STATE OF CALIFORNIA CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION

In the matter of:

CRC BUSINESS MEETING

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 28, 2021
11:00 a.m.

Transcription By:

eScribers, LLC

APPEARANCES

COMMISSIONERS

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

STAFF

Alvaro E. Hernandez, Deputy Executive Director Anthony Pane, CRC Chief Counsel Fredy Ceja, Communications Director Marcy Kaplan, Director of Outreach Ravindar Singh, Administrative Assistant

TECHNICAL CONTRACTORS

Kristian Manoff, AV Technical Director Katy Manoff, Comment Moderator Megan A. Gall, Consultant

VRA COUNSEL Strumwasser & Woocher

David Becker

Public Comment

Helen Hutchinson, League of Women Voters Rosalind Gold, NALEO Educational Fund Samuel Sukatan, California Environmental Voters Grace Garner, Palm Springs Council Speaker Number 5

3

INDEX

	PAGE
Call to Order and Roll Call	3
VRA Analysis	6
Closed Session	23
Public Comment	23
Executive Director Report	31
Communication Director Report	59
Outreach Director Report	73
Chief Counsel Report	83
Public Comment	84
Subcommittee Updates	86
Public Comment	144
Closing	145

PROCEEDINGS

2 | September 28, 2021

2.0

11:00 a.m.

CHAIR SADHWANI: All right. Well, we will try this again. Welcome, everyone. Welcome, California to the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. My name is Sarah Sadhwani. I'll be the rotating chair for the next several sets of meetings. Our vice chair is actually Commissioner Antonio Le Mons, who could not be with us today.

So we have Commissioner Toledo sitting in as our vice chair today. Thank you so much, Commissioner Toledo, for offering to do that. And it's a very exciting day today at the CRC because many of us are here in Sacramento. It is the first time many of us are meeting in person.

So we are super excited to be here and still looking forward to meeting everyone else on the Commission who couldn't join us today. But really exciting. And we're still working on a few of the technical kinks, so bear with us if we have some sound or issues or some other components today.

- Ravi, can we take roll call?
- 23 MR. SINGH: Yes. Thank you, Chair.
- 24 | Commissioner Sinay?
- 25 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.



1 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Taylor? 2 Commissioner Toledo? UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He's here. 3 4 VICE CHAIR TOLEDO: Here. Sorry about that. 5 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Turner? 6 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here. 7 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Vazquez? COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: 8 9 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Yee? COMMISSIONER YEE: Here. 10 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Ahmad? 11 12 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here. 13 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Akutagawa? 14 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here. 15 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Andersen? 16 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here. 17 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fernandez? 18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Presente. MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fornaciari? 19 20 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here. 21 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Kennedy? 22 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here. 2.3 MR. SINGH: Commissioner Le Mons? And Commissioner Sadhwani? 24

CHAIR SADHWANI: Here.

25

MR. SINGH: You have a quorum, Chair.

2.3

CHAIR SADHWANI: Great. Thank you so much, Ravi.

All right. Well, for today, things are going to be a

little bit different than our normal meetings. We are

actually going to hold off on taking public comment this

morning, largely just due to scheduling. So my apologies

to those who may have called in hoping to reach us this

morning, but we will be taking public comment later on

today and throughout the day.

We are going to start off today with an update and review of our VRA analysis from our VRA attorney, David Becker, as well as statistician Megan Gall. So I'm going to turn it over to them to get us started this morning.

My understanding is that we will start an open session.

ATTY BECKER: Yes. Thank you, Madam Chair. And thanks for having us here today, since, as you know, last week the final population numbers from the census were available in the statewide database. And since then, the data team at Q2 and the lawyers and Dr. Gall have been busy working, trying to identify areas that might invoke Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act and be relevant to your considerations.

We're going to just -- in open session I'm going to describe the process and what we've got then we're going to need to go into closed session because there are some

specifics we're going to discuss that could be the subject of future litigation if there is litigation. So I'll identify when that is. And with your approval, we'll go into closed session at that time.

2.3

So first of all, what we've begun doing, I'll just give you a quick reminder. There are three preconditions that indicate whether Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act might require a district to be drawn in a certain way. And those are called the Gingles preconditions in the case Thornburgh v. Gingles in 1986.

And this is all old news to you. We've gone over it many times, but I'll just remind you, the first Gingles precondition is that a minority group is large enough and geographically compact enough to form a majority in a district. And then we look at the second and third Gingles preconditions with which both relate to what we call racially polarized voting.

Second Gingles precondition is, does that minority group vote cohesively for particular candidates of their choice? And then does the rest of the area -- everyone who's not in that minority group is the third jingles precondition do they vote cohesively in such a way that they would usually defeat the minority candidate of choice?

So we're looking racially polarized, voting for the

second and third Gingles preconditions. We've got pretty completely for you to show you in closed session are areas of California where based on the data we've received to this point. We think it's either it's that is probable or likely that the first Gingles precondition would be met.

In other words, the minority group in a particular area could be -- could form the majority of a district. And then we will begin -- what we're doing is we're we will with your approval direct the -- Dr. Gall to do racially polarized voting analysis in those areas to see if the second and third Gingles preconditions are present.

And I believe we've got an example for one of the areas that we can show you, so you'll get a sense of what you're going to see. She has not been able to because we've just gotten it where she's not been able to complete the entire state, but we'll be able to go into some detail as to what that will be.

And I think we're going to -- Dr. Gall, please nod if I'm saying something right or shake your head if I'm saying something wrong. But I believe we're anticipating that by next week, we'll have all of it or almost all of the racially polarized voting analysis in these areas complete. That's at least the target.

It's a lot of work. But Dr. Gall has been very diligent about proceeding with that. I'll take any questions there are about the process and what we're about to show you. But then to go into specifics, I'm going to request that we go into closed session.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Your recitation of the third condition was slightly different from what I'd heard and/or seen before, and I just wanted to clarify what I have in front of me is that the minority must be able to demonstrate that the white majority votes sufficiently as a block to enable it, usually to defeat the minorities preferred candidate.

And you said all others. So I guess part of this is exactly how is minority defined. I mean, are we able under Gingles to look at possible coalitions or are we looking a just within the boxes that we have?

ATTNY BECKER: Okay. And I'm not sure -- I'm hoping that my audio is okay. Can someone give me thumbs up if they can hear me? Okay. I'm seeing some nods. Okay. Good. Thank you. All right. So some of this I'll probably have to address in closed session, but in -- what I can say is that the ability for minority voters who can form a majority.

In other words, they've already met the first



Gingle's precondition. They're large enough to form a majority in a district, the ability for them to elect candidates of choice and to and the challenge that they may face in having those voters defeated is at the core of Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act.

Historically, what that has meant is it's usually a minority versus white calculation. But I think

2.3

minority versus white calculation. But I think
there's -- I think that's something we wanted to talk
about a little more. But I think the law is pretty clear
that it is that there are there are ways in which groups
could coalesce to defeat a particular minorities
opportunity to elect where they could otherwise do so.
And we should talk about that. I don't think it's going

to be very common, but it could happen.

Also, I just want to for my purposes, this is how I usually define terms like coalition and crossover.

