, which
11 has the ability to -- to amend Section 2. And in fact,
12 they have amended Section 2 multiple times, and the
13 Voting Rights Act overall. So I think -- I think
14 that's -- that's the first part of that answer.

15 The second part, though, is I think this really
16 relates to the cracking and packing aspect. I think this
17 is why packing -- it's really important to avoid packing
18 and cracking at the same time. You could conceivably and
19 effectively segregate minority voters into a district
20 where they are a supermajority, unnecessary --
21 unnecessarily large enough majority to elect candidates
22 of their choice, and in so doing, really minimize
23 minority voters' political power, because you minimize
24 minority districts where minority voters could elect
25 candidates of choice.

1 And so I think that's one aspect of that, that I
2 just -- I don't know if that completely answers your
3 question. But you know, with regard to the policy, there
4 are a lot of strong feelings about the Voting Rights Act.
5 I know that. But there's -- the proper place for that is
6 in the halls of Congress.

7 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And Commissioner Akutagawa?
8 I know I saw your hand up earlier.

9 VICE CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Thank you. I guess
10 I'm going to say that I am probably Alicia -- or
11 Commissioner Fernandez's instead of uncle, aunt. And so
12 I think I'm going to be asking you those kind of
13 questions that perhaps, you know, she can use to take to
14 also share with her aunt as well too, or her tia. In my
15 case, I would say my tita. So let's see. I have, I
16 guess, maybe two questions. One, the second one that
17 came up as a result of what Commissioner Toledo was just
18 asking you. And perhaps I could just start from there,
19 since you just finished that question.

20 I guess, I'm trying to understand some of the
21 communities of interest inputs that we received. Callers
22 had referred to wanting to have certain kinds of
23 districts that, you know, for example, we've heard from
24 some callers in the Sunnyvale area who spoke about an
25 Asian majority district. We've also heard from other

1 callers who have talked about having a more Latino
2 majority district or at least having the ability to elect
3 a Latino candidate. I think which, you know, makes
4 sense. But at the same time, I think in my mind, I'm
5 just trying to reconcile what you're saying about in this
6 case, I guess I'll say packing. How does that also then
7 relate to this op-ed around communities of interest
8 leading to segregation when we're hearing from
9 communities also saying that this is what they want so
10 that they have the better opportunity to elect a
11 candidate of their choice. And so I guess I thought I'd
12 just start there in terms of --

13 MR. BECKER: Yeah. I mean, this is -- this is a --
14 these are really good questions. And I guess I think
15 what I'd say first is community input is so important,
16 but the data is going to be the place where we start with
17 most of these things. I mean, a lot of people -- I've
18 done this for a long time. I mean, a lot of people don't
19 have a great sense of the size of the community and what
20 the cohesiveness might be.

21 And the data is going to dictate that, and we're --
22 and by the way, the data might not always be conclusive,
23 especially when we're looking at racially polarized
24 voting. I mean, it's nice when you look at -- when you
25 get can get districts that are ninety percent Latino or

1 ninety percent African American or ninety percent Asian,
2 and perhaps even within that, very heavily of the same
3 ethnic subgroup of Asians.

4 And they truly are voting, like just across the
5 line, almost 100 percent you can see -- that's really
6 nice to have in the sense that it paints a really clear
7 picture. But they're going to be places where it's a
8 little more complex than that, where we might see --
9 might have a district with maybe seventy percent minority
10 and it's voting sixty-five percent for candidates that --
11 consistently.

12 And the white community might have a thirty-five
13 percent crossover, and we're not quite sure. We'll start
14 with the data and then really importantly, we're not
15 going to end there. The community input is going to be
16 important and we're going to take that into account. But
17 you have a better sense of this than anybody already, I
18 know.

19 There's no way to draw a map that every single
20 person is happy and is going to love it and is going to
21 pat you on the back at the end. There are going to be
22 people who are unhappy. You're going to do the best you
23 can, given the data and facts and laws that you need to
24 consider. And our goal is to help guide you through that
25 process. But the community input's absolutely essential.

1 If, again, I'll set aside the policy issues, I can
2 only tell you what the law is right now. And the --
3 fortunately, the law in -- with regard to Section 2 in
4 redistricting is still pretty darn clear. And the facts
5 are going to be sometimes really clear and sometimes less
6 so. And we'll do our best to try to advise you on that.
7 And then when there is less clarity, I think we -- I
8 think going to the community input is going to be
9 absolutely essential.

10 VICE CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. And actually, I
11 have a second question, and I will also say clear is
12 good, too. So I think actually what you just talked
13 about in about the data actually is a good segue into my
14 second question. And I think there's been questions that
15 I've heard raised about the quality of the data that
16 we're going to get because the census was delayed.

17 There -- there are -- there are questions about
18 undercounts, especially in minority communities. People
19 have referenced that when the census was done, it was
20 very different. It was early in the pandemic and their
21 communities have changed significantly. I think these
22 are all the kind of things that we're going to be hearing
23 as we go forward in -- as much as I know, I personally, I
24 mean, in my very idealistic way, I would love to have the
25 perfect maps that everybody will be happy with.

1 But I do realize that that's not going to happen
2 most likely. But hey, we can try. That's why we keep
3 saying we want to hear from people about their
4 communities of interest. But can you help me
5 understand -- and I think maybe for others, either on the
6 Commission or who are also listening, around these data
7 quality questions, is there -- is it a real issue, or is
8 this just, you know, the data is what it is and we just
9 have to work with what we get?

10 MR. BECKER: So I think -- these are great
11 questions. Again, I can't say definitively until the
12 data comes out. I think we'll take a close look at it.
13 I think community input is, again, going to be absolutely
14 essential here if we -- if we see -- if we see census
15 data that would seem to deviate substantially,
16 particularly with regard to undercounts in areas where we
17 would expect higher numbers, we should take a close look
18 at that and see other data.

19 But on the equal population criteria, in particular,
20 the census data is going to be extremely dispositive.
21 This is not to say -- this is not to say that there's no
22 way to get around that if there's a major, major problem,
23 and there's really good evidence of that. But it's going
24 to be really, really hard. And we don't have a lot of
25 jurisprudence to fall back on with regard to that.

1 Now, when we're trying to figure out, you know,
2 we're sticking with equal population, we're trying to
3 figure out what a minority opportunity district might
4 look like and who -- and what precincts we would need to
5 include in that minority, what census blocks, it may be
6 that we could take into consideration some other data
7 outside of the census data that gets -- that gets given
8 to -- given to you all. We'll have to see. I don't want
9 to speculate too much. I mean, I'm cautiously optimistic
10 that the census has been working very diligently and that
11 the delay actually is going to lead to higher quality
12 data than we might have gotten otherwise.

13 It's -- but again, it's -- I think we're going to
14 have to wait and see and then listen to the community
15 when they say that, you know, oh, wait a second. They
16 said, you know, this area has a population of 100,000 and
17 we think it's 150,000. I mean, that's going to be
18 something we're going to need to look at very closely if
19 that's if that occurs.

20 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay, great. I see that
21 we're up against 5 o'clock. Any additional -- I have one
22 final question. Does anyone else have any final
23 questions? And I'm not sure if we have to take public
24 comment before we wrap up also.

25 My question, if I will, I'm not seeing any other

1 Commissioners raising their hand, so I'll jump in. There
2 had been a federal Voting Rights Act case here in
3 California recently, I believe Luna v. the County of
4 Kern. Wondering if you could talk a little bit about
5 that case and to what extent that's something that we
6 need to have on our radar as we move forward in our
7 process.

8 MR. BECKER: I'm going to be completely honest with
9 you. I need to go back and look at that case. So I
10 don't know that I'm prepared to answer that right now.
11 The -- I am -- I'm not -- I'll just say this. I mean, I
12 try to keep up on this stuff as much as possible around
13 the country. I'm not aware of a case that has
14 substantially altered Section 2 redistricting
15 jurisprudence in the last -- really last couple of
16 decades.

17 The Section 2 jurisprudence is pretty set. And
18 again, because it's so factual, it's such a fact-
19 intensive inquiry. You know, if and when this goes to,
20 you know, someone -- someone sues you and claims that you
21 didn't -- you either didn't take into account the right
22 things and you did -- you needed to do more with regard
23 to Section 2, or you might also get a claim that race was
24 taken too much into account and kind of a Shaw v. Reno
25 claim, there's going to be a very much of a factual

1 analysis going back and forth.

2 But I will -- Commissioner Sadhwani, I'll promise to
3 go back and review that case and get back -- get you an
4 answer.

5 MR. WOOCHEER: Yeah. My recollection is that was the
6 case on the supervisorial districts in Kern, and the
7 court had ruled that they could make a second minority-
8 majority district.

9 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That's right.

10 MR. WOOCHEER: It was a fairly straightforward
11 application, I think, to the facts of the case -- of the
12 case law. What turned out to be kind of interesting
13 after the case was they held an election. The court
14 ordered a special election to be held based upon using
15 the new districts. And it turned out that the same white
16 incumbent won even under the new district lines.

17 So it kind of shows that it's not just -- it's not
18 the be all and end all. And when you do these analysis,
19 sometimes there are these other factors that even though
20 you -- you know, you think you've created a district and
21 you've done your racially polarized analyses and you've
22 gotten a percentage that you think is appropriate, there
23 are other factors that come into play, and it just it
24 doesn't necessarily always pan out that way.

25 But that's my recollection, is that it was a pretty

1 much straightforward application and it's consistent with
2 everything, you know, we've been talking about today.

3 MR. BECKER: And I'd just add, and this might help
4 in conceptualizing this, especially since when we look at
5 racially polarized voting, we have to look at who are the
6 candidates that voters are voting for and what are those
7 election results look like?

8 But the Voting Rights Act does not protect the
9 rights of candidates to be elected within a certain
10 district. It does not protect the rights of a political
11 party. It does not protect the rights of certain office
12 holders. It protects the rights of voters to choose
13 their candidates of choice. And that's the thing we're
14 looking at.

15 And sometimes, particularly in areas that don't have
16 independent redistricting commissions like California,
17 you will see legislators working hard to protect their
18 districts for themselves. And that's one of the reasons
19 that, again, the work that you do is so important because
20 your work is really focused on the voters first and the
21 voters only.

22 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Great. Thank you so much.
23 And so with that, I will -- if there are no additional
24 questions from the Commissioners, I will thank you very
25 much for this presentation. We look forward to

1 continuing to work with you and seeing as this as this
2 process moves forward and continuing to work in close
3 collaboration. And so with that, I'll hand it back to
4 you, Chair Yee.

5 CHAIR YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani. Mr.
6 Becker mentioned the RVP analyst. That posting has gone
7 out. Perhaps you've seen it. We would encourage you to
8 distribute that far and wide. There had been some
9 anticipation that the Commission needed to make some
10 approvals before that posting went out. As it turns out,
11 that's not true.

12 We already had all the authorization we needed in
13 the contracting for VRA counsel. So the posting will go
14 out. We anticipate the VRA counsel will receive
15 applications and narrow down candidates and eventually
16 forward one or more candidates for our consideration and
17 approval. So that will all be coming fairly soon,
18 hopefully.

19 MR. WOOCHEER: Commissioner Yee?

20 CHAIR YEE: Yes, Mr. Woocher?

21 MR. WOOCHEER: Salvador has provided us with the
22 answer to Commissioner Sinay's question from earlier
23 about the number of districts.

24 CHAIR YEE: Sure.

25 MR. WOOCHEER: I've never been (indiscernible). So

1 according to the report, in the last redistricting, there
2 were fourteen out of eighty Assembly districts, there
3 were four out of forty Senate districts, and there were
4 seven out of the fifty-three Congressional districts that
5 were drawn to be in compliance with Section 2 of VRA.

6 CHAIR YEE: Very good. Thank you.

7 MR. WOOCHEER: That's between ten percent for the
8 Senate and seventeen percent of the Assembly districts.

9 CHAIR YEE: Thank you, Mr. Perez. Okay. Even
10 though we are now behind schedule, I'm wondering if we
11 should take public comment for the sake of anyone who
12 wanted to call in and ask further questions on the VRA
13 presentation we've just heard. Can we briefly open the
14 lines, Katy, for public comment on item 4-D?

15 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. The
16 Commission will now take public comment on item 4-D. To
17 give comment, please call 877-853-5247 and enter the
18 meeting ID 95977110538 for this meeting. Once you have
19 dialed in, please press star 9 to enter the comment
20 queue. The full call-in instructions have been read
21 previously in the meeting and are provided in full on the
22 livestream landing page. And I do invite those that have
23 called in previously and have been in the queue and
24 waiting to please press star 9 indicating they wish to
25 comment, if they do wish to comment, on item 4-D.

1 At this time, Chair, we do not have any raised hands
2 in the queue.

3 CHAIR YEE: Very good. We'll wait just a moment.
4 If there are no callers, we will be going to closed
5 session. Closed session will be a discussion of pending
6 litigation. Pending can include potential or planned
7 litigation, not necessarily active allegation. So that
8 closed session will be discussed -- in discussion of
9 pending, which is to say possibly potential or planned
10 litigation, not necessarily active litigation.

11 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The abbreviated
12 instructions are complete on the stream, Chair. And
13 there are no hands raised at this time.

14 CHAIR YEE: Very good. Thank you, Katy. Why don't
15 we take a five-minute stretch break, come back to close
16 session at 5:25. Thank you.

17 (Whereupon, a recess was held)

18 (Whereupon, a closed session was held)

19 CHAIR YEE: Welcome back into open session. We
20 continue our meeting tonight with agenda item number 4-A;
21 this is the Government Affairs Subcommittee discussion of
22 timeline matters in regards to the census delay and
23 mapping deadlines.

24 Just a quick review of how we got here. In a normal
25 census year, the draft maps would have been due July 1st

1 and final maps August 15. With the unprecedented delay
2 in the U.S. Census, which our work depends entirely, or
3 largely, almost completely, the legislature in the
4 Padilla decision extended a -- extended deadline for us.

5 They anticipated a four-month delay, that the draft
6 maps could be due on November 1st and then the final maps
7 December 15th. But they added a clause if the Federal
8 Government transmits the census data to the states later
9 than what they were projecting, later than July 31st, the
10 number of days that constituted that delay it could be
11 added to the mapping deadlines.

12 Just to make things more complicated, the delivery
13 of that data has now become more complex than normal.
14 The census is projected -- is promised to deliver on or
15 before August 16th. Legacy formatted data with numbers
16 that will be identical to the final P.L. 94-171 data, but
17 in a legacy format, on or before August 16th. So it has
18 not happened. We're not positive exactly what date that
19 will actually happen.

20 Our Statewide Database will take a week or so to
21 convert that into a usable format. There is also about a
22 month's worth of reallocation of those people who are
23 incarcerated, which we're doing -- whom we're going to
24 reallocate to their last known addresses. Statewide
25 Database will do that work. And that will take about a

1 month.

2 So the question is what date to set for -- what date
3 this leaves us with under the Padilla decision or under
4 arguments we may wish to put forth as a Commission to the
5 State Supreme Court?

6 We've certainly heard a lot of testimony from the
7 public asking for as much time as possible and noting
8 that the meaningful input that the Voters FIRST Act
9 promises to give the public an opportunity to give will
10 be impeded by the holiday season, shifting the deadline
11 to December 15th, where if it gets shifted to December
12 31st, or early in January, we have the holiday season,
13 which will certainly make giving the input more
14 difficult.

15 Now, we've heard the testimony. We're sympathetic
16 and share many of those feelings. However, the question
17 is what we are constrained to do by law, what we may or
18 may not be able to ask to be changed in that law. Okay.

19 So at this point, we have many callers. I'm
20 wondering if any Commissioners wish to add anything to
21 the summary I just tried to provide. And if either our
22 Chief Counsel or our VRA counsel wish to add anything at
23 this point before we go to callers.

24 If not, let's take -- why don't we go ahead and open
25 the lines and take calls for a time. Katy?

1 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. The
2 Commission is now taking public comment on the report out
3 from closed session. To give comment, please call 877-
4 853-5247 and enter the meeting ID number 95977110538 for
5 this meeting. Once you have dialed in, please press star
6 9 to enter the comment queue.

7 The full call-in instructions have been read
8 previously in this meeting and are provided in full on
9 the live stream landing page. We will go first to caller
10 with the last four 9575. And up next will be caller
11 4376.

12 CHAIR YEE: I'm sorry, Katy. Just before we take
13 that call, let me take a step back and report that no
14 action was taken during closed session. It was a closed
15 session on pending litigation. Pending can include
16 potential, planned, or active litigation. No action was
17 taken.

18 Actually, from this point forward -- I'm sorry,
19 Government Affairs Subcommittee, this actually should be
20 your discussion to conduct. And is there anything more
21 you wish to say and would you like to moderate the calls?
22 My apologies.

23 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'm a little confused,
24 Chair. Is this -- are we -- where are we on the agenda
25 exactly? Are we on The Government Affairs Subcommittee

1 or is this calls as a -- as a part of closed session?