There's a lot of confusion about those terms, and it's not anyone's fault. The Supreme Court has some confusion about those terms. This is how I'm going to define them.

This is how I generally use them. And that doesn't mean it's right, but it's just how I -- what I'm usually meaning when I use these terms.

A coalition district for me would be where a single minority group doesn't -- is not large enough to satisfy the Gingles precondition in a district, the first Gingles

precondition. But together with another minority group that is also not large enough on its own to form a majority in a district, they could be combined, and we could look and see if they vote cohesively together as a single group.

2.0

If all of those things are met, I think there's a very strong argument that that kind of coalition district could and should be drawn under Section 2 of the Voting Rights Act. But again, this presupposes that neither is large enough on its own to form a majority in a particular district to satisfy the first Gingles precondition.

So this would be a situation where perhaps you had thirty percent of one minority, thirty percent of another minority, forty percent white. You might theoretically look at whether Minority A and Minority B together forming sixty percent of a potential district or voting cohesively for the same candidates. Does that makes sense to everybody. Hopefully I'll see some nods. That to me is what a coalition district is.

Crossover is the -- is when the third -- in the third Gingles precondition when the nonminority group is voting at some rate for the minority candidates of choice. The minority that satisfied the first Gingles precondition we looked at the second. And you will hear

1 from Dr. Gall when we talk about this a little more.

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There are places where the racially polarized voting is so stark that statistically it looks like virtually zero

4 crossover amongst what is usually the white community.

But there are other places where there is some crossover. And that crossover, depending upon the rate of crossover, doesn't defeat the third Gingles precondition all the time. It could be only ten or twenty percent, in which case you would still see significant, racially polarized voting probably that satisfies the third jingles precondition.

I'm speaking purely hypothetically here, because we're not getting into specifics. I want to be clear about that. But that ten to twenty percent crossover could be really relevant in the remedial phase. we've decided a Section 2 district probably should be drawn in informing what that District should look like and what the composition of that District should look like.

And if we can generally count on, say, ten percent white crossover, then the minority might not need fiftyfive percent or fifty percent or forty-five percent when we're drawing the district because it can count on regular crossover. So this is -- the crossover is relevant both to the third Gingles precondition because

- 1 if it's really quite high, it would indicate that that
 2 condition doesn't exist.
- And/or it could be relevant or it could be relevant in the remedial phase when we're trying to determine how do we make sure that we're drawing districts that the minorities that satisfied all the Gingles preconditions
- 7 do end up with an opportunity to elect candidates of
- 8 their choice.
- 9 There will be a test on this later. Does anyone --
- 10 I hope that makes sense. And I think when we get to some
- 11 | specifics, we'll be able to talk about this. But
- 12 | obviously we can't do that. And given that that it may
- 13 be that this could come up in future litigation.
- 14 Although we hope not.
- 15 Madam Chair, I think, were you talking -- speaking?
- 16 Because I can't hear anything on my end.
- 17 CHAIR SADHWANI: No. I think there's a sound issue.
- 18 Hang on.
- 19 ATTNY BECKER: I got you now.
- 20 CHAIR SADHWANI: Okay. Okay. Great.
- 21 Commissioner Sinay?
- 22 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. So this is a holdover
- 23 question from our -- your presentation last time, Dr.
- 24 | Gall's presentation. I felt like at the end I kind of
- 25 | was like, wait, so was it or was it not a VRA district?

1 So you walked us out --2 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: We're not hearing 3 Commissioner Sinay. 4 COMMISSIONER SINAY: What do I need to do? 5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible). COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm sorry. Okay. Can you hear 6 7 me now? CHAIR SADHWANI: 8 Yes. 9 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. Thanks. So this is a 10 holdover question from the presentation that Dr. Gall 11 gave us. At the end of the presentation, I kind of felt 12 like all of a sudden I wasn't sure from the exercise if 13 they were or they were not VRA districts. And then even 14 today, when you started explaining the difference between 15 crossover and coalition, I'm not -- I'm not sure. 16 I think you all did a great job in kind of explaining the different ways to do it, the methodology, 17 18 the definition of methodologies. I have the presentation 19 in front of me so I don't mess up on all the wording. 20 But could we at some point just go back to that exercise 21 and say, yes, it is, and this is the reason why? Because 22 I don't think we looped and closed that off. So I 23 apologize if others got it, but I really want to make 24 sure I understand it. 25 ATTNY BECKER: I think what I'd suggest -- I'm

1 hoping that what we show you in closed session might be a real-world California example of something that will help 3 answer that question for you, because obviously we don't need to actually determine whether the Cook County, 4 5 Illinois, racially polarized voting existed there. I think we're going to show you a Real-World example 6 7 that might help answer that question and then we could 8 probably come back in open session and discuss that more 9 fully, if you'd like. Does that make sense, Commissioner 10 Sinay? No? 11 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry, it doesn't, because I 12 think the more -- that was an exercise and we were told 13 it was a training. And so if we're walking away, not 14 knowing the answer of that "training", that means we did 15 not get trained. And I think the more times we 16 experience it and also the public got that training, and 17 I think they need to hear what that response might be. Dr. Gall, do you want to go back to 18 ATTNY BECKER: 19 that? I don't know that we're prepared to go back to 20 that specific question, but do you want to go back to --21 DR. GALL: I was trying to pull up my presentation 22 right now. If you could give me just a moment to pull it 23 up, I'd be grateful. 24 CHAIR SADHWANI: Of course. 25 DR. GALL: Okay. So in that example, what we had

consistently was the white vote was split. The black voters had a clear candidate of choice and Latino voters had a different candidate of choice with crossover to the -- to the African-American candidate.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum.

DR. GALL: In this example, the black voters did have a clear candidate of choice. And theoretically, that would satisfy Gingles 2, which is -- does the minority -- is the minority expressing a candidate of choice. Where we would fall apart a little bit is in Gingles 3.

And I don't think that we would be able to prove Gingles 3 that the majority was thwarting the will of the minority. If anything, both white voters and Latino voters were crossing over to the minority preferred candidate to boost that candidate to win. And so in that situation, I would -- that's how I would read those results.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you very much.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Okay. Great.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Stop me if it's not -- if it's a closed session question, maybe. So my question specifically for California is the new census data came out in the Latinos is the highest population in

1 California. So are they no longer considered minorities? I just want to -- so is your definition of minorities, 3 nonwhites? So I quess I'm -- just want to make sure. ATTNY BECKER: I can answer this. 4 5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. ATTNY BECKER: The Voting Rights Act defines 6 7 minorities. Latinos are absolutely considered minorities. Blacks are considered minorities. 8 9 are considered minorities. That is settled law. 10 should also note, I believe that Latinos CVAP in 11 California under the new census, data was roughly thirty 12 percent, maybe just a shade under. 13 Even by being mathematically fortunate that -- well, 14 even mathematically, they are -- they're still a minority 15 within California. But absolutely, no question, legally, 16 Latinos, African-Americans and Asians are considered 17 minorities for purposes of Section 2 Voting Rights Act 18 analysis. 19 CHAIR SADHWANI: I'll just jump in here. 20 think a part of that, you can correct me if I'm wrong, 21 Mr. Becker, but it has to do with historical exclusion; 22 is that correct? 2.3 Yeah. If you remember the totality of ATTY BECKER: 24 the circumstances, the totality of the circumstances all

relate to historical discrimination and its continuing

25

1 and present-day effects on those populations. But I just want to be -- also be clear, particularly with -- not that Asians have less coverage, they have equal coverage, 3 but there have been extensive findings in the 1965 Act, 4 5 in the 1970 and 1975 renewals about Latinos as well. absolutely covered under the Voting Rights Act. 6 7 CHAIR SADHWANI: Perfect. Great. Thank you. additional questions from commissioners? 8 9 Oh, Commissioner Fernandez? 10 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. Thank you. Just one 11 Thank you, David, for that. I kind of knew the 12 answer to it, but I just wanted to make sure everyone 13 knew the answer to that. So thank you so much. My other 14 question was in our last meeting -- I'm trying to get my 15 hand down. There we go. There was a comment that 16 precincts change regularly. So when you do the racially 17 polarized voting, how does that research -- how do you do 18 that research if precincts continue to change? Does that 19 make sense, Megan? 2.0 DR. GALL: It does. And the California Statewide 21 Database gives us those data. And the fact that the 22 precincts change does not matter to the analyses because 23 we are still analyzing precincts within the jurisdiction

of interest. If they happen to change from the next

election, the past, the next, that's irrelevant to the

24

25

analysis. And luckily those data already exist for us with the database.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Okay. Great.

ATTNY BECKER: And again, I'll just point out, Karin MacDonald said something along this line before. Not every state, in fact, not really any other state has the benefit of the database that California does. It is a it is a tremendous resource. I know Dr. Gall has worked in a lot of places, but it's something that not every place has.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Yes. We are definitely lucky to have the Statewide Database as a resource here in California.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. This is a question actually. I guess it's for either of you. And could you actually explain -- and it's for all of us and including the public, when you're doing the RPV analysis that the exogenous and endogenous -- because is it true you basically have to redo the VRA analysis for each type of district. So can you kind of walk us through, if you're doing assembly, what is endogenous/exogenous for Senate, for Congressional because it kind of comes up when we do the whole listing all the criteria and then people think, oh, nesting, you just do that for the

assembly and stick two of them together and you have the Senate. So could you kind of --

2.3

ATTNY BECKER: Meghan, I'll start, but I'm probably going to have to hand it off to you. So endogenous are simply the elections for the same office that you're analyzing. So when we're looking in assembly districts, assembly districts are -- assembly district races are endogenous. Everything else is exogenous. Senate same thing. Congressional same thing.

Exogenous doesn't mean irrelevant. It does mean less relevant. So endogenous are going to be the most dispositive in determining whether racially polarized voting exists. So when we're looking at assembly districts -- and you'll see when we're showing you this, we're going to we're measuring Gingles 1, we're looking at concentrations and numbers of populations sufficient to form a majority within an assembly district, for instance.

So we're using Assembly District numbers as the denominator, and we know what the numerator would need to be to be at fifty percent. That numerator is going to be nearly double for Congressional and Senate Districts will be double for Senate Districts. It'll be nearly double for Congressional Districts.

So then within that, we're going to look at



1 elections that touch on those areas. So for instance, we

2 | might be looking at an area of minority concentration

3 | that actually touches three or four Assembly Districts.

4 And we might need to look at all of them in that area to

5 | see what's happening.

2.0

Now, we can then if we're if we're getting an incomplete picture or we or there's also a Senate district there, we very well likely might look at the Senate district elections as well to see what we can find. Again, going back ten years, looking at primaries in general. We might look at congressional races as

well. We might look at statewides.

The clearer the picture becomes sooner, the less likely we'll need to rely upon exogenous elections that are further and further away from that district, if that makes sense. There might be circumstances where we see really clear, powerful data. And we might look at a little more, but we don't need to go much farther. We can see, yes, it exists. No, it doesn't exist.

And there are going to be certainly circumstances where the concentrations are large enough that we probably need to look at all three districts anyway and statewides might inform that effort too. And we need to look at all of them to get a clearer picture.

There are things in the in historical election



analysis that can make it -- can make it appear to be a less complete picture like strong incumbents, where there haven't been a lot of challengers, for instance, or there are times when you've got an incumbent and this kind of goes along with the first one. There's an incumbent that isn't of the same race as the as the minority population.

But there's been a long historical coalition that's been formed there and it just can create some somewhat noisy data that -- and we'll try in those circumstances to paint as complete a picture as we can based on the data for you. But the endogenous elections will identify for you. You'll see what we found.

And Dr. Gall and I hope you can take it from me at this point and correct anything I've said that was wrong. Dr. Gall will also go into a lot of detail about what she looked at, what she found. You'll get specifics on the types of elections we looked at, what candidates. We'll go into that level of detail with you and you'll see that.

And by the way, this will be an iterative process if there's something where. We've reached a conclusion or even our conclusion isn't absolutely really clear. You should feel free to ask us, is there more that we can do? Are there things that we should look at and we'll answer that as clearly as possible.

1 CHAIR SADHWANI: Dr. Gall, did you want to jump in? 2 DR. GALL: No, that was a great answer. CHAIR SADHWANI: Okay. Very good. He's going to 3 4 take over as a as a political scientist one of these 5 days. Are there any additional questions from Commissioners? And if not, we will head out for a closed 6 7 session under the pending litigation exception. 8 anticipate that we will be back around 2:30 p.m. this afternoon, though certainly we could be back earlier if 10 we get done earlier. 11 So please keep an eye out for the public. 12 eye out for the live stream. We will update when we are 13 coming back. And I'm sure we'll try and put out a couple 14 notices via social media as well for those who are trying 15 to follow along. Thank you so much. We'll see you in closed session. 16 17 (Whereupon, a recess was held) 18 Oh, thank you so much. CHAIR SADHWANI: 19 back. We are back from closed session in which we took 20 no action. We will move into public comment at this 21 time. 22 Kristian, will we be reading public comment for us? 2.3 MR. MANOFF: Katy should be here for us. 24 CHAIR SADHWANI: Oh, great. 25 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I am here. Can you hear

1 me?

2.3

877-853-5247.

CHAIR SADHWANI: We can hear you. And we're all very jealous of your current location.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. I took this picture this morning. Thank you so much. All righty. In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To call-in, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is

When prompted to enter the meeting I.D. number provided on the livestream feed, it is 88264383219 for this meeting. When prompted to enter -- when prompted to enter a participant ID simply press the pound key. Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press star 9. This will raise your hand for the moderator.

When it is your turn to speak, you will hear a message that says the host would like you to talk and the press star 6 to speak. If you would like to give your name, please state and spell it for the record. You are not required to provide your name to give public comment.

Please make sure to meet your computer or livestream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your call. Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for

when it is your turn to speak. And again, please turn down the livestream volume. We do have a couple of callers at this time.

Caller 6252, if you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time by pressing star 6. The floor is yours.