2 CHAIR YEE: Right. Let's combine those two. And so
3 the calls should be on the report back from closed
4 session as well as now moving on to agenda item 4-A, the
5 Government Affairs Subcommittee. Does that make sense?
6 Does that -- or do we want discussion before we take
7 those calls?

8 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I had thought we would do
9 discussion first, but if you want to take callers, I see
10 there's a lot -- that's -- that's fine.

11 CHAIR YEE: That's what I was saying.

12 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, as you -- as you wish.

13 CHAIR YEE: Well, I got ahead of myself. This is
14 actually a Government Affairs Subcommittee item and not
15 a -- so I should defer to the Government Affairs
16 Subcommittee in this matter.

17 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think if you want to take
18 calls, that's fine. And then we can continue with our
19 discussion afterwards. I think that's perfectly fine
20 for us.

21 CHAIR YEE: Okay.

22 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Commissioner Toledo, if
23 you're okay with that as well, of course.

24 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Very good. Let's go ahead and
25 take calls then on the closed session report back as well

1 as prospectively on the Government Affairs Subcommittee,
2 item 4-A.

3 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Okay. We will start with
4 caller 9575. Please follow the prompts to unmute.
5 Caller 9575, the floor is yours.

6 MS. DIAZ: Hi. Good evening, Commissioners. My
7 name's Karina Diaz. I'm with the Coalition for Humane
8 Immigrant Rights, CHIRLA. CHIRLA is an immigrant rights
9 organization in California with national impact. Our
10 mission is to achieve a just society, fully inclusive of
11 immigrants.

12 CHIRLA is one of the largest and most effective
13 advocates for immigrant rights. Through our organizing,
14 community education, and civic engagement, we engage
15 immigrant youth at the high school and college level,
16 immigrant families, domestic workers, (indiscernible),
17 first-time voters and new American voters.

18 We're also a member of the IVE Redistricting
19 Alliance. And I'm calling today to uplift the
20 recommendation to set the January 28th in the year 2022
21 as the deadline for the finalized maps to express our
22 support to move the primary elections no later than June
23 21st, 2022 to accommodate any necessary chips in the 2022
24 election calendar as a result.

25 We believe process matters, and the CRC should have

1 partnered with community members to ensure the most
2 inclusive process for redistricting, which includes
3 granting the most time possible to review and input
4 grassroots organizations for adequate time to engage, to
5 educate, train and mobilize our diverse and hard to reach
6 communities for creating and submitting maps and
7 reviewing draft maps.

8 The work of residents and community groups is an
9 important part of our independent redistricting process.
10 We are collecting and analyzing COI data, developing VRA
11 Section 2 compliant maps, analyzing the 2020 census data
12 once it's released in a usable format, and engage in
13 coordinating and developing joint maps with other
14 residents and community groups. It is important that we
15 have enough time to help the CCRC (sic) fulfill the role
16 for which it was created. The community groups can help
17 the CCRC --

18 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

19 MS. DIAZ: -- and local residents are able to get a
20 major piece of work, which is engaging our community
21 members on how to best combine into representative
22 multiple COI maps into draft maps. I just want to thank
23 you --

24 MR. MANOFF: Time.

25 MS. DIAZ: -- so much for your time this evening.

1 Thank you.

2 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
3 our next caller, caller with the last four 4376, if you
4 will please follow the prompts to unmute. Caller 4376,
5 you are unmuted. The floor is yours.

6 MS. RAMIREZ-ZARATE: Hi. Good afternoon,
7 Commissioners. Thank you for your commitment to creating
8 a fair and participatory redistricting process. My name
9 is Alejandra Ramirez-Zarate with Advancement Project
10 California, a multiracial civil rights organization.

11 I'm also representing the People's Bloc of Los
12 Angeles County, and we are a multiracial table dedicated
13 to the inclusion of everyday residents, conducting public
14 education and proposing solutions to the redistricting
15 process that promotes the political voice,
16 representation, and access to resources of historically
17 underrepresented groups.

18 I'm calling to urge you to set a deadline for your
19 work of January 28th, 2022. With the heaviness of the
20 past sixteen months and impact on our communities, our
21 organizers need additional time to mobilize folks,
22 particularly those most marginalized and impacted by the
23 pandemic. Their voice is critical to this process.

24 Communities are at the heart of why we have an
25 independent redistricting commission, and it will be

1 those very same communities that ultimately bear the
2 impact of the final maps for the next ten years, as you
3 all well know.

4 Moreover, having a deadline of December impacts our
5 ability to mobilize people to participate. And this goes
6 against the intent and letter of Proposition 11.

7 Additionally, the recent California Supreme Court
8 decision centered public participation in their extension
9 of the redistricting deadline.

10 This framework reflects a policy adjustment that the
11 public should have the opportunity to be involved
12 throughout their redistricting process and be provided
13 with additional time that takes into consideration the
14 holidays and other challenges that they're currently
15 facing and will continue to face as they rebuild from
16 this pandemic.

17 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

18 MS. RAMIREZ-ZARATE: You were granted flexibility by
19 the California Supreme Court decision. We encourage you
20 to use it and center committee voices, take into
21 consideration a constrained deadline that may impact our
22 collective ability to include those voices. Therefore,
23 January 28th deadline works best. We support you and
24 your work and --

25 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

1 MS. RAMIREZ-ZARATE: -- continue to cheer you on in
2 your mandated path and hope you adopt the January 28th
3 deadline and make a final decision promptly. Thank you
4 so much. Hope you have a great evening.

5 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
6 up next, we have caller with the last four 8735. If you
7 will follow the prompts to unmute. Caller 8735, if you
8 will please press star 6 to unmute. Caller 8735, you are
9 unmuted. The floor is yours.

10 MS. PANDURO: Thank you. Hi. Good evening,
11 Commissioners. My name is Jessica Panduro. I'm with
12 InnerCity Struggle and the People's Bloc LA region. At
13 InnerCity Struggle, we're an intergenerational
14 organization who have worked in the Eastside for over 26
15 years. We are dedicated to the Eastside in building
16 stronger schools, civic engagement, and prevent housing
17 displacement, and stronger and more powerful Eastside.

18 Today, I'm calling to urge all Commissioners to push
19 for the deadline to be on June (sic) 28th, 2022 to ensure
20 that we have true representation of community. As some
21 of my colleagues who called and mentioned, these past
22 sixteen months have been really tough for our community.
23 Our community is growing. We're getting back into a more
24 normalized schedule. But more than anything, our
25 communities were one of the communities that were most

1 impacted.

2 And we want to ensure that this redistricting
3 process allows them to have an input for true
4 representation. The next ten years are going to be
5 critical in impacting our community the most. So please,
6 I just want to ask for you all to consider and push for
7 the June (sic) 28th, 2022 deadline. Thank you.

8 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Up
9 next, we have caller with the last four 6597. If you
10 could please follow the prompts to unmute. Caller 6597,
11 you are unmuted. Go ahead. The floor is yours.

12 MR. BANE: Hello? Can you hear me okay?

13 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, we can.

14 MR. BANE: Very good. Thank you for the
15 opportunity. My name is David Bane. I am the chair of
16 the San Diego County Independent Redistricting Commission
17 and am calling both to offer my compliments to your
18 continued work and also to update you on our efforts.
19 You have, I think already, our June 29th letter that was
20 sent.

21 And in particular, I'd like to draw your attention
22 to the table on page 9 that I think you've seen before
23 laying out the various dates and options for extended
24 deadlines. My main point today, though, after some late-
25 breaking consultations today and yesterday, is not to

1 advocate for a particular date for your Commission, but
2 simply to note that it would be useful to have a date set
3 as soon as possible.

4 That's really for two reasons. One, it would help
5 us and I think other local commissions to know where your
6 Commission is and what your plan is for handling public
7 input after data is received, a key point that I think
8 several Commissioners raised in the meeting earlier today
9 as well as that if you've got various options for
10 pursuing a change in date, we really do have to pursue
11 the legislative option.

12 And as you know, we have proposed an extension to
13 January 15th after various consultations with
14 stakeholders, including the Los Angeles County IRC,
15 registrars of voters, and others. Again, we note that
16 according to our latest information, discussions in the
17 State Legislature are continuing, with a number of
18 legislators still very keenly aware of the challenges we
19 face at our local level and looking for the best way
20 forward on those challenges.

21 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

22 MR. BANE: I don't want to review the full history
23 of all the documents we sent you. I did want to note,
24 though, that none of the legislators with whom we've
25 spoken have taken formal positions on the question of

1 extending deadline. They are, however, having active
2 discussions.

3 Again, we're in the process --

4 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen.

5 MR. BANE: -- of collecting public input, holding
6 public hearings in August and September. We appreciate
7 the high standards and strong example you're setting, and
8 again, appreciate the opportunity to be in touch. We
9 look forward to your continued dialogue. Have a good
10 meeting tonight and in the future. Thank you.

11 CHAIR YEE: Thank you. By the way, the letter that
12 the caller refers to is posted in today's handouts and
13 letters. Next call.

14 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much, Chair.
15 Next is caller 0003. If you will please follow the
16 prompts to unmute. Caller 0003, the floor is yours. Go
17 ahead.

18 MS. NIMMERS: Hi. My name is Kristin Nimmers. I'm
19 part of the Black Census and Redistricting Hub, which is
20 focused on engaging hard-to-count black communities in
21 this process. I'm calling to lift up the importance of
22 extending the deadline from December to mid-to-late
23 January to ensure there's enough time for public input.

24 Over the last few weeks of COI zone meetings, I
25 think we've seen how difficult it can be to mobilize the

1 community to participate in these hearings and be engaged
2 in the redistricting process. That's going to be even
3 more difficult in the fall when we're competing with
4 holidays, families are traveling and focused on preparing
5 for those holidays, and not necessarily tuned in to
6 what's going on in redistricting.

7 This practice was intended to be community centered
8 to include the voices of California's diverse population
9 and the Supreme Court itself centered public
10 participation in their decision to extend the deadline.
11 And we can only ensure that the community is part of this
12 process if we're considering them and how they engage as
13 we map out this timeline. Thank you.

14 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Up
15 next, we have caller 6337. If you will, please follow
16 the prompts to unmute. Caller 6337, the floor is yours.
17 Go ahead.

18 MS. GOLD: Good evening, Commissioners. This is
19 Rosalind Gold within the NALEO Educational Fund. As
20 always, much, much thanks for your very thoughtful and
21 insightful dialogue on so many important issues regarding
22 the work of the Commission. I just want to first uplift
23 the comments made by several other callers about the
24 challenges that it creates for community input, where
25 major input times are scheduled concurrently with a

1 holiday season, and how that will be a barrier to
2 ensuring that underrepresented communities have a chance
3 to provide comment on the actual draft maps produced by
4 the Commission.

5 But I also wanted to just quickly make a few other
6 points in response to comments other callers have made.
7 First of all, there has been some discussion how -- about
8 how well you're getting a lot of input about communities
9 of interest. Well, communities of interest input does
10 not substitute for comment on the actual map.

11 You know, if you think of building these maps of
12 California and redistricting maps, like, you know, having
13 a bunch of Legos and putting together a Lego building,
14 you know, communities of interest are your Lego building
15 blocks, but not until people see the final draft Lego
16 building can people really fully see the impact on all of
17 the different areas of the state and be able to provide
18 input on the building that you will have proposed as a
19 whole.

20 Secondly, we do think that there are legal pathways
21 to having --

22 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

23 MS. GOLD: -- a major deadline beyond the end of
24 December. Some of those have been made and put into
25 comments that you have seen. And addition to the time

1 that's needed to get public input on the draft maps, we
2 also want to make sure that we can be a good partner --

3 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

4 MS. GOLD: -- or our civil rights organizations can
5 be a good partner with the Commission on providing draft
6 maps, using the data, providing and submitting our draft
7 maps that are compliant with the VRA. And so we're a
8 good partner on --

9 MR. MANOFF: Time.

10 MS. GOLD: -- VRA compliance. Again, we just want
11 to thank you for your thoughtfulness. We look forward to
12 continuing our work together. Thank you.

13 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Up
14 next, we have caller 3392. If you will please follow the
15 prompts to unmute. Caller 3392 --

16 MS. PONCE DE LEON: Good evening, Commissioners.
17 Hi, good evening, Commissioners. My name is Alejandra
18 Ponce De Leon with Advancement Project California, and
19 also representing the IVE Redistricting Alliance. I'm
20 calling here in regards to the issue of the deadlines,
21 and I know this has been a very challenging issue that
22 you have been taking on. Just want to call in and uplift
23 that as an alliance, we're here and will continue to be
24 here for equity in the redistricting process.

25 The CBOs in our alliance, along with many more

1 organizations who continue to advocate for a deadline
2 that provides as much time for everyone in California to
3 participate, and in particular for low-income, black,
4 indigenous, and people of color communities who are in
5 the trenches day in and day out, keeping people in their
6 homes, getting people vaccinated, fighting to keep
7 immigrant families together, and engaging
8 underrepresented communities to meaningfully participate
9 in the redistricting process at the state, at the county,
10 at the city, and school level.

11 We continue to push for a January 26 -- 28th
12 deadline because the time is needed not only to mobilize
13 residents to the COI public hearings, but for communities
14 to come together to inform and create maps of their own
15 that empower their communities and ensure fair
16 representation, to also analyze and provide feedback to
17 your maps, to bring the voices of communities you barely
18 get to hear from and don't have the privilege of time,
19 resources, and knowledge of this abstract process.

20 California's redistricting process --

21 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

22 MS. PONCE DE LEON: -- is a community-driven process
23 since its inception. We have an independent
24 redistricting commission because community groups
25 advocated for it, collecting signatures and educated as

1 mobilized the voters. The spirit behind --

2 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

3 MS. PONCE DE LEON: -- this Commission is to give
4 the power and voice to the people to guide and inform how
5 district lines are drawn so that together we ensure fair
6 representation for the next ten years. This is only
7 possible with a timeline that allows for diverse,
8 inclusive --

9 MR. MANOFF: Time.

10 MS. PONCE DE LEON: -- and robust public
11 participation. Thank you for your time.

12 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Our
13 next caller is caller 2829. If you will please follow
14 the prompts to unmute yourself. Caller 2829, the floor
15 is yours. Go ahead.

16 MS. WESTA-LUSK: Yes, this is Renee Westa-Lusk. I
17 just need some clarification from the discussion that was
18 had earlier this evening with David Becker, I believe.
19 And he made a comment about Section 5 of the U.S. VRA was
20 gutted back in 2013. How does this act impact the
21 requirement that -- that the 2020 Commission is following
22 where it says districts must be -- comply with the Voting
23 Rights Act to ensure that minorities have a fair
24 opportunity to elect representatives of their choice.

25 Because he was making a point that the four -- or I

1 guess there were three counties at that time, or maybe
2 four, that were under the Federal VRA and I thought those
3 counties still have to be regarded as part of the VRA
4 guidelines that you have to adhere to when drawing lines.
5 I don't know if your general counsel can clarify that for
6 me. Thank you.

7 CHAIR YEE: Our general counsel probably could. But
8 we're actually favored to have our VRA counsel present
9 with us. And I'm wondering if, Mr. Woocher, if you could
10 give a very brief response.

11 MR. WOOCHEER: Yeah, just to clarify. There are two
12 different sections of the Voting Rights Act that were
13 being referred to. There's Section 2, which is what we
14 are operating under now in terms of what Mr. Becker was
15 talking about and that the Commission will be subject to.

16 And those jurisdictions, those counties that were
17 previously under Section 5 are still subject to Section
18 2. Section 5 was a specific provision that applied to
19 certain counties in the country that had a historical
20 fact pattern that had to actually get pre-clearance from
21 the Justice Department for any changes to be made. And
22 none of the changes could have any kind of retrogression
23 in the opportunities given for minority voters in those
24 counties.

25 Those -- that law -- that section was essentially

1 stricken by the Supreme Court a few years ago, but
2 Section 2 is still fully operative. Those counties, the
3 districts that are created in those counties, will have
4 to comply with Section 2. And those will, in fact, be
5 some of the districts that we will be focusing on for our
6 Voting Rights Act compliance.

7 So the truth is, it doesn't really have any impact
8 because it related to a slightly different issue.
9 Section 2 still protects minority voters in those
10 counties and in those areas.

11 CHAIR YEE: Thank you, Mr. Woocher. Thank you, Ms.
12 Westa-Lusk. Next caller.

13 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes. Caller 6401, if you
14 will please follow the prompts to unmute. Caller 6401,
15 the floor is yours. Go ahead.

16 MS. CARRIZALES: Good evening, Commissioners. My
17 name is Veronica Carrizales and I am with California
18 Calls. We're a statewide alliance of thirty-one
19 community-based and grassroots organizations spanning
20 urban, rural, and suburban counties across the state. We
21 engage, educate, and motivate low-income voters from
22 amongst young people, from communities of color, from
23 poor and working-class neighborhoods to be civically
24 engaged, to make California's electorate reflect our
25 state's diverse population.