MS. HUTCHINSON: Thank you very much. This is Helen Hutchinson with the League of Women Voters of California. It's really nice to see some of you being able to be in the same room together. I appreciate that. I want to thanks -- add my thanks to Mr. Becker and Ms. Gall for their work and in particular how accessible they are making the Voting Rights Act and racially polarized voting analysis for us in the public. It helps everybody understand the issues and the process.

I have a question for you and potentially for your counsel. Can you explain or help us understand the rationale for doing at least some of the Voting Rights

Act and racially polarized Voting Act analysis discussion in closed session when there is no current litigation?

Thanks so much.

ATTNY PANE: Some assumptions. This is Anthony

Pane. I can probably give you somewhat of a of an answer

on that in response. So a state body there's,

Redistricting Commission included, is able to go into

- 1 closed session for the pending litigation exception. And
- 2 as you point out, the pending litigation exception
- 3 | certainly includes litigation for which the state body is
- 4 a party.
- 5 Also may include situations where the state body is
- 6 not a party but may want to wish to initiate litigation.
- 7 It could also include exposure to litigation, and that
- 8 exposure to litigation is also an acceptable basis for
- 9 going into closed session. So I just wanted to highlight
- 10 any of those categories -- any of those categories are
- 11 ones which state body can go into closed session.
- 12 MS. HUTCHINSON: Thank you very much. That is very
- 13 helpful.
- 14 CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you for your call, Ms.
- 15 Hutchinson.
- 16 Katy, it looks like we have a few more callers.
- 17 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, we do. Up next,
- 18 | will be caller 6337. And up next, after that will be
- 19 6855. And I'd like to invite caller 3818 to press star
- 20 9. If you wish to give comment, this will raise your
- 21 | hand. Caller 6337, if you'll please follow the prompts
- 22 to unmute at this time by pressing star 6. There you go.
- 23 MS. GOLD: Great.
- PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.
- MS. GOLD: Good afternoon, Commissioners. This is

Rosalind Gold within the NALEO Educational Fund. I first wanted to start by thanking you all for the extreme hard work and thoughtfulness that has gone into the materials that have been handed out for the next day or two of meetings. And again, the amount of real tireless work you've been doing in terms of thinking about how all of the parts of the line drawing process are going to fit together.

I just wanted to request that with respect to the potential line drawing calendar, that the Commission not take action on this calendar today. We are all, those of us who are working with community organizations and working to mobilize community members to provide input once the Commissions maps come out, are really in the process of looking at the calendar, looking at how the timelines might affect our ability to mobilize people, especially in terms of the relationship to Thanksgiving.

We could just probably use today and maybe even tomorrow morning to talk to our community members and to think through a couple of different scenarios. So I do want to request if the Commission could hold off on taking any final action until tomorrow at the earliest. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you so much, Ms. Gold. And you know, certainly we have on our agenda for this

afternoon, hopefully to begin a discussion on it, though that certainly might not happen until tomorrow given the number of other things we have on our plate.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Up next, we have caller 6855. If you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time.

MR. SUKATAN: Hello.

2.3

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The floor is yours.

MR. SUKATAN: Hello, Commissioners. Good morning.

Afternoon. Excuse me. Totally lost track of time. Sam Sukatan from California Environmental Voters Educational Fund, environ voters. You heard me introduce myself as CLTV. Just wanted to call, one, because we changed our name and two, again, to cosign Rosalind of NALEO's comments about appreciation for the work that you doing with the calendar and situation that I know the Commission did not ask for with the court and some of us also supported.

Definitely appreciate slightly more time to come to a consensus and to support community organizations also environmental organizations as the Thanksgiving holiday would make it more difficult for us to get folks to comment on the first month of March.

But as before, we know that you can bear the load that's been put in front of you, and we look forward to

1 continuing to partner with you. Definitely appreciate 2 it. Have a wonderful meeting today.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: All right. Thank you.

Up next, we have caller 3818. If you will please follow the prompts to unmute at this time. The floor is yours.

MS. GARNER: Good afternoon, Commissioners. This is Grace Garner again calling on behalf of the black census and redistricting hub. I have a few logistical questions for you. In terms of the maps presentations, if a group were to submit a map now, could a PowerPoint presentation of the actual presentation be submitted at a later date as long as it's before October 11th?

And the other question is, when a group is or an individual is giving these actual map presentations since we won't be able to control the screen on our own, how logistically will that work and what kind of information does staff need in order to make sure that this is a seamless process?

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you so much for those questions. And you know, I think we will be talking about this in a little bit more detail later. Certainly to the first question, you are welcome to submit your map at any point in time, as is anyone, and we will certainly be talking more about the logistics of the presentations. So thank you.

1 MS. GARNER: Thank you. PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And up next, we have 3 caller 5882. If you will please follow the prompts to 4 unmute at this time by pressing Star 6. The floor is 5 yours. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Hi. I would like to, like 6 7 everyone else, thank you for the work and making things accessible. My question follow up is a follow up on 8 Helen Hutchinson's from the League of Women Voters. 10 as I understood her question, it was not whether the 11 state body was able to use the pending litigation 12 exception. That to me was clear. 13 But why you might want to, in terms of potential 14 litigation, and right -- so as to hold your cards close 15 to the chest. That that makes sense. But are there some 16 aspects where you're choosing to work on this outside of 17 the public view for very clear reasons? But could we 18 have some contours of that so that it didn't seem as 19 black boxy? Thank you very much. 2.0 CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you for that comment. 21 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And that was all of our 22 callers at this time, Chair. 2.3 CHAIR SADHWANI: Great. Thank you so much, Katy.

the end of today's meeting. So we are going to move into

And we will, of course, do public comment again at

24

25

1 our agenda for today by starting with our director reports. And we will -- which is Agenda Item Number 3. 3 And we will begin with our executive director report from 4 Director Hernandez. 5 MR. HERNANDEZ Thank you, Chair. And good afternoon, Commissioners and Californians. So I will 6 7 start in regards to our meetings for the Southern California. We are working on finding locations so that 8 this body can meet together. We've secured some 10 locations for the October meetings near Los Angeles, 11 downtown Los Angeles, and we'll be working to secure 12 rooms and all the logistics that come with that. 13 We'll provide additional information to all the 14 Commissioners in that regard so that you have that for 15 planning purposes. I wanted to make sure that all of you 16 are set up on Concord and that your account is set up so 17 that we can help with any logistics as needed. Ravi can 18 definitely assist in that. Those of you who have 19 traveled today and needed assistance, Ravi can help with 20 that process. 21 I've also spoken to Kristian about the set up and 22 he's indicated that the Commissioners will and any 23 attendees will be required to log on to the Zoom on their 24 laptops for the meetings. And he's also further

indicated that everyone should have headphones with a

25

microphone so that we don't have feedback at the meetings and echoes and things of that nature. So just putting it out there early so that you can go and find those headphones with the microphone on it.

2.3

Gaming type headphones, the big earmuffs, if you'd like, just keep in mind you'll be wearing them for long periods of time. So that's at -- that's what we have for the meetings that we have scheduled down south. We're still working on logistics for November and trying to find a location in San Diego area.

We have looked at other options as Commissioner

Fornaciari had indicated, looking at possible hotels.

We're still looking into that. So far, it's been rather difficult to find accommodations at the State rate, but we're working on that. If that should occur, we will let you know and make those necessary changes to those logistics. Any questions on that?

Yes, Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Would it be possible for staff just to purchase the right headsets that we may all need, instead of all bringing several and trying to figure out what works and all that?

MR. HERNANDEZ: We're going to work on that as well. But I wanted to give you the option again. Some folks prefer certain type of headphones with the microphones.

My kids prefer the ones with the big ole microphones and the earmuffs. So we are going to look into that and see what we can do for the Commissioners. And keep in mind, if you have them, just let us know. We want to pursue getting those for you, but we are looking into that as well.

CHAIR SADHWANI: I see additional questions from Commissioner Fernandez and then Kennedy. Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

Yes. So my assumption is that our videographer is not traveling with us. Is that the case? I do remember or recall in the videographer contract that we did have information in there in terms of for hybrid, for them to travel with us and be there on site versus be off site.

So I would prefer to have them on site.

I'm not sure how my fellow -- other fellow

Commissioners feel about that, but this whole headphone
thing, I'm just imagining things going wrong. Yeah.

Because they usually do. So anyway, I'm just stating my
preference would be to have the videographer there with
us when we travel off -- away from Sacramento. Thank
you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Alvaro, do you have any sense or could you speak to -- is it appropriate to speak to the

contractual agreement about whether or not videography would or would not be traveling with us?

MR. HERNANDEZ: They could. That is not the question. But we're looking at the logistics of everything, and it just made sense to have everyone on the laptops in the same room because we're not using the larger room as we had originally projected and therefore be similar type of setup as we have here. Except everyone would be on their laptops without all the bells and whistles, as you see here in the room.

CHAIR SADHWANI: So just to be clear, it would be possible to have all of the bells and whistles that we have in -- setup in Los Angeles or other locations.

MR. HERNANDEZ: It is possible, yes. So we can work that out if that's a desire of the Commission to do so.

I'll work with our videographer folks to see what will be possible.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Um-hum.

MR. HERNANDEZ: And just keep in mind, we're talking about traveling down south, lodging, equipment, all those things that they would have to then transfer from one location to the next. And then we do have them week to week meetings. So we go down south, we come back to Sacramento, go down south, come back to Sacramento. So we're bouncing back and forth. Just a consideration for

1 you all to keep in mind. 2 CHAIR SADHWANI: Okay. So while we're -- oh, 3 Commissioner Sinay? 4 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, the headsets that came 5 with your phones that the Commission sent to you do work on these computers. I just checked them. 6 7 CHAIR SADHWANI: There are headsets with our phones? 8 Okay. Thank you. 9 Commissioner Kennedy? 10 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. Director 11 Hernandez, Dr. Kaplan was fairly far along in discussions 12 with UC Riverside about meeting venues, and then we 13 called it off at the -- towards the end towards where we 14 were actually agreeing on a date, time, and place. 15 wondering if those discussions have been resumed because 16 we would not have to start over from the very beginning 17 with UC Riverside. 18 So we did reach out to many of the MR. HERNANDEZ: 19 people that we had originally contacted when we were 20 looking at doing the COIs in person. Some places are not 21 available, some places are not open. So we have reached 22 back to a lot of the same groups that we had talked to 23 originally. 24 We are looking at this particular venue that

we've -- where we're trying to get in place, just

25

- 1 basically sign the dotted line because it's available.
- 2 |We can continue to look, but we're running out of time.
- 3 And so I'm just going with what we have now. And if we
- 4 can look at some other options, we will. But it's -- we
- 5 have to make some decisions quickly because we're running
- 6 out of time.
- 7 So that's where we are today with the planning of
- 8 that. There are other options. We've looked into them.
- 9 They haven't come through. And so rather than delaying
- 10 | it and then doing it last minute, I wanted to secure what
- 11 | we knew we had available today.
- 12 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. So that's a no. As
- 13 | far as being in contact with UCR.
- MS. KAPLAN: We were originally just looking in the
- 15 Los Angeles area and then began to expand into other
- 16 regions within Southern California. So the initial
- 17 | contact was for a lot of the Los Angeles area locations.
- 18 | It was just recently where we were expanding into Ontario
- 19 and other areas, and that's where the L.A. location was.
- 20 We were able to secure for two series of meetings,
- 21 | so that's just noting. So if we want to further expand
- 22 into these other regions, we can then go back to those
- 23 | contacts. But just to reiterate what Alvaro had noted.
- MR. HERNANDEZ: So to answer your question, no, we
- 25 have not reached back out to Riverside.



CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner Ahmad, I think it had your hand up previously, right? Why don't you go ahead and then I'll get back to you, Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. Just really quickly, I can help with headphones set up. I don't want any of my colleagues to worry about that. And then also Zoom and anything is just a quick Google search away. So if we want to save some funding on travel for the whole videographer team, I am willing to step up and help out in that area.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you for that, Commissioner Ahmad.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. And thank you, Commissioner Ahmad, for offering that. I would still prefer to have the videographer with us so that Commissioner Ahmad can be freed up for Commission work. And once again, our contract has that information in our original schedule. We were planning to travel throughout the state, so it was going to be traveling to different cities, different weeks. Right now we've going back and forth from Sacramento to Southern California. And then the second part of it is with that piece, I think it is in the Commission's best interest at least two weeks prior to a meeting, either be -- while being in

- 1 Southern California to take a poll as to which Commissioners will be attending. Because if it turns out 3 there's only going to be four or five Commissioners, then maybe we want to rethink whether or not we want to 4 5 reserve a space and everything else that goes involved with that. So I'm just kind of throwing that out there 6 7 for something for us to think about. CHAIR SADHWANI: I think that those are excellent 9 ideas and I think it would be helpful just to better 10 understand the -- like we hear you, Commissioner 11 Fernandez and I actually share your perspective that we 12 were going to be traveling around the state. So we -- to 13 the extent that we are going to host meetings in other 14 locations, then we should have the full setup. 15
 - But it would be helpful to get a sense of other Commissioners perspectives on this matter. Is there a motion that you might want to put forward on this, or do we want to just discuss it? Can we get a sense of other Commissioners -- is there a desire to one have videography on site for meetings when we are traveling? And two, are -- is everyone comfortable with having a poll and setting a date and you need to respond by that such date?
- Commissioner Toledo? 24

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

25 VICE CHAIR TOLEDO: It's a little bit unclear what



1 benefits and disadvantages of either. I know that there is, of course, financial advantages to not having 3 videography travel as much. But are there. And I 4 haven't been in person, so I'm not sure what those images 5 might be. So that's just a question. 6 CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you. 7

Commissioner Turner?

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

or question was much as the same of Commissioner Toledo. Obviously, we look at justifying cost and yes, it was also included from the beginning. But I'd also like to get a little bit of the other side to determine, is it that our tried-and-true videographers aren't available? Is it cost, perhaps?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I think my comment

Can we justify costs by renting the same equipment in Southern California so that we're not taking it back and forth? Because also with the equipment moving it back and forth, there's always the opportunity that you're damaging it in the travel. So I'd just like to know a little bit more.

Yes, I'd love for them to go with us, but there has to be more behind it. And I'd like to understand that, because for sure I can be swayed to do something different understanding, full ramifications of saying pack it all up and continue to move it.