1 We are also a member of the IVE Redistricting
2 Alliance, and I'm calling today to urge you to adopt our
3 recommendation to set January 28th as a deadline to
4 finalize maps. And we also want to express our support
5 to move the primary election no later than June 21st.

6 We believe it's important to allow enough time for
7 community input in the redistricting process. This is
8 critical so that no community is disempowered for the
9 next ten years. You know, we know that it takes a lot of
10 time to do this work. And as a community-based
11 organizations that are working with low-income
12 communities of color, we need adequate time to engage, to
13 prepare, and to mobilize residents for submitting maps
14 and for providing input on the Commission's draft maps.

15 This is something that's necessary for low-income
16 communities of color to meaningfully participate in the
17 process and to ensure fair representation. So for this
18 reason, we're urging you to please adopt our --

19 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

20 MS. CARRIZALES: -- recommendations to set the
21 deadline on January 28th. Thank you.

22 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. And
23 that was all of our raised hands at this time, Chair.

24 CHAIR YEE: Very good. At this point, I will hand
25 these to the Government Affairs Subcommittee who will

1 continue with agenda item 4-A, discussion of census
2 timeline and our timeline. I apologize for flipping
3 things a bit there with the callers, but hopefully that
4 was worth it for our callers not to have to wait longer.
5 So Government Affairs Subcommittee is Commissioners
6 Sadhwani and Toledo.

7 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Perfect. Thank you so much.
8 And always great to put community first. So thank you
9 for that, Chair Yee. Yes. So you know, we, of course,
10 have been working on the issue of the census delay and
11 issues with the census from the very beginning, since the
12 formation of this Commission, including, if you recall,
13 way back when, it seems like ages ago, even looking at,
14 you know, the Trump administration's move to remove
15 undocumented immigrants.

16 And we were -- we were actively a part of an amicus
17 brief from the -- along with the Attorney General's
18 office back in the fall, throughout January, February,
19 March, particularly as we began to get new information
20 about the census delay and in particular, the release of
21 what is now being known as the legacy data. We
22 continued, Commissioner Toledo and I, to discuss the
23 various options and examine the various options, as well
24 as acknowledging that we do not, as the Redistricting
25 Commission, operate in a vacuum, that our work is then

1 handed off to other -- other, you know, other key
2 individuals throughout the state who have to administer
3 an election.

4 We've heard from a lot of different community
5 voices, of course, and we thank everyone for all of their
6 great input into this process. But from the -- from the
7 beginning, we had said that this is largely a legal
8 question, largely given the ruling in the Padilla case
9 last summer, and where we had left this issue the last
10 time that we had raised it in in greater detail was that
11 we would wait until our legal counsel was -- was more
12 fully formed. And thankfully, we are now in that
13 position.

14 We have Anthony on board as our Chief Counsel. We
15 have the Strumwasser, Woocher, Becker team joining us for
16 VRA and other legal matters during this pre-maps time
17 period. And so with that, I want to turn it over to Mr.
18 Woocher to provide some insight on their legal analysis
19 of this issue of the census delay and its impact on our
20 map adoption timeline.

21 MR. WOOCHEER: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani. So
22 I just want to begin by responding to a couple of the
23 public comments, because I think it sets the scene here.
24 And I know that these weren't literally intended to be
25 taken the way, but a number of the speakers were talking

1 about urging the Commission to set a deadline of a
2 certain date and -- one date versus another date.

3 And I just want to make it clear that the Commission
4 is not operating under a blank slate here. The
5 Commission can't set any deadline. The deadlines have
6 been set by the Constitution and the statute that were
7 enacted by the voters and then by the Padilla decision,
8 and in some ways by the Statewide Database. And I'll
9 just walk through this analysis to explain why that's the
10 case.

11 So the original deadline is in the Constitution for
12 the final maps. It was supposed to be August 1st. I
13 mean, I'm sorry, August 15th. And you know, normally the
14 Constitution prevails. That's it. But due to the unique
15 circumstances that existed with the delay in the census
16 data being released to the states, the Legislature had
17 the foresight to go to the Commission -- to the Supreme
18 Court, rather, and say, look, even as a Legislature who
19 makes the laws normally we're constrained by the
20 Constitution. And there's nothing we can do about that
21 date in the Constitution legislatively to address the
22 problem that we have, that the census data is going to be
23 delayed.

24 And it's literally, under the information that we
25 now have, would be impossible for the Commission to do

1 its work and complete the maps by that date, given the
2 timetable that we now know, we've been told which we're
3 to expect to receive the census data.

4 And so the Court exercised its authority under a
5 very sparingly used doctrine called the Doctrine of
6 Reformation, in which the Court in Padilla has said, you
7 know, when it is impossible to comply with the letter of
8 the law, we think we have the authority, as the Supreme
9 Court authority in the state, to make a change in the law
10 to effectuate the intent of the law in a way that most
11 closely resembles what the original language of that law
12 was.

13 And so what the Supreme Court did there was it
14 extended the deadline by essentially four months. Each
15 of the deadlines under which the Commission operated for
16 preparation of the preliminary maps and for certification
17 of the final maps, maintained all the timelines that
18 otherwise existed in the Voters FIRST Act, and said that
19 these are the dates that we think should apply based upon
20 the current timetable.

21 And then they said, but we recognize that there's
22 still some uncertainty. And so we are also ordering the
23 Commission to revise the deadline by the additional
24 federal delay that might exist beyond the date that we
25 now believe is going to apply for the release of the

1 census data to the State.

2 And that seemed to address everything, except that
3 we then found out that there were going to be two
4 different forms of census data released to the states.
5 And when the Supreme Court said, "the census data", they
6 didn't identify which of those sets of data, which of
7 those databases should apply. So we have an ambiguity
8 now.

9 And it's not really up to the Commission to say we
10 are going to set a particular date. We're going to
11 decide what's appropriate. What we -- the Commission
12 could do is seek the Supreme Court's opinion on what the
13 proper date is based upon that ambiguity and the new set
14 of facts.

15 And even in that regard, the Commission's hands are
16 tied. Because while it may appear on the surface that
17 there's a choice between using this legacy data set that
18 is apparently hopefully going to be released in mid-
19 August, by August 16th, or waiting to get the PL data set
20 that would normally have historically been the way in
21 which the census releases the data.

22 The Commission actually doesn't get the data
23 directly from the Census Bureau. The Commission gets the
24 data from the Statewide Database after the Statewide
25 Database has taken the federal data and made the

1 adjustments to it that are called for under state law.

2 And then they provide that data to the Commission to
3 start the process.

4 So the Commission doesn't really even have a choice
5 here between which sets of data they would prefer to use,
6 because the Statewide Database is making the decision and
7 they have made the decision that they are going to take
8 the legacy data. They think they need a week in order to
9 reformat that so it's equivalent to the PL 94 data.

10 And then they are going to make the adjustments that
11 are called for under state law to deal with the inmate
12 reallocation and other issues. And then thirty days
13 thereafter, they will be providing that data set in a --
14 in a computer format to the Commission for the Commission
15 to begin to draw the lines.

16 And so the only issue really before the Commission,
17 we believe, is to determine, based upon that set of
18 circumstances, can we get some certainty now as to what
19 the deadlines are we are facing under the Supreme Court's
20 decision in Padilla, as modified by these circumstances
21 that the court didn't anticipate?

22 We have provided you with our advice for a variety
23 of reasons that we believe it is very likely that the
24 court would hold, consistent with its reasoning in
25 Padilla and these facts, that the new date for which the

1 final maps would have to be drawn, based upon an August
2 16th delivery and are based upon a week for the -- for
3 the Statewide Database to reformat that data would be
4 January 7th.

5 And we believe it's wise for the Commission not to
6 just assume that that's the correct date, but to
7 affirmatively seek the court's opinion and approval and
8 solicit its confirmation as to what the date is, what the
9 date -- the dates are, that under these new set of
10 circumstances, the court believes it intended in the
11 Padilla decision to apply so that the Commission can know
12 and base its work upon a set timetable that we know as
13 far in advance as possible.

14 So our advice to you would be to authorize us or
15 authorize someone to go to the court to seek a
16 modification of the court's opinion, which clarifies
17 under these circumstances what the deadlines are, and to
18 let the court believe -- explain our reasoning as to why
19 we believe that that deadline ought to be no later than
20 January 7th.

21 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you so much for that,
22 Mr. Woocher.

23 Commissioner Toledo, would you like to jump in and
24 share a little bit about our thoughts on -- as a
25 subcommittee on this advice?

1 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. And I do want to
2 acknowledge just the community input that we have
3 received about meaningfully engaging the community, and
4 that's something that we all have committed to, that we
5 are all very concerned about, that we're committed to
6 ensuring that all people have the opportunity to provide
7 input and be meaningfully involved in this process, and
8 balancing that, of course, with all of the other factors
9 and -- and statutory and constitutional requirements that
10 we must.

11 And so with that, I'm going to make a motion and
12 that's motion on behalf of the Government Affairs
13 Committee, and that is to accept the advice of counsel
14 and seek an order from the California State Supreme Court
15 confirming that our map adoption date is based upon the
16 date on which the legacy data can be formatted into a
17 usable format by the Statewide Database and received by
18 the Commission. And so that would be the motion -- the
19 recommended motion from the Government Affairs Committee.

20 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And I am happy to second.

21 CHAIR YEE: Okay. We have a motion made by
22 Commissioner Toledo, and seconded by Commissioner
23 Sadhwani. Just to be clear, this motion does not involve
24 an actual date yet because we don't know when the actual
25 legacy format or reformatted data will be available.

1 So your motion is phrased contingent on what they
2 did actually is. So based on that date and we would
3 project out the equivalent time to get to an actual
4 map -- to get to a comment period and a final map
5 deadline.

6 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. That's correct. And
7 given what we know today, we would then anticipate that
8 date to be January 7th. But of course, we don't know if
9 the census data is -- exactly when it will -- you know,
10 if August 16th is definitely that final date, if the
11 Statewide Database ends up taking more time or something.

12 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: That's right. I think we
13 don't know when we'll get that data; we have some
14 expectations -- or when we'll get it in a format that is
15 usable. And so those are the areas where we're keeping
16 some flexibility. Although we have some assurances that
17 we will -- that it'll be close to and hopefully on
18 January 7th.

19 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Discussion of the motion.
20 Commissioner Fernandez?

21 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I understand the
22 recommendation. It makes sense to me. I would like to
23 see if we could potentially push the date further in
24 terms of with the additional holidays that are in the new
25 time frame. And then also my other question is, I

1 realize that the Statewide Database, they have full
2 confidence that they will be able to work with the data
3 that will be -- the legacy data, but will there be
4 language in case the data isn't usable for whatever
5 reason?

6 I mean, I realize that they've been in communication
7 with the census and they are probably pretty close to 100
8 percent. But I just -- I'm trying to hedge my bet here
9 to make sure that we wouldn't have to go back twice in
10 case the data -- there's something wrong with the data
11 and we have to wait for the PL 94 data.

12 CHAIR YEE: Let's see. I think the motion was
13 phrased in terms of the actual delivery or the actual
14 successful reformatting of the data; was that correct?
15 So that would take care of that, I think.

16 Perhaps, Commissioner Toledo, could you restate the
17 motion?

18 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'll state the motion and
19 get -- and maybe we can think about if there is any
20 modifications that could address Commissioner Fernandez's
21 comment.

22 CHAIR YEE: Then we'll go to Commissioner Kennedy.

23 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I move to accept -- so the
24 motion is to accept the advice of counsel and seek an
25 order from the California State Supreme Court confirming

1 that our map adoption date is based upon the date on
2 which the legacy data can be formatted into a usable
3 format by the Statewide Database and received by the
4 Commission.

5 It sounds to me like there's the holidays issue that
6 we want to also take into consideration, and perhaps
7 it's -- we can add some language to this to -- do you
8 have -- maybe Commissioner Fernandez has some suggestion?

9 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Actually I don't. But
10 thank you for that vote of confidence. I appreciate
11 that. No, I think that because the motion has "legacy"
12 in there, I think that was what I was kind of wary about
13 a little bit. And granted, I'm almost 100 percent
14 certain that they have confidence that they will be able
15 to convert that data into something -- into whatever is
16 usable. But just in case.

17 And in terms of holidays, I'm not sure what language
18 we could use, but maybe our VRA counsel could think of
19 some language that we could use, or -- yeah. Or possibly
20 look at other supporting criteria or arguments that we
21 could use to try to extend that date out, that would be
22 good chance of being successful.

23 CHAIR YEE: I'll also note the Commission does not
24 receive the reformatted data. We only receive at the
25 very end the reformatted and reallocated data, so.

1 Commissioner Kennedy, I think you're next.

2 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, and your point, Chair,
3 was what I was going to ask about, because it sounded
4 from the motion as if we were going to receive that
5 reformatted data. And I have heard some things that
6 would lead me to believe that we would in fact, receive
7 the data at that point. And my concern is that the
8 motion needs to ensure that we need to -- I mean, we need
9 to make sure that we know when we're going to get the
10 data, you know, on a relative basis. You know, is it as
11 soon as it's reformatted? Or is it not until it's
12 reformatted and reallocated? And -- because that would
13 have an enormous impact on the time. Thank you.

14 CHAIR YEE: Right. There's two separate questions,
15 I think, here, because, you know, reformatted but not
16 reallocated data, we will not use that. That is not
17 being used by the Commission to do any redistricting.
18 It's only after the reallocation that we have numbers
19 that we will use for redistricting. But that's a
20 separate question than when the clock starts ticking,
21 which is where the -- which is what the motion is
22 addressed to, I believe.

23 Does it's a start with the arrival of the legacy
24 formatted data in the Statewide Database? Does it arrive
25 when the legacy formatted data has been converted into

1 the equivalent of the PL 94 data, or does it in fact not
2 start until the PL 94 itself is delivered? So I'm
3 wondering if Director Hernandez might display the motion
4 as it stands so we can contemplate it more specifically?

5 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, Chair.

6 CHAIR YEE: Okay. So I'd like to suggest that we
7 strike the last phrase, received by the Commission, since
8 there is no -- if that's okay with Commissioners Toledo
9 and Sadhwani --

10 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

11 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

12 CHAIR YEE: -- since that's not an actual event.
13 Yeah. Okay. And then I think we need further discussion
14 on what's now the last phrase, formatted into a usable
15 format. I think we might need some more precision there,
16 formatted into the equivalent of the PL 94? Or --

17 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I can go back and look at
18 the memo that Karin sent several months ago about what
19 that process would be, if it's helpful to try and figure
20 out if there's a specific term that would be --

21 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think usable is usable,
22 right. So it has to be -- we have to be able to use that
23 to draw maps and base -- and to have maps that are --
24 that are -- use the appropriate data. So -- which would
25 probably be PL data, but -- census data, but usable would

1 probably be that. And we can be more specific if the
2 Commission wants.

3 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I just also want to
4 reiterate, I mean, Karin has testified -- Karin Mac
5 Donald of the Statewide Database has testified before the
6 Commission, as well as in written memos in the past
7 attesting to the fact that legacy data is the PL 94 data
8 just in a different format. So I do want to just be
9 careful about our use of the term PL 94 because the data
10 in that data file will be the same, to the best of my
11 understanding.

12 MR. WOOCHEER: Commissioner Yee, if I could make a
13 suggestion, perhaps?

14 CHAIR YEE: Yes, Mr. Woocher?

15 MR. WOOCHEER: Let's -- let me trot this language
16 out. That a motion to accept the advice of counsel and
17 seek an order from the California State Supreme Court
18 confirming that the calculation of the, "additional
19 federal delay" is based upon the date that the Statewide
20 Database, in capital letters --

21 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Let's pause there, and let
22 Director Hernandez catch up.

23 MR. WOOCHEER: Okay.

24 CHAIR YEE: Calculation of the, quote --

25 MR. HERNANDEZ: Chair, do you wish me to type it out

1 or hold off until it's finalized?

2 CHAIR YEE: Oh, I see. Right.

3 MR. WOOCHEER: Let me read it once.

4 CHAIR YEE: Okay.

5 MR. WOOCHEER: Then you can see if you like it enough
6 to type it out.

7 CHAIR YEE: Sure. Sounds good.

8 MR. WOOCHEER: So that the calculation of the
9 "additional federal delay" is based upon the date that
10 the Statewide Database is able to reformat the legacy
11 data set into a usable format for building the statewide
12 redistricting database. I think that incorporates some
13 of the language that Karin had had in her prior memos
14 about what the process will be.

15 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Commissioners Toledo and
16 Sadhwani?

17 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I do believe that's the intent
18 of the original as well. So I'm happy with -- I'm fine
19 to utilize that language. To make it a little bit more
20 specific and to provide more guidance to our counsel and
21 staff. I still don't think it gets to Commissioner
22 Fernandez -- and I think we also -- 's point about -- it
23 certainly does get to the point of the legacy data and
24 the calculation of the adoption date.