1 CHAIR SADHWANI: Director Hernandez, you want to 2 respond to that? 3 MR. HERNANDEZ: Sure. So we can do that. We were 4 looking at different options. We were looking at a 5 hybrid method and looking at -- we have changed from what we originally planned. It was supposed to be in-person 6 7 for the public to attend. They're not attending. And so this is just the meeting of the Commission. 8 9 And so we were looking at different options. That was an 10 option that was presented to me. I thought it was 11 reasonable, given that we all do need to be in the Zoom 12 because that is what is livestreamed and therefore it is 13 still a Zoom meeting. 14 Everyone is going to be on their laptop. That's a 15 requirement to be in the Zoom. And so logistically it 16 made sense to me. But if the Commission decides that 17 they truly want to have the videographer staff there, 18 they're able and willing. 19 CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner Fernandez, do you have 2.0 another comment? 21 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I should probably keep my 22 comment to myself right now so we can go on to the next 23 person. 24 CHAIR SADHWANI: Okay. 25 Commissioner Anderson?

1 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. One 2 consideration is, remember, for -- in the 2030 Commission, they'll be looking at how much we actually 3 4 spent. And we're supposed to be taking account as much 5 as we can for what was abnormal and what is normal. what is normal is that everyone travels, the videographer 6 7 all travels. If we don't have that amount at all, the legislature 9 could look at, well, okay, great, let's deduct the things 10 that only happened because of the pandemic and just stop 11 there. They wouldn't add in the things that -- other 12 expenses that we really should have had, but didn't 13 because it was all virtual. 14 So I think at some point it would be worth some sort 15 of travel, moving the roadshow at least. So we have an 16 actual dollar amount that then we could multiply up or 17 something. So that's just a consideration for next time. 18 CHAIR SADHWANI: That makes sense. 19 Commissioner Turner? 20 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. And thank you, 21 Director Alvaro, for your response on the videographers 22 going with us to Southern California. I appreciated the 23 response about it. We're going to be on Zoom anyway. 24 And our team, our videography team does things so

seamlessly and well. I appreciate them greatly.

I don't necessarily know all of the extras. So right here we're sitting in for the public in a wonderful space with a lot of equipment and what have you. But I'm still looking at a Zoom screen. And so if they go with us, we'll still be looking at a Zoom screen and what other benefit is it?

So when we get to line drawing, will their attendance or not make a difference as to whether or not I imagine I'll be able to see maps on a large screen and watch it? Or am I going to really be looking at maps just on my computer here? So that's what I want to know.

So with the videographers going with us, will it make a difference of what is displayed and what I can see large screen as opposed to like, well, we have this television that's larger with screens or something on the wall. I want to know what's the difference that will be provided by them being present as opposed to if we were just seeing our computers.

MR. HERNANDEZ: I don't have a sense because I don't know the location of the facility and what's available at that facility. Obviously, some of these televisions that you see before you are part of the videographer's equipment. The larger one is our equipment that we would have to have it taken down there as well. Those would be available.

1 As far as having a large screen to view the maps, I don't know if we would have that capability at the location. That is something we could definitely look 3 4 into. The line drawers may attend in person. 5 they're also going to be displaying it on the Zoom for the Californians to watch it. 6 7 So I mean, it's definitely something that we can 8 look into to find a larger screen and see how we can display that information better so that you can see it. 10 It is rather difficult to see it on your laptop because there's so much information within that image that it 11 12 does cause us some challenges. 13 So you know, those are some options that we could 14 look into. But I don't know exactly how that facility is 15 set up. I don't know what they have available. And so 16 we do have some additional logistics that we have to work 17 out. So I can't really say how that's going to change at 18 this point. 19 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. So just one follow up. 2.0 I'm still not clear. What do I miss if they're not 21 there? 22 Their personalities. MR. HERNANDEZ: 2.3 COMMISSIONER TURNER: And that will be a huge gap. 24 Hard to fill.

Mr. Hernandez: I don't think that you'll miss much.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Obviously, there may be some technical issues that -- they are awesome at what they do and making sure that everything has been mentioned already is seamless. And so technical glitches may happen and they may happen if they're there, too, because it's an unknown -- a different facility, different location that they're have to having to adjust to. But beyond that, I couldn't tell you how different it's going to be without them.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. Um-hum. Okay. So conceivably, one of the other options is is we can try one without them and see what we've lost and then make another decision about them going. If we got there and determined, we were just really flailing without them.

MR. HERNANDEZ: That is an option. I would air on the side of let's not go there. The last thing is we want to flail on that side. Hopefully, things will just run smoothly. But again, that was a -- I was being cognizant of a number of different things, logistics being what they are trying to figure all the different pieces. And there were moving pieces when we started this process. And now we've got more of a finality as to what we're doing and how we're doing things. So we can obviously pivot at this point if we wanted to do that,

but that I would defer to the Commission to decide if that's what you wish to do. But we do have those two options.

CHAIR SADHWANI: And I think that's a really great point, Alvaro, as we have been operating in a state of ambiguity for quite some time, not knowing if we would have to have public meetings, have to -- what we would have to do, when our deadline would be. We now have a whole lot more clarity. And that clarity only just came very recently.

And I think now is the opportunity, if there's something in particular that you want to see over the next couple of months, now's the time to really voice that so that we can make it happen or not. I see, Commissioner Toledo.

VICE CHAIR TOLEDO: I appreciated Commissioner

Andersen's point about that any decision might impact

future budgets for the next Commission. The other point

I -- and I also appreciated the outcome in terms of what

we will miss and/or gain by having the right staff or our

technical staff there.

I am thinking that if we do meet in person and we're going to have to use audio -- rather audio phones and other equipment, but it may make sense to have an IT person -- a help desk type person there to help with any

technical issues. And I also appreciate Commissioner Ahmad for volunteering to help us with some of these things.

I know I haven't been able to get my earphones to work with my laptop at all. And luckily, my speakers work pretty well. But I think it might be good to have some kind of technical assistance available if we do it in person. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Yeah, I think that's a great suggestion.

Commissioner Ahmad?

2.3

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. And thank you, everyone for this conversation. I just would like us to think about what is the difference between us sitting in this room and us sitting at home. And I don't have a TA person at home except Google University that helps me out and identifying my own users.