25 But the potential of adding dates due to the federal

1 holidays issue is still not incorporated in the motion.
2 So I'm still trying to figure out how to -- how to get
3 that language in there, because I do think it's something
4 that's important. If we can secure additional dates
5 because of the -- or try to secure additional dates due
6 to the -- due to the holidays.

7 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Well, one thing at a time. Why
8 don't we go ahead then and swap in Mr. Woocher's proposed
9 language for the motion since Commissioners Toledo and
10 Sadhwani are amenable.

11 MR. WOOCHEER: So --

12 CHAIR YEE: And Mr. Woocher, if you have that --

13 MR. WOOCHEER: Can you hear me?

14 CHAIR YEE: -- do you have that in a form that you
15 can email it to or get it to --

16 MR. WOOCHEER: Sure.

17 CHAIR YEE: -- Director Hernandez? That would
18 probably be easiest.

19 MR. WOOCHEER: Yeah, let me see if I can do that.
20 I'm not --

21 CHAIR YEE: Or through the chat, or --

22 MR. WOOCHEER: Let me try to use the chat.

23 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Just read it slowly.

24 MR. WOOCHEER: Okay. Yeah. That's easier for me.

25 Okay. So it's leaving off -- I don't have that language

1 you had up there, so I don't know. I can't see that.

2 MR. HERNANDEZ: I will get it up in just one second.

3 MR. WOOCHEER: Okay.

4 MR. HERNANDEZ: Share screen.

5 MR. WOOCHEER: Okay. Confirming that -- and we'll
6 start from there. Calculation of the "additional federal
7 delay" is based upon the date that the Statewide Database
8 is able to reformat the legacy data set into a usable
9 format for building the statewide redistricting database.

10 CHAIR YEE: Why don't we capitalize Statewide
11 Database?

12 MR. WOOCHEER: Exactly. The first Statewide
13 Database. Not the -- not that one, but the one above it
14 should be capitalized. Yeah.

15 CHAIR YEE: And striking everything after the
16 period.

17 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Put "the" before
18 "calculation".

19 MR. HERNANDEZ: So this language that I've
20 highlighted should be removed?

21 CHAIR YEE: Correct.

22 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Put "that" after the word
23 "date".

24 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Confirming Commissioners Toledo
25 and Sadhwani, are you satisfied with the new version?

1 MS. JOHNSTON: One suggestion. I'm sorry. One
2 suggestion.

3 CHAIR YEE: Yes, Marian?

4 MS. JOHNSTON: I don't know what I did to get double
5 here. Oh, thank you. After the additional data --
6 additional federal delay as used in the Padilla decision.
7 So it references the decision.

8 CHAIR YEE: Okay.

9 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: That's fine.

10 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I agree. Thank you, Marian.

11 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Discussion of the revised motion.

12 MR. HERNANDEZ: Chair, was that motion accepted, or
13 the revision accepted by the Commissioners?

14 CHAIR YEE: I believe so. Commissioners Toledo and
15 Sadhwani, can we have just one more audible affirmation?

16 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. It's acceptable to me.

17 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Toledo?

18 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes. This makes sense for me.

19 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Discussion before we go to public
20 comment.

21 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'm still trying to account
22 for Commissioner Fernandez's --

23 CHAIR YEE: Right.

24 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- point, and I think it's an
25 important one about accounting for federal holidays and

1 the shortened time frame that we do have during --
2 because of the time period this is going to hit.

3 The only language that I can come up with at this
4 point -- and just for discussion purposes, I'm not adding
5 it yet, but maybe adding a phrase like, and further seek
6 to secure additional dates to account for the federal --
7 or the federal holidays or something like that. And
8 that's -- so I just wanted to throw that out for
9 discussion purposes. Because I know that a couple of
10 folks have brought that up.

11 CHAIR YEE: Sure.

12 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Commissioner Yee?
13 Commissioner Yee? I don't know if you can see my hand.

14 CHAIR YEE: There you are. Yes, Commissioner
15 Taylor?

16 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you. I also had some
17 verbiage, maybe this can address the issue. I have
18 consistent with the counting of holidays in the statutory
19 timeline, we'd like an additional X -- I think it's four
20 days to account for the holidays in this augmented
21 timeline.

22 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Discussion of that suggestion.
23 And I'm wondering, Mr. Woocher, if you might give us
24 advice on whether to perhaps keep these thoughts separate
25 in two different motions so that one does not sink the

1 other, you know, or whether we should try to combine
2 them.

3 Commissioner Fernandez?

4 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Actually, Mr.
5 Woocher, I would actually like your opinion as to whether
6 or not that would be a good argument. I mean, that's --
7 I wanted feedback in terms of is that a good argument in
8 terms of moving forward? Are there other arguments --
9 strong arguments that we could use to try to extend the
10 deadline? That's -- that's the feedback I wanted. So
11 thank you.

12 MR. WOOCHEER: Okay. Well. I'm hesitating here a
13 little bit because lawyers would generally prefer not to
14 give their legal advice in a -- in a -- in an open
15 session. There's a privilege for attorney-client
16 communications. The Commission can waive that and
17 request me to do it, but it is a privilege that belongs,
18 I don't want to make this more complicated, but it's a
19 privilege that belongs to the Commission as a whole.

20 And so to the extent that I am being asked to
21 provide our legal advice and analysis in a public
22 setting, I believe I can only do that if the whole
23 Commission wishes me to do that rather than in response
24 to one Commissioner's single question.

25 So I apologize for making this more complex, but I

1 don't want to get in trouble with my professional
2 responsibilities as an attorney in giving a -- what is
3 clearly a privileged communication in terms of the legal
4 advice to the, you know, in this public setting.

5 CHAIR YEE: Okay. We're all getting educated. What
6 form would that permission need to take?

7 MR. WOOCHEER: I guess there would have to be some
8 sort of motion directing, you know, waiving the privilege
9 and requesting me to respond to the Commissioner --
10 Commissioner Fernandez's question with my legal advice.

11 CHAI YEE: Okay. Commissioner Kennedy and
12 Fernandez?

13 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Commissioner Turner's hand is
14 up. So I would --

15 CHAIR YEE: I'm sorry.

16 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- ask if she could go first.

17 CHAIR YEE: Okay. I'm sorry I missed you,
18 Commissioner Turner. Please go.

19 COMMISSIONER TURNER: That's okay. Thank you. And
20 I am going to go a slightly different direction. So if
21 you're still staying in this vein, maybe I should wait.

22 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. I just wanted to point
23 out, I believe that Commissioner Toledo mentioned federal
24 holidays or someone mentioned federal holidays. I just
25 looked up very quickly, federal holidays are Thanksgiving

1 Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day.

2 California state holidays, according to CalHR,
3 include the day after Thanksgiving. So the day after
4 Thanksgiving is a state holiday, but not a federal
5 holiday. So we'll want to clarify. Thank you.

6 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. So you're talking right
7 down the path that I want to, so I will go next. I
8 wanted to -- I wanted to talk about degree of difficulty.
9 So now when we're naming holidays, because it's a
10 holiday, it's a one-for-one. And I think the complexity
11 of the issue here is the holiday season, the degree of
12 difficulty that people have an opportunity to engage in
13 the process.

14 And so a day, a day for a holiday, federal and yes,
15 or state, I think is still problematic. We're talking
16 about the ability for people to engage during a holiday
17 season where they may not be around, period, or those
18 that are the trusted messengers that would be able to
19 bring people out and help them engage in the process are
20 actually closed down during the entire period.

21 So I just wanted to lift that up, because I see the
22 day for day. And yes, I think we should be looking at
23 California state holidays in addition to -- or you know,
24 instead of just the federal holidays. But I think degree
25 of difficulty for -- of engagement is what also I want to

1 lift, and not just a single date.

2 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Fernandez?

3 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I'm withdrawing my
4 request to Mr. Woocher. I'm good. Thank you. I'm
5 comfortable moving forward if we include the state
6 holidays. Thank you.

7 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Vazquez?

8 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I agree with
9 Commissioner Turner. I don't -- I'm -- I can try to
10 think up language, but I think additional -- I would like
11 to see if we can come up with a way to have the
12 additional federal delay defined inclusive of the holiday
13 season, which is fourteen calendar days, inclusive of
14 Thanksgiving through Christmas and New Year's. I don't
15 have a language yet, but that's what I'd like to try to
16 figure out.

17 CHAIR YEE: Okay. There is a motion on the table,
18 so we need any further discussion on the motion, we need
19 public comment. And if the motion is still on the table,
20 we need to take a vote.

21 Commissioner Sinay?

22 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I know we purposely aren't
23 putting dates on there. I did hear that -- I guess I
24 have a concern that if the data comes in earlier than the
25 16th, then we're pushing even more into the holidays.

1 Right now, at least we have a week after the holidays.

2 And so I -- in a way, would rather put a date in there.

3 And I don't -- I know that there's probably some
4 logic on why we're not putting a date in there, but put a
5 minimum date in there. I think the way it was explained
6 to us was a maximum date, you know, by January 7th. And
7 I'm just concerned that -- I mean, I want to make sure we
8 get a date figured out, and I want to move forward on
9 this.

10 But I also agree with Commissioner Vazquez and
11 Commissioner Turner that we'll have plenty of time for
12 the public input on the lines throughout, you know,
13 throughout the process. But the last, you know, people
14 want to see the last map and feel that they've got to
15 say -- speak up.

16 And so I would hate it if we all of a sudden receive
17 the information on August 6th and it just moved us in
18 right on top of Christmas. I don't know when Hanukkah
19 falls this year, but so I kind of feel -- I would feel
20 more comfortable just putting in January 7th or later
21 versus just leaving it open.

22 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Any further discussion.
23 Commissioner Fornaciari, no? Why don't we go ahead and
24 take public comment? Commissioner Andersen and then
25 public comment. No? Okay. Let's go to public comment,

1 Katy, on agenda item 4-A and the motion on the floor.

2 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The Commission will now
3 take public comment on the motion on the floor and agenda
4 item 4-A. To give comment, please call 877-853-5247 and
5 enter the meeting ID number 95977110538 for this meeting.
6 Once you have dialed in, please press star 9 to enter the
7 comment queue.

8 The full call-in instructions have been read
9 previously in the meeting and are provided in full on the
10 livestream landing page. I invite those that have been
11 in the queue if they wish to make comment to press star 9
12 to raise their hand indicating they wish to comment.

13 Caller 6597, please follow the prompts to unmute.

14 CHAIR YEE: And Director Hernandez, if we could have
15 the motion displayed again please. Thanks.

16 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Caller 6597, the floor is
17 yours.

18 MR. BANE: Hello, David Bane from the San Diego
19 County Independent Redistricting Commission again. We
20 had a similar discussion on all this, which I'm finding
21 incredibly useful. Thank you for it. And in dealing
22 with, quote unquote, the holiday period issue, we found
23 it useful to talk about, again, the original period
24 envisioned for public input, especially before and after
25 maps started being issued.

1 I know there was some discussion of this before, but
2 I just wonder if that might be incorporated in some way
3 or understood in the language in the motion. In any
4 case, I, again, do not want to be in the position of
5 telling your Commission in any way how to do its
6 business.

7 I just deeply appreciate what you're doing in
8 responding to public comment into what local
9 redistricting commissions face. And I do think
10 preserving the time originally envisioned is something
11 that, at least in principle, would find a sympathetic ear
12 at the court, because it is part of that process that was
13 defined, as your counsel so clearly laid out.

14 So thank you again for the discussion. Thanks for
15 moving forward. And again, look forward to continued
16 discussion.

17 CHAIR YEE: Thank you. Could you repeat that whole
18 phrase that you started out with?

19 MR. BANE: I'm sorry?

20 CHAIR YEE: Could you repeat the whole phrase that
21 you started off with? Original period envisioned for
22 public input and you had some more --

23 MR. BANE: I don't have it written down in front of
24 me. But something like, to further confirm that the
25 original period envisioned between -- I suppose, between

1 reformatting the viable format of the data and the period
2 when maps are actually due. In other words, to preserve
3 the period originally envisioned in the process as
4 enshrined in the Constitution and in law.

5 CHAIR YEE: Very good. Thank you.

6 MR. BANE: My pleasure. Thank you.

7 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And Chair, I believe that
8 is all our raised hands at this time.

9 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Any further discussion from
10 Commissioners?

11 Commissioner Taylor?

12 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah, Commissioner Yee. I was
13 sort of in line with -- with that caller in my
14 explanation with the beginning -- with consistent with
15 the accounting of the holidays and the statutory
16 timeline, I would think that that's along the same lines.
17 Not that that that has to be used, but again, the idea is
18 to frame any exception in the original timeline that was
19 envisioned. So again, consistent with the accounting of
20 the holidays in the statutory timeline, or something to
21 that effect, I think would address that concern.

22 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Chair, I apologize. This
23 is Katy. We did have one more raised hand.

24 CHAIR YEE: Very good. Let's take that call.

25 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Caller 6158,

1 please follow the prompts to unmute. Go ahead. The
2 floor is yours.

3 MS. MARKS: Hi. Thank you so much. My name is
4 Julia Marks and I'm calling from Asian Americans
5 Advancing Justice - Asian Law Caucus. Thank you all for
6 this conversation. We really appreciate the
7 thoughtfulness you're bringing into these issues,
8 especially the points recently made about the need to
9 account for the holiday period.

10 And since you'll be seeking clarification from the
11 court on a later timeline, we strongly recommend that you
12 ask for time that not only accounts for a processing
13 delay, but also does account for the holiday period.
14 Because the new timeline would overlap with holidays, it
15 is really an unprecedented scenario, not just that the
16 data is delayed and that the data will be in this
17 different format, but that these key periods overlap with
18 state and federal holidays.

19 So thank you very much for considering asking the
20 court for clarification and the additional time that
21 community groups and community members need to
22 participate in the process.

23 CHAIR YEE: Thank you, Ms. Marks.

24 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And that is all our
25 raised hands at this time.

1 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Thank you, Katy.

2 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: You're welcome.

3 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Commissioners Sadhwani and
4 Toledo, we have your motion. We've had discussion.
5 Let's see, Commissioner Andersen, you had a thought?

6 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Could I make a second
7 motion?

8 CHAIR YEE: I believe that you can.

9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I move -- and I'm sorry. I
10 apologize if there's an echo. I move that the Commission
11 seeks to contact the affected parties including the
12 Secretary of State, the Election Board, and the
13 originating groups of the Voters FIRST Act to address the
14 holiday issue, for additional days to be requested for
15 the Supreme Court to consider.

16 MR. HERNANDEZ: Chair, just to clarify, it sounds
17 like Commissioner Andersen would be making an amendment
18 to the current motion that's before the Commission, or
19 are we trying to make a separate motion? If we would be
20 making a separate motion, that should probably be tabled
21 until action has or has not been taken on the current
22 motion on the floor. But if this is a friendly
23 amendment, perhaps then that could be currently
24 considered by Commissioner Toledo and Commissioner
25 Sadhwani. And if they wanted to so amend the current

1 motion, they could.

2 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Andersen, what's your --

3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: If it would fit that way,
4 yes. I just didn't know if it -- if it would because it
5 wasn't a -- this was mostly to accept the advice of
6 counsel. So I guess it would be then -- and just
7 essentially, I don't know if it was the -- or the
8 Government Affairs or the Chair, so I would say, and have
9 the Commission to contact those -- the groups to see if
10 we could -- if we could come with a date -- additional
11 days for the holiday to then for request the Supreme
12 Court. So I don't know if that can be added to -- I
13 don't know.

14 CHAIR YEE: Well, it's simply your choice whether to
15 propose it as such.

16 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sure. I would propose to
17 add it.

18 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Commissioners Sadhwani and
19 Toledo? And then we'll get to the Commissioner Turner.

20 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I was actually thinking -- and
21 it kind of would go along with Commissioner Andersen's
22 point, although maybe it's different, potentially taking
23 Commissioner Taylor's language about -- to further seek
24 an order from the California -- so adding another
25 sentence or another clause, to further seek an order from

1 the California State Supreme Court to preserve the time
2 originally envisioned consistent with the original -- and
3 I believe Commissioner Taylor said consistent with the
4 original -- and I'm probably butchering his language --
5 the original holidays consistent with -- and I'm trying
6 to insert the language that Commissioner Taylor had had
7 in there, which would require us to go back to all of our
8 stakeholders and work with them on that as well as
9 Government Relations.

10 So we -- so getting to Commissioner Andersen's
11 point, that language would mean -- actually, any of this
12 would mean that we -- as Government Relations as a
13 Commission would have to go back to our stakeholders and
14 work through this process -- the legal and the policy
15 process with them.

16 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Turner?

17 COMMISSIONER TURNER: My point was to be able to add
18 in the language that was suggested with Commissioner --
19 with Commissioner Taylor, and then Commissioner Andersen
20 gave language as well. I just did not want to -- it was
21 lifted twice. I thought some of it was good, viable, you
22 know, I thought there was a way that it could be written
23 in and I didn't want us to keep getting past it, that's
24 all.

25 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And so I think Commissioner --

1 so maybe if we can --

2 COMMISSIONER TURNER: There is --

3 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Let's see, we have a required
4 break in about twelve minutes. I'm wondering if we can
5 take that a bit early and if Commissioners Toledo and
6 Sadhwani would like to contemplate this proposed
7 amendment and perhaps come back with either a revised
8 version of the original motion -- of the revised motion
9 or further -- or revert back -- come back with a further
10 revision of the revision or revert back to the original
11 revision, then we can contemplate. Should we do that
12 then? Shall we go to break then till -- let's see, I
13 think we should just go ahead and take our full fifteen-
14 minute break then. So it's 7:48. That would take us to
15 8:13.

16 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Chair, since we're assigning
17 work, can the break a little bit longer for those of
18 us --

19 CHAIR YEE: Sure. This means going into extra
20 innings for sure. So how much longer?

21 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'm okay with the fifteen-
22 minute break personally. But I don't -- I don't know
23 about others.

24 CHAIR YEE: So why don't we say --

25 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think I'm okay with fifteen,

1 because I think we have the language. I think we just
2 have to massage it a little bit.

3 CHAIR YEE: Why don't we say 8:05; how's that?

4 (Whereupon, a recess was held)

5 CHAIR YEE: Welcome back. We'll continue with
6 California's Citizens Redistricting Commission, and we're
7 discussing agenda item 4-A. There has been a motion on
8 the floor concerning our timeline. We're in the middle
9 of considering a possible amendment to that motion. So
10 Commissioners Sadhwani and Toledo, you are the Government
11 Affairs Subcommittee and it's your motion. You can
12 take --

13 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I have forwarded the motion to
14 Director Hernandez, so he should have it and be able to
15 share it.

16 MR. HERNANDEZ: So this is the motion that we had
17 previously. This is the updated motion language.

18 CHAIR YEE: Okay. So Commissioners Toledo and
19 Sadhwani, if you're happy with the updated language, then
20 you can --

21 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So maybe I can read it out to
22 the group so we can all hear it. To seek an order --

23 MR. WOOCHEER: I'm sorry. I think the additional
24 language was appended to the earlier version of the
25 motion, not the version that we all agreed upon at --

1 before we went for the break.

2 CHAIR YEE: Oh.

3 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Oh, you're right. So if we
4 can take the last portion of the -- starting with the
5 "with" -- "with the request". If we can cut the last
6 portion of -- thank you, Fred. Thank you for catching
7 that.

8 MR. HERNANDEZ: So did you want me to take that out?

9 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No. If you can -- we're going
10 to move things from the original motion to this motion.

11 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay, hold on a second.

12 MR. WOOCHEER: So you're going to take that last
13 phrase and add that to the original motion.

14 MR. HERNANDEZ: Take the last phrase and add it to
15 the original motion. Okay. Got you. All right. I'm a
16 little slow at this time of the evening, I apologize.

17 MR. WOOCHEER: We all are.

18 MR. HERNANDEZ: And it needs to be added at the end
19 here? Or where shall I add it?

20 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: At the end.

21 MR. WOOCHEER: Yeah. Replace the period with a comma
22 or insert a comma there. And then, you know, now add --
23 and then at the beginning of that you can get rid of the,
24 it's not -- really unnecessary "to accept the advice of
25 counsel", and just have, "to seek an order". There. I

1 think that's it.

2 CHAIR YEE: Okay. So the revised motion reads as
3 follows: motion to seek an order from the California
4 State Supreme Court confirming that the calculation of
5 the "additional federal delay" as used in the Padilla
6 decision is based upon the date at the Statewide Database
7 is able to reformat the legacy data set into a usable
8 format for building the statewide redistricting database,
9 with a request for an additional extension of four days
10 to account for Christmas and Thanksgiving holidays.

11 Okay, discussion. Commissioner Kennedy?

12 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Two things. One, I would
13 suggest that we put, "to be", after "is". "The Padilla
14 decision is to be based upon the date of". And as far as
15 the holidays, we're looking at Thanksgiving, Christmas
16 and New Year's. And I just would put them in
17 chronological order to make sense. But --

18 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Commissioners Sadhwani and
19 Toledo, are you okay with those changes?

20 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes. Those are great
21 comments. Thank you.

22 CHAIR YEE: Okay. And to account for the
23 Thanksgiving, Christmas, and New Year's holidays.

24 Commissioner Vazquez?

25 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I'm just really

1 thinking about the potential that we could get this
2 earlier than what we're currently talking about. And I'm
3 nervous that if we -- if we talk -- if we are specific
4 about which holidays we are trying to avoid, we may not
5 get -- we may not achieve the goal that I think we are
6 trying to achieve, which is to really have community
7 input of -- after the holidays.

8 So if we get it earlier, I -- like, I'm just -- I'm
9 just afraid that by saying only four days, then at best,
10 maybe January 4th, or you know, January 7th could be what
11 our time line is, which doesn't really get to what I
12 think -- what it -- certainly what I want and what I
13 think I'm hearing from other Commissioners who are
14 wanting us to be mindful of the holiday season.

15 And so I was doing some thinking over the break
16 about what this language could be, and I will read it.
17 And then I can -- I can email it to Alvaro. But it
18 starts, I'm proposing an amendment to preserve the
19 current motion as is starting with a Statewide Database.

20 And then it says -- let's see, the calculation of
21 the "additional federal delay" as used in the Padilla
22 decision is based upon the date the Statewide Database is
23 able to reformat a legacy data set into a usable format
24 for building the statewide redistricting database. And
25 then here's what I'm proposing changes:

1 And allows for the Commission to issue draft maps
2 consistent with the envisioned statutory time for review
3 that did not have an annual holiday season as a barrier
4 for meaningful public input. Instead of "season", we
5 could put a time period of fourteen days. And I'm
6 sending this to Alvaro.

7 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Commissioners Toledo and
8 Sadhwani, how do you feel about this proposal?

9 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I guess for me, I'm just
10 wondering what defines annual holiday season? I think at
11 the end I heard you say fourteen days, and I'm just
12 wondering where that number comes from. And I do also
13 kind of wonder -- and I'm just thinking out loud here,
14 we're basing this on the Christmas season, but certainly
15 there are other seasons that are out there.

16 We don't want to think about those, or we do, or how
17 do we account for those? I mean, of course, we have a
18 federal holiday for Christmas, which is kind of what we
19 based this motion on. But I'm just trying to better
20 understand, like, how to frame an annual holiday season.

21 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Turner?

22 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I was -- I've been
23 trying to think through Commissioner Vazquez and then
24 Commissioner Sadhwani's question. I'm wondering if it
25 can be framed that it just is a winter holiday season, so

1 that we're not naming any explicit holidays. But I think
2 it is common California knowledge that winter holidays is
3 inclusive of quite a bit and there are many things that
4 close down and stop operating during that time period.

5 So the wording, I would probably lean towards naming
6 it either winter or holiday, but the fourteen days comes
7 because for many of the coalition groups that I work in,
8 grassroots groups, it's almost an impossibility to move
9 things through that time period.

10 Things close down and not out of the luxury that
11 they just get to now not work. But because of the
12 complexity of the work all year round, it's almost mental
13 health break, shutdown time, et cetera. So we don't need
14 to go in all of that, but they're not around and it is
15 difficult to engage during that time period, and it is
16 the full two weeks. It's not -- so the fourteen days, I
17 don't know how to put words around it or on it other than
18 that, but that's when people are ghosts. They're no
19 longer available to engage.

20 CHAIR YEE: Further discussion. Commissioner
21 Andersen? No.

22 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. Yes, I do. Actually,
23 rather than say allow for [da-da-da-da], I kind of like
24 leaving the first set with these changes, the request for
25 additional extension of fourteen days to account for the

1 annual holiday time period. Annual -- yeah, annual
2 holiday time period.

3 CHAIR YEE: Okay. That is a different proposed
4 amendment.

5 Commissioner Kennedy and then Vazquez?

6 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: This is just musing aloud.
7 I'm wondering -- and I mean, I guess we could go back to
8 the videos from 2011, but are we expecting more feedback
9 from the preliminary draft maps or from the final maps?
10 If we're talking about preliminary maps --

11 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No, preliminary draft.

12 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: The wording is preliminary
13 draft maps.

14 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, sorry.

15 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: The ones that are, you know,
16 due by November 1st, or November 1st plus whatever
17 additional federal delay. I'm just wondering aloud where
18 we expect the most input, and maybe our community
19 partners can help us out on that one. Thank you.

20 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Vazquez and then Sadhwani.

21 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I'll pass.

22 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Sadhwani?

23 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. I think as written,
24 if I'm understanding this correctly, this would suggest
25 that we -- if data is received August 16th, that we are

1 asking for January 7th, plus an additional fourteen days,
2 which would put us at January 21st, which I believe from
3 the prior conversations that we had, would very likely
4 impact the date of the primary. I don't have an exact
5 assessment of whether or not that would actually happen
6 at this point in time, but I would be uncomfortable with
7 that.

8 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Vazquez? And then I have a
9 comment.

10 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. Understood. I was more
11 thinking that those fourteen days would be January 2nd
12 onward, so that we'd practically be talking about the
13 16th, right? Is my math right? The 15th, which I guess
14 is a Saturday, so the 14th. And I only put in those --
15 the specificity of dates to be more specific about the
16 holiday time period.

17 CHAIR YEE: My comment, and then Commissioner
18 Fernandez. So I'm thinking, on one hand, I'm really
19 torn. On one hand, fourteen days, you know, I mean,
20 since as early as I can remember, fourteen days for
21 Christmas break, you know, that was the best, right? But
22 legally, you know, I mean, it's a school -- it's a
23 traditional school break period.

24 Legally, I don't know how we would defend it. And I
25 just -- I just -- that's, you know, I just don't know. I

1 could possibly see time for equivalent holiday, you know,
2 the language that Commissioner Taylor had originally
3 suggested, a number of holidays on an equivalent basis to
4 the original period. But fourteen days based on, you
5 know, granted that's -- that is a special -- a unique
6 time in the year, but still, legally I just don't see how
7 that argument is going to carry.

8 Okay. Commissioner Fernandez?

9 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I
10 would actually -- I would be more comfortable just naming
11 a date, like January 14th, because at the end of the day,
12 we don't know when we're going to receive the data,
13 right? And -- but maybe what we can justify is we know
14 it's going to -- based on when we're going to receive it,
15 it's going to be somewhere within the holiday, winter
16 season, whatever we want to call it.

17 And you know, regardless of when I receive it, I
18 would shoot for more of a specific date so we're not
19 thrown too early, like at the end of December or too
20 late, end of January. So I mean, I would -- January
21 14th, I think it's a -- it's a Friday, I think would be
22 doable. Or I would be able to support that. But again,
23 it's something that we would have to be able to argue.

24 CHAIR YEE: I'd be hesitant about, you know, if that
25 argument fails and that date is rejected, then we're back

1 to nothing. We're just back to Padilla. And so --

2 Commissioners Toledo and Vazquez?

3 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you, Chair Yee. The way
4 I'm looking at this is it's really two motions in one,
5 the first really being about the -- at this point, the
6 January 7th date. So the -- and then a second motion
7 that's kind of tied together about this additional
8 holiday extension.

9 And so we would -- the arguments would be -- we'd be
10 seeking advice from -- or not advice, but we'd be seeking
11 an order from the court on these two issues. And they'd
12 be presented in the best way possible to get the best
13 outcome possible. But we may -- we might succeed on one
14 and not the other. All right.

15 We're going to make the best -- we would make the
16 best case possible on both and -- and not get everything
17 we want. Ideally, we would -- we would get what's best
18 for -- because I'm sure the court would weigh what's best
19 for California and to ensure that the constitutional and
20 all of the requirements are met.

21 And so we may or may not get everything we want, but
22 perhaps making the -- putting forward the arguments
23 may -- would at least voice the concerns that we're
24 hearing from the community and from some of the
25 Commissioners. So that's something that we could do,

1 doesn't mean we have to do that. And so that's something
2 to think through.

3 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Vazquez and then Turner?

4 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. Like I said, I'm a bit
5 agnostic about the fourteen days. I tried to make annual
6 holiday time period the policy-driving language. Because
7 as there are many holidays through -- from November to
8 January are several significant cultural and religious
9 holidays that simply just were not -- were not a -- an
10 issue in the prior timeline.

11 And so I feel like I would like to see us try to
12 make an argument that accounts for just the fact that,
13 for planning purposes, November and December, every --
14 everything across the state in terms of business except
15 unless you're in retail slows down. You -- they just --
16 that business goes slower.

17 I know even in my work in activism, for the most
18 part, we plan for nothing to get done in November and
19 December because people are off on vacations, they're
20 selling -- celebrating their cultural holidays and
21 Thanksgiving, traveling, et cetera. Things don't --
22 things don't happen in November or December, and we
23 basically write those months off as no progress made.
24 They're time for ideating and planning with your internal
25 team. But you don't plan for anything substantive to

1 happen because nothing can happen. And so I just
2 really -- I really want us to think about how to
3 implement that at the Commission level.

4 And I agree with Commissioner Fernandez. I think
5 maybe it's probably best for us to name a date that we're
6 shooting for. But I would also like to see in the motion
7 that we approve at least the foundations of what our
8 argument would be for that date.

9 Commissioner Turner and then Kennedy?

10 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. The latter part,
11 with a request for an additional extension to account
12 for -- and either naming them if it's the Commission's
13 desire or the holidays with an addition -- with the
14 request for an additional two-week period, or one-week
15 period, or whatever it's going to be, or with the request
16 for an extension until January 14th to allow for, is --
17 would be instead of naming the four days, perhaps would
18 be my suggestion.

19 CHAIR YEE: Okay. So at this point, we need
20 Commissioners Sadhwani and Toledo to weigh in on the
21 currently highlighted language.

22 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Chair?

23 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Kennedy?

24 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Also -- and this goes a bit
25 to my previous point, I think we might want to consider

1 looking at this extension as only applying to the final
2 deadline and not the deadline for the preliminary draft
3 maps, i.e., if we're -- if we're -- I mean, the
4 additional federal delay, yes, that should apply to the
5 deadline for the preliminary draft maps. But any
6 additional time should only affect the deadline for the
7 final maps, not the deadline for the preliminary draft
8 maps. And that would serve to ensure more time for
9 public comment on those preliminary draft maps. Thank
10 you.

11 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Toledo?

12 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'm just wondering if
13 Commissioner Kennedy has any suggested language to
14 account for his suggestion that -- some language that we
15 might be able -- he might be able to offer as an
16 amendment to incorporate his thinking? And --

17 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I think if we -- if where we
18 talk about this additional extension of X number of days
19 or until such date. Well, if it's until such date, then
20 I think that could reasonably be interpreted as only
21 applying to the final -- the deadline for the final maps.
22 If we're -- if we're asking for a certain number of days,
23 then I would just say for an additional extension of X
24 number of days to the deadline for the final maps.
25 Making it clear that it only applies in the case of the

1 final maps. Thank you.

2 CHAIR YEE: So to be clear. So that would
3 potentially change the proportion of time periods for
4 draft and final map? Okay. Whoa. That's an even bigger
5 ask.

6 MR. WOOCHEER: Actually, I think that's what we
7 were -- I mean, that -- I would agree with Commissioner
8 Kennedy. That was implicit in my understanding of what
9 we were asking for, that it would only be for the final
10 maps. That's the -- that's really what everybody's been
11 talking about. And it's really just a -- it should have
12 been in there to begin with to make that clear. But that
13 would have been my understanding of the intent. And yes,
14 it would change that six weeks. The theory would be it's
15 not really effectively six weeks because of the holidays.
16 And in order to preserve the intended time period for
17 public review, you need to actually make that six weeks a
18 little longer.

19 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Well, we have some proposed
20 amended language, including the fourteen-day language, as
21 an amendment that, Commissioners Toledo and Sadhwani, we
22 need you to either accept or reject.

23 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think the Commissioner
24 Akutagawa was going to say something.

25 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Commissioner Akutagawa?

1 VICE CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. Not going to
2 necessarily say I have additional language, but I do
3 wonder if there's -- if it makes sense to say something
4 that -- okay. Let me start over. I know that what I'm
5 hearing is that there's some concerns of what ifs. What
6 if we get the data earlier than then? That would move up
7 the timeline even if we say fourteen days, we could still
8 find ourselves within that, you know, the final maps
9 being due within a holiday time. Therefore, the -- the
10 ideal of having a stated date by which the final maps
11 would be submitted.

12 I wonder if there's some language that could be in
13 there that is kind of similar to what's in here, whether
14 it's fourteen days or something. But should it fall
15 within, you know, the last two weeks of December due to,
16 you know, a winter holiday time, that the timeline would
17 be moved forward, you know, X amount of days or something
18 like that.

19 So then regardless of when we get it in August -- I
20 doubt it's going to come any earlier than the 16th. But
21 I think to some of the -- I think some of the
22 conversations, someone said, well, what if we get it like
23 a week earlier then? You know, I mean, just trying to be
24 prepared for all that, short of just stating the date.
25 If there's discomfort in stating the date.