So if we're not letting in the public because of COVID concerns, but we're meeting in person, I don't see how this is any different than us just individually meeting from home. I would caution us to even think that we're missing out on anything if the video photographer team doesn't travel with us, because that would mean that we were missing out on something for the last year, which I don't think we were. So just my thoughts.

```
1
         CHAIR SADHWANI:
                          Thank you. And in response to your
    question, I think the difference is sweatpants perhaps.
    But I'll keep that to myself. Any other final comments
 3
 4
    on this topic?
 5
        Alvaro, can you give us a rundown over the next
    couple of weeks what that schedule looks like? So next
 6
 7
    week we are back here in Sacramento; is that correct?
        Mr. Hernandez: That is correct. We are back here
 9
    in Sacramento. Let me pull up my schedule. Just one
10
    second. Yeah. Yeah. So Yeah, in Southern California.
11
                                   I got it here.
        COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI:
12
        MR. HERNANDEZ: Do you have it?
13
        COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah.
14
        MR. HERNANDEZ:
                        Okay.
15
         COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: October 13th, 14th, 15th,
16
    in Southern California. Do you want me to say that out
17
    loud?
18
                         I got it here.
                                         Okay.
        MR. HERNANDEZ:
                                                So October
19
    4th, 5th, 6th, and 7th were here in Sacramento. October
20
    13, 14, 15, we're in Southern California.
21
        CHAIR SADHWANI: And is there a location for that?
22
        MR. HERNANDEZ: We have secured location for that.
2.3
        CHAIR SADHWANI: Okay.
24
        MR. HERNANDEZ: October 20, 21, 22, is back in
25
    Sacramento, and 23 as well, which is a Saturday. We have
```

1 a location for that here in Sacramento as well. October 27 through the 30th, Southern California. We have a 3 location at this point. It's the same location as the 4 previous one, Southern California. But we're still 5 looking at options to see if we can find other locations. But I wanted to secure what we knew we had versus 6 7 continuing to look for things and then come up short and 8 then I'm not going to hear the end of that. So I just 9 want to make sure get what we can get right now. 10 November 3rd, 4th, and 5th, we're back in Sacramento. October 8th, 9th, and 10th -- oh, November. 11 12 I'm sorry, November 8th, 9th, and 10th, and then also on 13 the 12th, we're scheduled for Southern California. 14 That's where we're looking for a location in San Diego 15 area. 16 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So we we're taking 17 Veterans Day off? 18 MR. HERNANDEZ: Veteran's Day is Veteran's Day. 19 I don't know how the Commission wishes to proceed with 20 that. But on the schedule, that is a holiday. And then 21 thereafter we are in Sacramento the 16th through the 22 19th, and then we have Thanksgiving. And then the 30th 23 through December 2nd, we're back in Sacramento. And then 24 the subsequent meetings after that are in Sacramento for

25

the commission meetings.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Sure.

2.3

MR. HERNANDEZ: But I know that we may have some additional meetings for feedback and things like that similar to our COI meetings, and those have not been scheduled at this point.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Perfect. Thank you so much for walking us through that. Okay. Great. Director Hernandez, did you have anything else for your Executive Director's Report?

MR. HERNANDEZ: I do. That was just the beginning.

All right. So I wanted to give you an update on the paper COI. We received the final approval from the U.S.

Post Office last week, and we're working with the State printing to print the paper COI and have it delivered and looking at different options on the delivery.

Some of the quantities are rather large to the prisons, and so we're trying to figure out how to get them to them. It's not as easy as just sending it to an address because it's a P.O. box. They don't provide us a physical address, so we have to work with that scenario and try to work it all out. That's where we are with that.

We're also going to be looking at posting the paper COI PDFs online in the multiple languages that we have available. So we're working on that piece of it as well.

Any questions on the paper COI?

2 CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioners Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I believe it's the prisons and the libraries that you're also getting it to libraries throughout the state as well.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, the libraries are going to be much easier because the volume, the quantities are not as large as the prison industries, and therefore, it's a lot easier to get them out. So yes, we are looking at the prisons and the libraries, and I believe there's two other groups that are missing. It's not just the prisons, it's the sheriffs. And there's another group.

Marcy?

MS. KAPLAN: And at one point we had talked about that we might put a code just so that we had an idea of which ones were coming back from libraries and which ones were coming back from incarcerated individuals for our analysis at the end. Is that still -- it didn't have to be something big, but is that still in the works or because of everything that got approved, let's not touch anything?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes. No, the coding would take place when we are inputting that information. So we'll have -- when we receive them back, we're going to try to identify them where they're coming back from, because

directly to us. And then what we can do is in the database indicate where they're coming from. That would 3 4 be the only code. We didn't do any coding on the actual 5 documents. It's just too much to try to figure out. COMMISSIONER SINAY: Will we be able to, at some 6 7 point, have a report that's created that says how much 8 was sent to whom and then what came back and putting it 9 out there again, that we know that the numbers will 10 probably be small this time around. But just so that, 11 you know, we have a baseline for the future and for 12 our -- and for the public and all of us to know. 13 MR. HERNANDEZ: Absolutely. We will provide that. 14 CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner Kennedy? 15 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. Yes, it was 16 basically to request that we be provided with a copy of 17 the distribution plan. Thank you. 18 CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you. 19 Commissioner Fernandez? 2.0 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I'm not sure how 21 the -- for the California Department of Corrections and 22 Rehab, how they will be sending that information back if 2.3 the if it's from every facility. If we do receive them 24 from the facility, just so that everyone knows it's 25 stamped that it's coming from a correctional facility.

they're going to be sent back to us by the prisons

1 So we'd be able to know that they came from a correctional facility. So we might want to maybe -- can 3 tag that in the database or as part of our stats. 4 CHAIR SADHWANI: Great. Thank you. 5 Director Kaplan? MS. KAPLAN: Just to add to the other statewide 6 7 entity that's being -- will be shipped out to is the 8 statewide prison population, the County jails, and also the juvenile facilities. And then we work together with 10 the California Library Association and The State Library 11 and Office to distribute a request form for libraries,

12 and then went back and also followed up with more rural

13 libraries as well. So that was the direction by both of

those statewide associations to really get the requests

15 from the entities themselves.

16 CHAIR SADHWANI: Great. Thank you.

17 Alvaro?

14

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HERNANDEZ: Great. Thank you. Moving on, I want to go back and talk about the 2010 website. I don't recall if I shared this last -- I probably didn't share it last week cause I didn't get a chance to report out. So we've communicated with the website or I have communicated with the Website Subcommittee that there is nothing new to share at this time as far as getting that website up.

1 We're not able to post the 2010 website because it's noncompliance to ADA requirements. So we'll work with 3 the Subcommittee on what the next steps might be as far 4 as getting that webpage either compliant at some point 5 and posted somewhere. And we're trying to -- we're going to try to figure that piece out as we move forward. 6 7 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sorry. What was it noncompliant with? 8 9 MR. HERNANDEZ: ADA, America's Disability Act. 10 the websites have to be compliant with ADA requirements. 11 They have to -- all state websites must be compliant, 12 otherwise they have to be taken down. Our website, our 13 current website is ADA compliant. We have ADA 14 certificate, compliant certificate. So that's why we 15 cannot post the 2010 website at this time among other 16 things. 17 ATTNY PANE: Commissioner, if I could just briefly 18 contextualize it a little bit. There was a bill that was 19 passed between the 2010 Commission and the 2020 20 Commission that required all state websites to be ADA 21 accessible. And that's to the visually -- I mean, the --22 for example, a PDF may or may not be visually accessible 23 to those that are visually impaired. But say a Microsoft 24 Word document in a certain font is what is sort of what