1 CHAIR YEE: Okay. We've had one written and several
2 verbal suggested amendments.

3 Commissioner Andersen?

4 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. I think I might have
5 it finally. With a request for an additional extension
6 for the final maps to January 14th to account for the
7 annual holiday period -- oh -- and that allows for
8 meaningful public input.

9 COMMISSIONER TOLEDI: Commissioner Kennedy, does
10 that language incorporate your feedback?

11 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Can you repeat that,
12 Commissioner Andersen?

13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So okay. So basically it's
14 on the first part of it. And it says, after the comma,
15 "building statewide redistricting database", with a
16 request for an additional extension of -- no, an
17 additional -- sorry -- with a request for an additional
18 extension for the final maps to January 14th to allow for
19 meaningful public input. I'm sorry. The annual -- the
20 annual holiday party needs to go in their first. To
21 January 14th to account for the annual holiday time
22 period and allow for meaningful public input.

23 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I mean, that does address my
24 point about extending only the deadline for the final
25 maps. Thank you.

1 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And it puts -- and it puts a
2 final day on it, not just -- it moves that time period.
3 Although I don't want you to say about the three days and
4 seven days. But it does move into the 14th.

5 CHAIR YEE: Friday, the 14th. Okay. So that's
6 another proposed amendment to the motion.

7 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I guess, I'm just curious if,
8 as we were debating and thinking through this amendment,
9 does it -- I'm just -- Commissioner Kennedy mentioned
10 that it addresses one of his issues. Is there an issue
11 that the amendment doesn't address or that the language
12 doesn't address or any concern that you might have around
13 that if we were to change this -- make the amendment?

14 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Kennedy, respond to that.

15 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Because I mean, the reason
16 that I ask that is Commissioner Kennedy has been spending
17 so much time on the Gantt chart. You know, he has that
18 Gantt chart memorized and he knows every little thing
19 that could potentially be impacting and who it would
20 impact. So I just -- I'm curious to get his take on
21 this.

22 CHAIR YEE: So Commissioner Kennedy, then Turner,
23 then Taylor.

24 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. I mean, again, the
25 counties need these maps before they can begin drawing

1 new precinct lines. Drawing new precinct lines is likely
2 to take thirty to forty-five days. And you know, I --
3 I -- people often underestimate the amount of work it
4 takes to organize an election. And I don't want to be
5 the cause of election failure. I mean, this may -- this
6 may require a further change to the primary date. That
7 would be my only concern.

8 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Turner?

9 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. I was going to state
10 that I like the amendment or the suggestion that
11 Commissioner Andersen is lifting. And I'm hopeful that
12 by allowing the community more time to fully participate
13 with enough advanced notice, that perhaps there can be
14 additional people hired in to help with the process of
15 drawing the lines, or there can be something else that
16 would be able to assist them with this advance notice so
17 that we are at least allowing enough time for -- because
18 we want them to draw lines, we want them to participate
19 behind good data, behind complete and inclusive data.

20 And so I rush in any process and anything that is
21 tough. It is. But I'm just really hoping that there
22 would be an opportunity for them to make adjustments now
23 knowing that this may for them also be a year that's an
24 anomaly, one that they may have shorter amount of time
25 than they typically do, and see what can be done to help

1 them accommodate that.

2 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Taylor?

3 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you. I would like some
4 clarification or somebody to help me with how we arrived
5 at fourteen days, is -- was that qualitative? How do we
6 define what the holiday season is? And then again, there
7 was just a mention as to data. What would be our data to
8 support that when caused to -- when it's brought to
9 question. Thank you.

10 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Sadhwani?

11 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think, just to answer
12 Commissioner Taylor. As far as I can tell, January 14th
13 is an arbitrary date based on an assessment of the
14 Commission. That being said, if it's the will of the
15 Commission to go and ask the Supreme Court for the 14th,
16 then let's do it, right. You know, we've talked about
17 this issue over and over and over again for many months.

18 And I think the time is upon us to take action and
19 to move forward because inaction is actually going to
20 cost us time in the long run if we don't clarify our
21 final date. I would have preferred to have had a date
22 that we go to the Supreme Court that has some rationale
23 or data behind it.

24 But it sounds like there's a -- there's -- that, you
25 know, Commissions are kind of circling around January

1 14th. If that's what it takes for us to move forward,
2 then I can move forward with that. I mean, I think we
3 need to keep this process going. So if January 14th is
4 our date, I'm okay with that.

5 CHAIR YEE: I think we have two fourteens going
6 here, January 14th and then the fourteen-day delay.

7 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: My preference is the January
8 14th -- if I can just respond to that. The fourteen-day
9 time period, in addition to the first half of that
10 sentence, would put us at the 21st, which I do think
11 would have a severe impact on the primary.

12 I don't know about the 14th, but I think it was
13 somewhat squishy when we had done some of that analysis
14 before. So possibly we could retain the primary date.
15 But at the end of the day, this is simply a request to
16 the Supreme Court. We don't know that we would get it.

17 CHAIOR YEE: We have Commissioners Turner, Toledo,
18 and Andersen. And then we actually have some public
19 comments that we probably would like to hear.
20 Commissioner Fernandez, as well.

21 Commissioner Turner?

22 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. So I'm talking January
23 14th. And I think that there is no hard data unless
24 there has been studies done about just community
25 participation in the holiday months. So I don't think

1 we're going to get any hard data at all. I think the
2 additional time period just will allot for -- again, just
3 repeating the same information. I think it will allot
4 for Californians to engage those that aren't typically
5 engaging in the process.

6 We are out trying to ensure that we're doing our
7 part for outreach, and those that we're outreaching to --
8 those that will always participate in process, will
9 participate in the process regardless of what it is. And
10 we're trying to expand this to -- for more. And the 14th
11 will just allow that because it gets them further beyond
12 the time period that typically they're not around to
13 engage. They're not available or they don't respond. I
14 should not say they're not around or available, where we
15 don't have opportunity to engage; things do shut down
16 during this time period. So no hard data to be had. It
17 is very soft and squishy, but based on my fact and
18 reality of many years.

19 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Toledo?

20 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think my point is that --
21 that I wanted to make was that this is a -- this can be
22 crafted in a way that it's two arguments, right, one for
23 the initial argument that we had initially, and then
24 secondarily, the additional time for the holidays.

25 So we -- so it doesn't in case we got one or the

1 other, or both ideally. But -- and also the January 14th
2 would -- the reason I -- I'm thinking may work is that it
3 does give a planning date, right? It kind of sets a date
4 for the latest possible date for us to get the maps in.

5 And so from a planning perspective, it's for -- and
6 not just planning for us, but planning for all of
7 everyone else, although it is a challenge because it
8 doesn't mean we're going to get it. But that would be
9 the potential. It allows us to plan better and plan our
10 time out, and ensure the meaningful input and do our job
11 in a planful way. Certainly we're planning, but having a
12 final -- we're seeking additional time.

13 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Andersen?

14 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I actually said this
15 because I think we really need to ask for it. The public
16 has asked -- has asked us to ask for it. I don't think
17 we get it. I think is going to be January 7th. And
18 we're going to say, well, thanks. We looked -- because I
19 think the January 14th, they'll take one look at that and
20 then go back to the election board, unless the election
21 board says yes, then, okay, we'll get the 14th.

22 Otherwise, I think we'll get the 7th. But that's
23 why I said the additional extension just for the final
24 map. Because otherwise, if the dates go by the first
25 part, it will be the 7th. So at least if they like the

1 first part, we'll get the 7th and then hopefully more.
2 But and then there's the issue still, guys, of the three
3 days and seven days. But let's not even talk about that.

4 CAHIR YEE: Okay. So we'll get to that. That's
5 easier, hopefully.

6 Commissioner Fernandez and then we'll go to public
7 comment.

8 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just wanted to note that
9 many of the comments that we received talked about, you
10 know, our date being late January, and then they talked
11 about extending the election date to end of June. We --
12 as a Commission, we have no authority on that date. We
13 if -- if we miss the date and if they don't change their
14 date, I guess you can move forward with the old maps,
15 although the Congressional districts, I'm not sure what
16 they would do with that because there's two different
17 numbers now. So personally, I would try to not -- I
18 would try to get -- I would want to get the maps in
19 before it would impact the elections, the primaries.

20 CHAIR YEE: Okay. We're going to public comment
21 now, but note that the motion as it stands does not
22 include the amended language, at least not yet.

23 So Katy, could we take public comment, please?

24 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. May I ask
25 for clarification on what the public comment is on?

1 CHAIR YEE: Yes. Public comment on the motion on
2 the floor concerning our timeline.

3 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Okay. Thank you, Chair.

4 The Commission will now take public comment on the
5 current motion on the floor for the timeline relating to
6 motion for 4-A -- agenda item 4-A. To give comment,
7 please call 877-853-5247 and enter the meeting ID number
8 95977110538 for this meeting.

9 Once you have dialed in, please press star 9 to
10 enter the comment queue. The full call-in instructions
11 have been read previously in this meeting and are
12 provided in full on the livestream landing page. And at
13 this time we do have several raised hands.

14 Caller 2448, we will be beginning with you. Please
15 follow the prompts to unmute. Caller 2448, the floor is
16 yours. Go ahead.

17 MR. CANNON: Hello. My name is Peter Cannon, and I
18 have called in previously. When the Padilla decision set
19 a deadline of December 15th, there were four state
20 holidays between the July 31st release of census data and
21 that December 15th adoption deadline: Labor Day,
22 Veterans Day, Thanksgiving Day, and the day after.

23 Under your proposed timeline, there would be two
24 additional state holidays, Christmas and New Year's.
25 Also, when the court moved the deadline from August 15th

1 to December 15th, they did not add additional days for
2 the additional holidays covered by that change, including
3 Labor Day, Veterans Day, and Thanksgiving. Thank you.

4 CHAIR YEE: Thank you, Mr. Cannon.

5 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Up
6 next, we have caller with the last four 5405. If you
7 will please follow the prompts to unmute. Caller 5405,
8 the floor is yours. Go ahead.

9 MR. JOHNSON: Hello, Commissioners. This is Dylan
10 Johnson with SEIU California again. Thank you for
11 opening it back up to public comment on this item. So I
12 just wanted to point out, your counsel has said that he
13 cannot give you advice in open session on seeking
14 additional time for the holidays. And the whole reason
15 the Commission has waited more than two months to address
16 this issue is so you could have counsel give you advice.
17 So I would, you know, recommend before moving forward
18 with such a motion, you should get advice from counsel,
19 even if that means going briefly back into closed
20 session.

21 You took two months, so it would be worth a few
22 extra minutes. For example, to Commissioner Sadhwani's
23 point and Kennedy's point, the more the deadline is
24 delayed, the more you will conflict with the electoral
25 calendar. And if that conflict impacts your chances for

1 success with the court, that's certainly something I
2 would want to know as a Commissioner before casting my
3 vote. So I just wanted to make a suggestion. And again,
4 I appreciate you taking the time and for the hard work
5 tonight.

6 CHAIR YEE: Thank you, Mr. Johnson.

7 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Up
8 next, we have caller 6597. If you will please follow the
9 prompts to unmute. Thank you so much. Go ahead. The
10 floor is yours.

11 MR. BANE: Hello?

12 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, hello. The floor is
13 yours.

14 MR. BANE: Thank you. David Bane, again, from the
15 San Diego County IRC. I just wanted to confirm to you on
16 our letter that I referred to earlier contains a
17 rationale for January 15th, of all things. When we
18 recognized it was this Saturday, we've actually shifted
19 to January 14th. But in addition to some of the points
20 that have already been brought out, I did want to mention
21 again that we have been in contact with registrars voters
22 and others who work on preparation.

23 And as Commissioner Kennedy so eloquently said, we
24 landed on January 14th, not least because it provided a
25 challenging, but at least possible, in our view, way to

1 keep moving forward and keep things in sequence and on
2 time while still allowing the public time for input
3 before and after map drawing.

4 I do want to mention, though, that you have the
5 chart that I mentioned earlier in the full attachments on
6 page 9 of how we looked at all the various dates
7 involved. But we are very concerned, and have been,
8 about allowing the public time during periods of
9 holidays.

10 And I don't want to be specific about any particular
11 holiday, but when communities of interest themselves may
12 have opportunities to talk, but also may have times that
13 would be challenging to respond. So I appreciate the
14 idea of going for a specific date and see how the court
15 reacts.

16 I think Commissioner Sadhwani has made the key
17 point. Taking some action tonight really is important
18 and really critical and would help us and I think members
19 of the public understand where you are, as so many have
20 said. But I do want to express appreciation for the
21 awareness that none of this is happening in a vacuum,
22 that there is important work before and after whatever
23 date is proposed, and that I'm confident local
24 commissions will continue working with you.

25 And I hope the Legislature will as well, on finding

1 all ways to mitigate this, because it's going to have
2 impact beyond the Commission's work. But I'm heartened
3 by the discussion tonight. Appreciate it and appreciate
4 the -- again, the chance to talk to you. Thank you.

5 CHAIR YEE: Thank you, Mr. Bane.

6 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much. Up
7 next, we have caller 3723. If you will please follow the
8 prompts to unmute. Caller 3723, the floor is yours. Go
9 ahead.

10 MS. HOWARD: Good evening, Commissioners. It's
11 Deborah Howard, California Senior Advocates League. I
12 have three questions from your discussion about this, and
13 I'm wondering if you can share or have an anticipated
14 timeline that the court would respond, what -- when might
15 we get clarity?

16 And then second, can you confirm, I believe
17 Commissioner Yee said that reformatted data is not
18 usable. It has to be reformatted and reallocated. So my
19 question is, is does that make September 23rd the date in
20 the original scenario memo for reformatted and
21 reallocated data to be the official calendar trigger?
22 And so I'm just hoping that you will clarify what is --
23 what you -- what you're defining as usable format.

24 And the second or the third question is is lastly,
25 both Commissioners Turner and Vazquez have talked -- made

1 many comments about the holiday season. And my question
2 is, are you looking at this as time for the Commission to
3 close down so families and other people would just be
4 celebrating as they celebrate? Or are you looking at
5 that as just -- I'm not understanding how you're thinking
6 about that.

7 And then, there is --

8 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

9 MS. HOWARD: I think that's it. Thank you.

10 CHAIR YEE: Thank you, Ms. Howard.

11 MS. HOWARD: Thank you.

12 CHAIR YEE: Yeah. I don't think anyone has
13 discussed whether or not we would take any time off other
14 than federal holidays -- federal and state holidays. The
15 time required for the reformatted data to be reallocated
16 as well, that has never been part of the calculation of
17 deadlines. That's simply time that has to be spent in
18 order to produce the database that we actually use for
19 redistricting.

20 So my mentioning that was not to comment on
21 deadlines, but rather just to comment on what it means to
22 have something delivered to the Commission. What will be
23 delivered to the Commission will be the reformatted and
24 reallocated data. That's what we work with. Any other
25 comments respond to her other questions? And actually I

1 lost track of them. If not, let's see. Any other
2 callers, Katy?

3 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Chair, I believe Turner
4 had her hand --

5 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. So --

6 CHAIR YEE: Are you responding to Ms. Howard?

7 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. Thank you for the
8 question. Though I would love that time for family, it
9 was not so much so for personal, but it was to ensure
10 that Californians community -- all community would
11 have -- all Californians would have an opportunity to
12 participate during the -- and not have more time to
13 participate after the holiday period.

14 What we know about many of our organizations,
15 grassroots organizations, those that are in place in an
16 attempt to get people to engage civically that do not
17 typically engage. We know that for that last couple of
18 months -- the last couple of weeks every year, we know
19 that the either the organizations aren't there to engage
20 the public and they're not there because typically what
21 we see is public that either go away, they do face
22 forward towards their families. Some go out of town,
23 some go, you know, from whatever their place of origin
24 is, and they're just not here.

25 We are just very careful and wanting to ensure that

1 we give people the opportunity to participate, to see
2 those final maps, to be able to weigh in on them at a
3 time when they are here in California and present and not
4 distracted by holidays or anything else. We want those
5 voices participating.

6 CHAIR YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

7 Any other callers?

8 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: That was all of our
9 raised hands of this time, Chair.

10 CHAIR YEE: Okay. We'll go to further Commissioner
11 comments, starting with Commissioner Sinay and then
12 Akutagawa.

13 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can we just put in January 14th
14 and keep it simple? I mean, I feel like the way the
15 motion is written now, we're giving them way too many
16 reasons to say no or to get confused. I'm confused. And
17 I mean, I know legalese is confusing, but I think when we
18 try -- I just feel like if we were to -- or say -- I
19 don't know.

20 It just -- I mean, I'm -- I will go with the June --
21 the January 14th. I feel more confident with the January
22 7th date, and -- but I think we need to make a decision
23 and -- but I wouldn't want to leave us open to it
24 happening on December 26th, the deadline ending up being
25 December 26th. And that's why I keep going back to can

1 we just put a concrete date?

2 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner -- I'm sorry, Commissioner
3 Akutagawa, and then Sadhwani?

4 VICE CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Well, actually, a couple of
5 things. One, I'm sorry if I kind of spaced out on this,
6 Commissioner Yee, but I think the previous caller asked
7 when the court might respond. So I just wanted to just
8 put that out there.

9 CHAIR YEE: Oh, right.

10 VICE CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Separately, I guess I just
11 want to just make it known. I mean, I agree with -- I
12 don't know, I guess I'm just really feeling a lot of -- a
13 lot of angst on all of this. I mean, I completely agree.
14 And I hear what -- what is being said about the holiday
15 time. Although, I do also want to just acknowledge that
16 not everybody celebrates that holiday time in the same
17 ways because it's a religious or whatever other holidays.

18 There are people who actually just -- just look at
19 it as it's just vacation time because the rest of the
20 state, or you know, their colleagues shut down. So I do
21 want to just acknowledge that difference. But with that
22 said, I think whatever we need to do to ensure that we
23 get the best possible comments that we can, but also at
24 the same time, I do also want to just state that any
25 delay that is going to impact the primary dates is of

1 great concern to me because I think that that is going to
2 disenfranchise Californians more so than the fact that
3 they have to give comment during a holiday time.

4 And I think to me, that's going to be an important
5 goalpost that we need to keep our eye on as well, too.
6 So you know, hopefully we can, you know, have -- have --
7 I don't want to say have our cake and eat it, it's not
8 really that. But to be able to accommodate the
9 additional time that's needed, but also making sure that
10 we remain mindful of the time.

11 And I do appreciate David -- David Bane's comments
12 about what San Diego has done. And -- and we should
13 probably, you know, if we can, maybe take a closer look
14 at what they've also written in as well to -- to help us.

15 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Sadhwani, Vazquez, and then
16 we actually have another caller.

17 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I just -- I -- two
18 things, largely in response to Commissioner Sinay. I'm
19 happy to -- well, it's not my motion, it's Commissioner
20 Toledo's. But as the person who seconded it, I would be
21 happy to accept the language of adding January 14th to
22 that end part as Commissioner Andersen, I think it was,
23 had suggested previously.

24 And then the second point, yeah, absolutely, the
25 court could come back and say it's not January 7th, it's

1 not the 14th, it's the 31st or some other date.

2 Certainly, we saw that to be the case in Michigan in the
3 recent case that -- that occurred there.

4 So of course, this is a different court. Perhaps
5 they'll think differently about it in terms of the people
6 of California and the process that we are engaging in.
7 But of course, that is one option that the court would
8 have in front of it. But I would be comfortable putting
9 the date of -- the request date of January 14th to that
10 second half of the motion.

11 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Vazquez?

12 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I think I just wanted
13 to respond to Commissioner Akutagawa's point. I think,
14 at least for me, the way I was envisioning these two
15 weeks. For me, they're a compromise for what I would
16 truly want, which is at least an additional month,
17 considering I feel like, like I've said before, November
18 and December are slow business months and by asking for
19 two weeks into the new year, that for me seems like a
20 very -- a huge compromise on our part in terms of
21 community input and compromising depth and meaningfulness
22 of the community input we receive.

23 And for me, that two weeks is a huge compromise,
24 ideally. And what many community partners have asked us
25 to do is set a deadline at the end of January. So I

1 already feel like we are -- we're compromising. I am
2 certainly compromising by this two week.

3 So it's -- there's somewhat of a legal. I was
4 attempting to -- trying to make a legal argument by
5 referring to the two weeks between Christmas and New
6 Year's. But ideally, in my mind, we really -- we really
7 lose two months of real substantive business work with
8 our timeline as is.

9 And so this two-weeks is an -- is that -- is a
10 compromise. And extending beyond that in terms of, like,
11 how much I believe the Commission is compromising in
12 deference to elections administration. I actually -- I
13 really disagree that that our process, our redistricting
14 process is any less important in terms of free and fair
15 elections than the administration of precinct drawing.

16 And I especially -- I like -- I take -- I take
17 issue -- and I don't think, Commissioner Akutagawa, this
18 is your implication. But I feel like some of this
19 process is the implication that the Commission has more
20 flexibility or is asking for more flexibility with its
21 mandate than can be -- can be accommodated in other
22 processes related to fair elections.

23 For me, again, speaking personally, if we have to
24 move the primary date, let's move the primary date.
25 Like, those are -- that's largely administrative. And I

1 feel like we're being asked to compromise a huge piece of
2 our mandate and the value of Citizens Redistricting
3 Commission, which is community input for -- and not --
4 and not having the administration of elections that take
5 place after our process, like, that is immobile because
6 it doesn't require community input.

7 And I feel like we're just -- like the implication,
8 I feel like what we would be saying if we don't at least
9 ask our partners in elections to, like, make additional
10 accommodations or have them seek additional relief is
11 that, oh, because, you know, we can, we can be flexible
12 with community input. And I just -- I'm uncomfortable
13 with that implication.

14 I feel like we have a mandate to do meaningful
15 public input. We know that public input will necessarily
16 go down between November and December. And the
17 compromise that I hope this Commission makes is that we
18 at least ask for two weeks to make up for that lost
19 business time and community engagement time in two
20 months.

21 CHAIR YEE: Okay. We are about to go to public
22 comment. But before that, Commissioner Toledo, I don't
23 think he weighed in on the fourteen-day thought that
24 Commissioner Sadhwani had proposed.

25 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And I don't know if

1 Commissioner Sadhwani wanted to go first. But you know,
2 I think Commissioner Taylor was one of the reasons why we
3 started thinking about an amendment. So I'm just curious
4 to see where he stands on the -- in terms of the language
5 that is proposed by Commissioner Andersen, because that's
6 the language that we're looking at this point, and
7 whether it embodies the spirit of the language that he
8 originally proposed or doesn't. And that's the one point
9 that I'm still trying to debate.

10 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Commissioner Taylor, if you have
11 a brief response to that.

12 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah. Briefly. Thank you.
13 You know, I think that there was -- so this to me sounds
14 like a total challenge to that -- to that whole timeline.
15 And I understand that -- that this is an exceptional time
16 given the circumstances that are -- that are before us.
17 And I'm trying to wonder if all the adjustment is being
18 made by the Commission. And where -- and if we're giving
19 due regard to the legal standard that -- the statutory
20 standard that was given to us. So my original verbiage
21 was trying to be respectful of that timeline and in
22 relations to what's before us.

23 So I would -- I would have to -- I would -- I'm
24 grappling with what to me seems like the arbitrariness of
25 the fourteen days. Or you know, maybe I can come to

1 grips with a hard date. But holiday season as a whole
2 seems to me to be innocuous. It's whole. I don't have a
3 definition for that -- that I struggle with. Thank you.

4 CHAIR YEE: Let's go ahead and take public comment.

5 Commissioner Sadhwani, do you want to jump in before
6 we do that?

7 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No, that's fine.

8 CHAIR YEE: Okay. At this point, the motion on the
9 floor is the motion as first revised without further
10 amendments concerning fourteen days or January 14th.

11 Okay, with that Katy, let's take our callers.

12 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Would you like me to read
13 the instructions still or just take the callers?

14 CHAIR YEE: Let's just take the callers.

15 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Okay. All right. Caller
16 6337, please follow the prompts to unmute. Caller 6337,
17 go ahead. The floor is yours.

18 MS. GOLD: Good evening, Commissioners. Rosalind
19 Gold with NALEO Educational Fund. My apologies if my
20 comment might be just slightly broader than the specific
21 motion that's on the floor, but it is certainly germane
22 to the topic that's being discussed, which is can the
23 Commission and should the Commission frame a request to
24 the Supreme Court for additional time beyond what might
25 be seen as a very formulaic calculation based solely on

1 the trigger date of when the legacy data is formatted?

2 And I just want to thank the Commissioners for
3 thinking in a wider way. I think that if the
4 Commissioners include an ask that goes beyond that
5 formulaic ask, that certainly making the best arguments,
6 I think as one of the Commissioners says, what is in the
7 best interest of the State of California and is
8 consistent with the Supreme Court's language on the need
9 for public input is certainly a very valuable option that
10 the Commission should look at.

11 And then finally, I know some Commissioners have
12 expressed concerns that if we change the primary date, we
13 will lead to voter confusion. Well, you know, as an
14 organization that has done a lot of voter education and
15 engagement, once we know the date of an election, we can
16 be very nimble and flexible on public education.

17 I mean, we are now gearing up to educate Latino
18 voters about a recall election, which is something that
19 we had --

20 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

21 MS. GOLD: -- no idea was going to be happening, you
22 know, ten months ago. So if, you know, we do have a
23 change in the primary date -- and it's not clear that
24 that would happen, but if we do have that we can adapt to
25 educating our communities to about that.

1 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

2 MS. GOLD: And that is a tradeoff we're willing to
3 take for the ability to have robust public comment once
4 the final draft maps are published. Thank you so much.

5 CHAIR YEE: Thank you, Ms. Gold. Next caller.

6 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes. Next caller is
7 caller 0563. I would like to invite those in the queue
8 to press star 9 indicating they would wish to comment
9 during this time. Right now caller 0563 does have their
10 hand raised. If you will follow the prompts to unmute.

11 Caller 0563, go ahead. The floor is yours.

12 MR. WOODSON: Good evening, Commissioners. This is
13 James Woodson calling from the Black Census and
14 Redistricting Hub. Thank you for this really robust
15 conversation and really the last few months of
16 deliberation that you all have been taking around this
17 issue.

18 I really called in, one, to echo my colleague from
19 NALEO's comments that she just made around the primary.
20 In specific, I wanted to just sort of address
21 Commissioner Akutagawa's comment about disenfranchisement
22 of voters, and you know, wanted to really just sort of
23 uplift that comment. There's certainly a risk of any
24 election, right, of disenfranchisement.

25 But I did want to emphasize, as you all are doing,

1 weighing of various different sort of factors and
2 considerations on all of these issues, that there is a
3 great risk of disenfranchisement and people not being
4 able to participate in redistricting. You know, the
5 impact of that could really, you know, be felt across
6 multiple elections, not just one election. You're
7 talking about at minimum ten, right?

8 A primary in sort of an Assembly race and a general
9 election. And so again, as you are thinking about this,
10 right, disenfranchisement is not just about people being
11 able to vote in an election, but really them being able
12 to participate in civic engagement and --

13 MR. MANOFF: Thirty seconds.

14 MR. WOODSON: -- participation. And that includes
15 the redistricting process, right? And that's -- that's
16 part of what we're fighting for is to be able to have
17 people be able to meaningfully engage in the
18 redistricting process, but also in voting.

19 MR. MANOFF: Fifteen seconds.

20 MR. WOODSON: So thank you for your time, I just
21 wanted to make that point, and I appreciate the
22 conversation.

23 CHAIR YEE: Thank you, Mr. Woodson.

24 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much.

25 Caller 3643, if you will please follow the prompts to

1 unmute. Caller 3 -- go ahead. The floor is yours. Good
2 evening.

3 MR. MEHTA STEIN: Thank you. Good evening. My name
4 is Jonathan Mehta Stein. I'm the executive director of
5 California Common Cause. I wanted to call in and thank
6 the Commission for its long, robust, thoughtful, careful
7 conversation tonight on this topic and the conversations
8 you've had on this topic going back now for weeks or
9 months.

10 In particular, I want to thank you for being the
11 carriers of the torch when it comes to the intent of the
12 Voters FIRST Act. We fought for the Voters FIRST Act in
13 order to put the community and the California public in
14 the driver's seat of the redistricting process. And we
15 see the care that you show towards that goal and today's
16 conversation and the conversation about how exactly to
17 extend the public participation period around and past
18 the holidays.

19 So we can see the intense -- your effort to protect
20 the original intent of the Voters FIRST Act in a
21 conversation today and in the careful consideration
22 you're giving to these issues. And so I just wanted to
23 call in and extend my personal thanks for the work that
24 you're doing and the work ahead. Have a great evening.

25 CHAIR YEE: Thank you, Mr. Mehta Stein.

1 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: That's all our raised
2 hands at this time, Chair.

3 CHAIR YEE: Okay. If we could have the motion
4 displayed once more.

5 Commissioner Toledo?

6 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So yeah, it'd be great if we
7 can have the motion displayed and the -- and I'm at this
8 point leaning towards Commissioner Andersen's friendly
9 amendments with the January 14th date specified.

10 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Let's get that language
11 finalized.

12 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And that's, just for -- in
13 terms of background, it's trying to balance the -- our
14 stakeholder feedback, ensuring that we get meaningful
15 input from the community, from the stakeholders, and
16 making sure that we are protecting the fundamental rights
17 of individuals to participate in our process, but also to
18 protect their ability to elect a person of their choosing
19 in the primary.

20 So it's balancing all of these things and trying to
21 get to a compromise that ultimately we can hopefully all
22 support, because that would be the strongest message, but
23 if not most of us supporting.

24 CHAIR YEE: Okay. So the language you wish to
25 change?

1 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So perhaps Commissioner
2 Andersen can read out her language.

3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I actually sent it to the --
4 Director Hernandez.

5 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, I've just added it. I deleted
6 everything beyond the comma.

7 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you, Commissioner
8 Andersen.

9 MR. HERNANDEZ: Is that where you wanted the
10 language?

11 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think it's missing a "with"
12 after the comma. With --

13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

14 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- an additional --

15 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: With the --

16 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: With a request.

17 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: For an, A-N, additional --
19 for an additional extension for the final maps to January
20 14th. Oh, I'm sorry. Whoops. No, no, no. You're
21 missing, [da-da-da] -- with a request for additional --
22 additional extension for maps to allow for meaningful
23 public input.

24 VICE CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Would it be submission --

25 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: (Indiscernible) -- oh, yes.

1 Correct.

2 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: For submission at that
3 point? Final maps.

4 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No.

5 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think after January 14th,
6 2022 --

7 MR. WOOCHEER: Would you like to --

8 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- we had, to account for
9 the additional holiday time period.

10 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: But no, I did switch it. So
11 to allow for meaningful public input accounting for
12 the -- to allow for meaningful public input accounting
13 for the annual holiday period. I did switch it for it
14 because I thought it actually -- it read better.
15 Basically -- and we could switch that around, to allow --
16 well, to account for that holiday annual period, allowing
17 for public input. But it's actually -- because we
18 actually want to allow meaningful public input and we're
19 accounting for the annual holiday period, which is why we
20 want to move the date. That's why I switched it. I
21 thought -- I thought the intent was there. But --

22 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Toledo.

23 MR. WOOCHEER: If I could add -- if I could suggest
24 one clarifying amendment, to have, with a request for an
25 additional extension -- or with a request for an

1 additional extension of the deadline for approval of the
2 final maps.

3 CHAI YEE: Okay. Commissioner Toledo and
4 Commissioner Sadhwani?

5 MS. JOHNSTON: Should that be --

6 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Should that be approval or
7 submission?

8 MR. WOOCHEER: It's approval. The language they use
9 is that you approve and then certify them.

10 MS. JOHNSTON: It should be certification, I think.

11 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Ah.

12 MR. WOOCHEER: You can have approval and
13 certification, but I'm trying to keep a little shorter.

14 CHAIR YEE: Okay, Commissioners Toledo and Sadhwani,
15 is this satisfactory?

16 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'm okay with the -- I'm okay
17 with this.

18 VICE CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Where it says, public input
19 accounting for the annual holiday period. Shouldn't it
20 be meaningful public input accounting -- to allow for
21 meaningful public input over the -- or during the annual
22 holiday period -- whatever the word is, "for" doesn't
23 belong there, it seems like.

24 MR. HERNANDEZ: Would it be for -- for public input
25 to account for the annual holiday period?

1 VICE CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: That's better than the --

2 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes, that is, to account
3 for.

4 MS. JOHNSTON: And account for.

5 CHAIR YEE: And. I like "and". Okay. How's that?

6 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Actually, no, because that
7 changes the meaning of it. That's like two different
8 things. But it's actually want meaningful input
9 considering the annual holiday period or so -- I -- I'd
10 like that -- what Counsel Pane said.

11 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So to allow for meaningful
12 public input to account for --

13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct.

14 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- instead of "and". Okay.
15 So Commissioner Fornaciari has his hand --

16 CHAIR YEE: Oh, I'm so sorry. Commissioner
17 Fornaciari?

18 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Sure. I guess I was
19 envisioning we were going to be delivering the maps to
20 the Secretary of State on the 14th -- not certifying
21 them. Because if we certified that day, I don't know.
22 Can we deliver on that date or do we then do we have to
23 wait till Monday to deliver them?

24 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Kennedy?

25 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: The Padilla order says, the

1 Commission is directed to approve and certify the final
2 statewide maps to the Secretary of State by no later
3 than.

4 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Fernandez?

5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I believe the 2010
6 Commission approved it in the morning and certified it to
7 the Secretary of State that afternoon. It was done on
8 the same day, I believe. I can confirm --

9 MS. JOHNSTON: They approved and certified it and
10 then delivered it the same day.

11 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Commissioners Toledo and
12 Sadhwani, I need you to sign off on this revision.

13 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Before I sign off on it, I
14 just want to acknowledge that it's been a long journey to
15 get to this point, hopefully. I mean, we've had months
16 and months of discussion and public input. And I just
17 want to thank everyone for -- for the feedback, the
18 comments.

19 It's not -- this is a difficult -- it's a difficult
20 decision. It's not actually what I had originally
21 intended, but it is, as Commissioner Vazquez and others
22 have said, a compromise. And it makes good faith
23 effort -- attempts to make a good faith effort to try to
24 get additional time for meaningful -- for more meaningful
25 public input. So thank you. And yes, I will move to --

1 to move this forward.

2 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Sadhwani?

3 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, I am in agreement with
4 everything that Commissioner Toledo just said, especially
5 after months and months of work and thinking about these
6 timelines and laying out all of the various possible
7 scenarios and all of the impacted players and community
8 members. So yes, I support this amendment.

9 CHAIR YEE: Okay. So the motion on the floor is to
10 seek an order from the California State Supreme Court
11 confirming the calculation of the "additional federal
12 delay", as used in the Padilla decision, is to be based
13 upon the date that the Statewide Database is able to
14 reformat the legacy data set into a usable format for
15 building the statewide redistricting database, with a
16 request for an additional extension of the deadline for
17 approval and certification of final maps to January 14th,
18 2022 to allow for meaningful public input to account for
19 the annual holiday period.

20 Any further discussion? We will take public comment
21 one last time on this motion. Okay. Can we take public
22 comment, please, Katy, on the revised motion?

23 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The Commission is now
24 taking public comment on the revised motion on the floor.
25 To give comment, please call 877-853-5247. Please enter

1 the meeting ID number 95977110538. Once you have dialed
2 in, please press star 9 to enter the comment queue.

3 The full call-in instructions are read at the
4 beginning -- or the full call-in instructions have been
5 read previously in the meeting and are provided in full
6 on the livestream landing page. And for those that have
7 called in, please press star 9 to raise your hand
8 indicating you wish to comment.

9 Chair, at this time, it looks like we do not have
10 any raised hands.

11 CHAIR YEE: Okay. We'll go to the vote. After the
12 vote, I'll be entertaining a second motion regarding the
13 three-day notice period now currently set in August for
14 comments on the final maps that we wish to have adjusted.
15 And I believe Chief Counsel Pane will have some language
16 for that. But for now, let's go to the vote.

17 MR. HERNANDEZ: Very well, Chair. We'll begin the
18 vote now on the motion.

19 Commissioner Ahmad?

20 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.

21 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Akutagawa?

22 VICE CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

23 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen?

24 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

25 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fernandez?

1 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

2 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fornaciari?

3 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.

4 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Kennedy?

5 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes.

6 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Le Mons?

7 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

8 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sadhwani?

9 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

10 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay?

11 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

12 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Taylor?

13 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

14 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Toledo?

15 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

16 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Turner?

17 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

18 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Vazquez?

19 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.

20 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Yee?

21 CHAIR YEE: Yes.

22 MR. HERNANDEZ: The motion passes, Chair.

23 CHAIR YEE: Unanimously. Thank you, everyone.

24 Great discussion. And thank you, Government Affairs, for
25 getting us through this. Okay. This should be much

1 simpler. There's the additional matter of the statutory
2 comment period during which we can give only three-day
3 notice. I believe Chief Counsel Pane will have some
4 suggested language for a motion to allow us to shift that
5 in the calendar as well. Chief Counsel Pane?

6 MR. PANE: Thank you, Chair. I would certainly
7 defer to Mr. Woocher, but I think we want probably
8 some -- the motion would have something along the lines
9 of, to allow a three-day notice period on the final
10 fifteen days before the deadline. And this would be an
11 adjustment to the -- you may recall that currently the
12 Commission statutes talk about three days' notice period
13 for public input testimony.

14 The conception was it's the final fifteen days prior
15 to the finalization of the maps. So what we're doing is
16 essentially moving that time to whatever end date is
17 adopted by the Supreme Court. So I don't know, Mr.
18 Woocher, what do you think about that as a potential
19 language for a motion?

20 MR. WOOCHEER: I think that's good. And particularly
21 since we are asking the court to extend what had been a
22 forty-five day to a roughly sixty-day. Tying it to the
23 last fifteen days is now the wiser course of action and I
24 think the more appropriate ask.

25 MR. PANE: Okay.

1 MR. WOOCHEER: So I think your suggestion is well
2 put.

3 MR. PANE: Yeah.

4 CHAIR YEE: Commissioner Fernandez?

5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So move.

6 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Do we have a second?

7 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'll second.

8 CHAIR YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

9 Commissioner -- or Director Hernandez, do you have
10 some language to display for us?

11 MR. HERNANDEZ: One second, Chair.

12 CHAIR YEE: We are actually at our statutory break
13 time; is that correct, Kristian, 9:25?

14 MR. MANOFF: Given our return time of 8:05, that
15 puts our break --

16 CHAIR YEE: Oh, I see.

17 MR. MANOFF: -- at 9:35.

18 CHAIR YEE: 35. Okay. Okay, after this, we only
19 have a very brief update from Line Drawing, from Language
20 Access, and Public Input can decide whether or not it
21 wants to discuss the question of group input.

22 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I would ask indulgence to
23 pass. I have to get up at 4:30 in the morning --

24 CHAIR YEE: Oh, dear.

25 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- and drive four hours.

1 So I'd rather wait on that till next week. But we'll get
2 to it next week, if that's okay.

3 CHAIR YEE: All good.

4 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And I'm on the East Coast.
5 I've got to get up in the morning and fly. So it's after
6 midnight here. So I think the line drawers are good.

7 CHAIR YEE: Okay.

8 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Linda and I can do it in
9 two minutes.

10 CHAIR YEE: Okay. It's what you may have.

11 VICE CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Fernandez, do
12 you want to just go ahead and get started?

13 CHAIR YEE: We -- let's see. We're still within
14 agenda item 4. Yeah, we could do that.

15 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, are we? You want us to
16 go?

17 CHAIR YEE: Yeah.

18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, Chair.

19 CHAIR YEE: Sure.

20 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, we're going. Here we
21 go. We're going to go to -- everyone should have
22 received -- it's been posted -- a copy of the -- the
23 latest public input meeting schedule. And what we did
24 after last week's meeting is the Language Access
25 Committee, along with staff, met. And what we did is we

1 assigned languages to specific meetings in August so that
2 Spanish will always be interpreted.

3 And then what we also did with the other eleven
4 languages, we kind of parsed those out to the different
5 zone meetings, COI input meetings that we had. Also, if
6 you noticed, we added -- on September 8th, 2021, we added
7 that it was a to-be-determined date, but we added a zone
8 California -- I mean, a southern zone, Zones H through K,
9 because what we found is that many of the languages -- we
10 couldn't attach six languages to San Diego and L.A., so
11 we had to add another meeting to accommodate for
12 Mandarin, Cantonese, and Japanese languages.

13 And so we felt the best way to do that was to add
14 another meeting date. And so we just classified it as
15 southern Zones H through K. And then the last thing that
16 we did is we also -- prior we had designated certain
17 meetings in July with specific languages. What we did is
18 we removed those because they -- it appeared to provide
19 confusion.

20 It's still the same policy: if you require
21 interpretation services for any of the meetings, if you
22 do so five business days prior to, we will accommodate
23 that request as long as it's the twelve that we have
24 approved. If it's not the twelve, we will do our best to
25 find an interpreter.

1 Commissioner Akutagawa?

2 VICE CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: I'll just give some
3 additional clarification. So for July, the standing
4 policy does still -- or the policy still stands in that
5 for the July meetings, we are only able to provide
6 interpretation services for those making public comment.
7 It will not include those who need interpretation to hear
8 the proceedings of the meeting. We just cannot get
9 someone because of the contract union and everything.

10 The earliest we're going to be able to start doing
11 that is in August, which is why you'll see that the
12 August dates will have automatically Spanish
13 interpretation both for hearing what the proceedings are,
14 but also to give public comment. The remaining eleven
15 languages, as Commissioner Fernandez, has been assigned
16 to various zones.

17 I think it was actually really L.A. that was going
18 to get bunched with, like, six or seven different
19 languages, and we realized we couldn't do that. Also, I
20 wanted to just make -- point out that for Chinese, both
21 Cantonese and Mandarin, because that was the second
22 largest major language needing interpretation, what we
23 did is we attached Mandarin and Cantonese interpretation
24 to both a Northern California meeting for specifically
25 the Bay Area, and we realized we also needed to do the

1 same in Southern California, which is the reason why we
2 added one of the TBD meetings as a Mandarin and Cantonese
3 meeting.

4 And then because we just needed to even out the
5 numbers of languages that we were going to offer, we felt
6 that Japanese was a -- is small but widespread enough
7 that we just felt like it just made sense to just add it
8 to that particular meeting. So then each meeting is
9 going to have no more than three interpretations
10 available because we just, you know, it was just going to
11 be a logistical nightmare.

12 So we felt that as much as possible, we wanted to
13 ensure that the languages that were major in those zones
14 were accommodated. And we felt that this this at least
15 will ensure that each language will be featured in one of
16 the upcoming August and September zone meetings, and that
17 will be automatic so people do not need to make a request
18 five days in advance. It will just automatically be
19 provided.

20 And hopefully we'll be able to then spur more
21 participation from, you know, our community members who
22 would prefer to engage in their in their native
23 languages.

24 CHAIR YEE: Thank you, Language Access, for
25 implementing our decision on that.

1 Commissioner Andersen, briefly, please.

2 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Very quickly. The Tagalog,
3 it used to be in area -- Zone C, the Bay Area. It's now
4 in K, which is I think San Diego. There's a large
5 Tagalog in San Diego as opposed to the Bay area?

6 VICE CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: There is. But we just needed
7 to make a decision. But the number of Tagalog speakers
8 wasn't large enough to justify both the Southern and
9 Northern California. We do know that there's a very
10 significant sized Filipino community in the Bay Area as
11 well as in central California especially and in southern
12 California.

13 But in terms of the numbers that we saw, the -- the
14 larger numbers were actually in southern California. San
15 Diego has a very large Filipino community as well, too.
16 And so we felt that it made sense to -- to assign it to
17 the San Diego region.

18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Well, we'll just have
19 to make sure that -- I'm thinking of the Tongan group.
20 There's a large Tongan group in the Bay Area. And so
21 that's why --

22 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. Right. And just so
23 that's what I said. Right. And that that does not
24 preclude them from requesting the language. They can
25 still request the additional language. So that's --

1 although we've noted specific languages, if the request
2 is done five days prior, five business days prior, we can
3 still accommodate that.

4 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Thank you all. Let's see.
5 Kristian, I think we can wrap if we can go five minutes
6 more. Can we do that or do we need to take a break?

7 MR. MANOFF: I'm hearing mixed things on the floor,
8 that there might be -- just a moment. Just a moment,
9 Chair.

10 CHAIR YEE: Sure.

11 MR. MANOFF: I think it would probably be better to
12 take a break, come back at 9:50.

13 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Let's do that then. When we come
14 back, we'll consider the motion on the floor and take
15 public comment on that and on anything else on item 4,
16 and closing public comment. See you at 9:50.

17 (Whereupon, a recess was held)

18 CHAIR YEE: Welcome back to the home stretch of
19 today's business meeting for the California Citizens
20 Redistricting Commission. We return to a motion that has
21 been proposed -- hasn't actually been made yet because we
22 haven't seen it yet. So let's have that motion
23 displayed, please.

24 It reads, the motion is to ask the California
25 Supreme Court to adopt the final fifteen days before the

1 map finalization to allow for a three-day notice period
2 for public input meetings. Commissioner Fernandez had
3 offered to make this motion. Does she do so? Yes.

4 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I do.

5 CHAIR YEE: And do we have a second? I will go and
6 second to move things along. Discussion? So basically
7 this floats that period to whenever the final nap
8 finalization period lands.

9 Okay. Let's go ahead and take public comment on
10 this motion on agenda item 4, which was the various
11 subcommittee items, as well as agenda item 7, which is
12 just our closing public comment.

13 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair.

14 MR. PANE: Chair, just a point of clarification. I
15 believe after this motion we probably need to go back to
16 the previous topic to have another motion on the -- on
17 the language access. No? I'm seeing different.

18 CHAIR YEE: I believe the --

19 MR. PANE: Is that right, Director?

20 CHAIR YEE: I believe we already had made a motion
21 in previous meeting. Let's see, Commissioner Akutagawa?

22 VICE CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Actually, for
23 clarification -- sorry, I just took a bite. For
24 clarification, I believe we do have to vote because with
25 the addition of the languages to the meetings, there is a

1 cost for that addition. And so because there's a
2 budgetary impact, I believe that -- I was informed that
3 we do need to take a vote on this.

4 CHAIR YEE: Okay. So perhaps you can prepare a
5 motion for that. Okay. Let's take public comment on,
6 then, the motion on the floor and agenda item 4.

7 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Chair, is there a way we can
8 do that motion and do public comment at the same time?

9 CHAIR YEE: Let's see. Do we have that motion?
10 It's not preferable to do two motions at once. I think
11 we should probably not. I'm sorry. We -- okay. So
12 Katy, public comment on the motion on the floor and
13 agenda item number 4 -- closing and agenda item number 4.

14 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Commissioner
15 Fornaciari -- okay.

16 CHAIR YEE: I'm sorry. Commissioner Fornaciari?

17 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. We voted to approve
18 the expenditure of the interpretation. I thought -- I
19 mean, we voted to approve that last time. So the I mean,
20 the financial decision has been made. I mean, from my
21 perspective, the Language Access Committee has just
22 decided how we're going to distribute a decision we
23 already made. So I'm just offering my perspective on it.

24 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Let's go back to the public
25 comment on the motion on the floor and agenda item 4.

1 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair.

2 The Commission will now take public comment on the
3 motion on the floor and agenda item 4. To give comment,
4 please call 877-853-5247. Enter the meeting ID number
5 95977110538 for this meeting. Once you have dialed in,
6 please press star 9 to the comment queue. The full call-
7 in instructions have been read previously in the meeting
8 and are provided in full on the livestream landing page.

9 At this time, Chair, we do not have anyone in the
10 queue.

11 CAHIR YEE: Commissioner Fernandez?

12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I would have to concur with
13 my fellow Commissioner Fornaciari that the motion that we
14 passed last week was to include Spanish for every meeting
15 in -- starting August 1st and then also the other eleven
16 languages at least once during the COI input meeting. So
17 that would cover if we did it twice. So I think we're
18 good. Just saying.

19 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner. That's
20 very helpful.

21 CHAIR YEE: Okay. Do not appear to be any public
22 comments. Any further discussion? No? Let's go to a
23 vote.

24 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. The motion to ask the Supreme
25 Court to adopt the final fifteen days before map

1 finalization to allow for a three-day notice period for
2 public input meetings. And we'll begin the vote now.

3 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Ahmad?

4 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.

5 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Akutagawa?

6 VICE CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

7 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen?

8 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

9 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fernandez?

10 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

11 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fornaciari?

12 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.

13 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Kennedy?

14 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes.

15 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Le Mons?

16 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

17 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sadhwani?

18 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

19 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay?

20 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

21 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Taylor?

22 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

23 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Toledo? Commissioner
24 Toledo? I see him.

25 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Sorry, it's late.

1 MR. HERNANDEZ: There he is.

2 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: My clicker is not moving
3 around.

4 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay.

5 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

6 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Turner?

7 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

8 MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Vazquez?

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She got off.

10 MR. HERNANDEZ: Okay. And Commissioner Yee?

11 CHAIR YEE: Yes.

12 MR. HERNANDEZ: The motion passes.

13 CHAIR YEE: Thank you, everyone. Okay. We do need
14 to take final public comment. Katy, agenda item 7.

15 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. The
16 Commission is now taking general public comment for item
17 7, items not on the agenda. To give comment, please call
18 877-853-5247. Enter the meeting ID number 95977110538
19 for this meeting. Once you have dialed in, please press
20 star 9 to enter the comment queue. The full call-in
21 instructions have been read previously in this meeting
22 and are provided in full on the livestream landing page.

23 And at this time, we do not have anyone in the
24 queue, Chair.

25 CHAIR YEE: Thank you, Katy. Anything else anybody

1 needs to contribute to our meeting?

2 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Are you kidding?

3 MR. MANOFF: Everybody's wiped out.

4 CHAIR YEE: Just got to ask. Okay. There being no
5 further public comment, and there being many hungry
6 tummies, this meeting is adjourned.

7 (Whereupon, the CRC Business Meeting adjourned)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, of the videoconference recording of the proceedings provided by the California Citizens Redistricting Commission.

Traci Fine

September 12, 2022

TRACI FINE, CDLT-169