25

is an acceptable standard.

```
1
         So all State Department websites have to certify
    that their website is ADA compliant. And so that's sort
    of been a going forward basis that state entities have
 3
 4
    taken and then they're sort of working on previous
 5
    documents. And by the way, it applies not just to the
    website, but it also applies to the documents that are on
 6
 7
    the website. So for the better part of a few years now,
    all state entities have been working on that.
 8
 9
         COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So actually on that, so does
10
    it mean that you also have to have auditory? Like should
11
    they need it?
12
         ATTNY PANE: I'm not exactly sure if that part
13
    applies to the certification. The bill itself that was
14
    signed into law applies in a specific context.
15
    Specifically, it has to have a certification about it
16
    being accessible to the visually impaired. I'm not sure
    if it also has to be applied as to hearing impaired as
17
18
    well.
19
         COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.
20
         CHAIR SADHWANI: Okay. Thank you. More? Oh --
21
         MR. HERNANDEZ: Hands raised.
22
         CHAIR SADHWANI: I'm sorry. I'm looking out and
2.3
    it's not on the Zoom.
24
         Commissioner Fernandez?
25
         Commissioner Kennedy?
```

1 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Director Hernandez, the Subcommittee would like to receive 3 whatever email or other correspondence you've had with 4 The State Archives on this so that we can see if there's 5 any further effort that we might want to take. MR. HERNANDEZ: I will get that information to you. 6 7 I just want to once again note that The State Archives doesn't archive websites, it archives documents, digital 8 9 documents, digital media information, but not a form -- a 10 format where they can house a full-on website. 11 That has been the challenge that we've been trying 12 to overcome, is that we'd like to have the entire website 13 available for historical purposes, but there isn't -- at 14 this point, that avenue to post a website or for someone 15 to host our website as is on their web site. And so 16 that's where we've been kind of looking to find that 17 solution. But definitely we'll send you that information 18 that I have. 19 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. And yeah, understood. But even if it's -- we know that members of 21 the public are looking for specific items. And if The 22 State Archives are able to pull up those items, then the

We want to be responsive to members of the public

having the structure of the 2010 website becomes less

20

23

24

25

relevant.

1 who are looking for specific documents or videos or transcripts or whatever it may be that were most easily 3 locate through that website. But if The State Archives 4 has them and we can refer members of the public to The 5 State Archives to obtain the information that they're looking for, that's -- I see that as perfectly 6 7 acceptable. So thank you. CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy. 8 Alvaro, was there more to your report? 10 MR. HERNANDEZ: Absolutely. All right. This is the 11 last thing. I promise. So our database has been updated 12 through September 10th. So that means all the COI input 13 meetings information has been loaded and is available 14 now. So that was something I wanted to share with 15 everyone. Make sure that you're looking and finding the 16 information that has been posted out there. 17 We're still going to be receiving correspondence, 18 emails, things of that nature that will take a little bit 19 of time to vet it and get it into the database because 20 we're going through the COI tool to have it available in 21 our database, CRC database. So we're working on that 22 piece and making sure that everything is working in 2.3 order. 24 I just put it out there for Californians.

find that there's something that is not there or

1 information that is confusing, please let us know at VoterFIRSTAct@CRC.gov. Thank you. That concludes my report on this. Are there any other questions at this 3 4 point. 5 CHAIR SADHWANI: And I see there are. Commissioner Fernandez? 6 7 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Yes. Regarding the updated database, I'm just going to look 8 this way because it feels weird for me to look in here. 10 Anyway. So right now we're about two weeks out. So as 11 we move forward with the line drawing, and I believe 12 there was a comment at our last meeting, like how 13 frequently will we be able to update the information like 14 now or two weeks out. As we get closer, are we going to 15 get like one week out, days out? And I might have missed 16 that part. So I apologize if I if it's repetitive. 17 MR. HERNANDEZ: Good question. We are trying to 18 streamline the process, but it depends on the volume of 19 correspondence and information that we receive. I think 20 it was two weeks ago we received over 100 pieces of 21 correspondence. So those do take some time to process. 22 Our goal is to do it more timely. We are looking at

bringing on some additional staff to help with that

23

24

1 there's enough information to create a map, and that's something that's key. So it's not just the information. We receive it and then that's it. And we share it with 3 all of you. 4 5 We do put it on our public input page. It's there. But we also have to take that information, put it into 6 7 the COI tool so that it can create the map if a map is 8 not been provided and then that information is then 9 transmitted to the -- I was going to say my old agency name. It's transmitted over to the Commission into our 10 11 Airtable. 12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Just a quick follow up. 13 if there's -- how frequently is the information from the 14 committees of interest tool, the statewide database, how 15 often is that updated to our, the Commission's database, 16 that input? 17 MR. HERNANDEZ: Sure. I believe at this point it is 18 every couple of days the goal is to get it where it's 19 daily. I know we had talked about doing it more 20 frequently than that. I don't know if we're going to get 21 to that place, but definitely the goal is to get it to 22 transmit daily. 2.3 CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner Kennedy? 24 Thank you. It's good to hear COMMISSIONER KENNEDY:

that you're looking into additional staff. I think that

1 is a timely consideration at this point. Just wanted to inquire, I had made a request three weeks ago on the 7th for a listing of all of our meetings to date, as well as 3 the status of each of the transcripts of those meetings. 4 5 So just wanted to get an update from you on that. MR. HERNANDEZ: And I do apologize. I did not send 6 7 that over to you. We do have a list. We did receive 8 some additional transcripts for the more recent meetings. I will update that information and get that over to you. But we have received them and I believe we're either in 10 11 the process of posting them or we have posted some of 12 them. 13 COMMISSIOER KENNEDY: Thank you. 14 CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good. Thank you so much. 15 Shall we continue on with the Communications Director's 16 Report? 17 Thank you, Madam Chair. Just a few MR. CEJA: 18 things before I jump into my report. The transcripts 19 were updated. The last batch that we got, we uploaded 20 immediately and it was in my last week's report. But it 21 was an amazing report. 22 But sadly, I didn't get to go over it because we ran 2.3 out of time. It was like the most robust report I've 24 ever written and had a bunch of great information,

including the transcripts that were uploaded.

there was a total of eight or ten.

2.3

The other thing is regarding the 2010 website, it has become an issue for us because not only do we not have the funds to continue having that website live, we don't have the people power to do it either. And we did lose a lot of files when it crashed years ago.

Now, the issue for the next Commission is what do they do with the 2010 Commission website? What do they do with the 2020 website? Because we have to maintain it and pay for its monthly fees. And so for whoever is keeping track of the next, I guess it's Lessons

Learned -- but we do have to come up with a plan before we end our work for what's going to happen with our website and eminently with the 2010 website, because we don't have a game plan yet. And if we don't keep it up, it's just going to die. And we lose all the information that's on there.

Jumping into my report, I don't have too much, just some updates. We did purchase a plug in for the website. So much like other amazing websites, we're going to have a language drop down menu where individuals that are visiting our site will be able to change the language for the website or in total its 104 languages that you can select.

So anything that's in text will be translated into



that language. I'm trying to remember if it also includes videos. I know that it includes the livestream because it's text that's ongoing as the meeting's going forward. But I don't know if that works for other tape material, so I'll inquire about that.

2.0

2.3

That should be up tomorrow. We were trying to get the code embedded into every one of our web pages today, but it doesn't seem to be working yet. Hopefully by tomorrow I'll make an announcement when we have that.

I'm setting up meetings with our advertising contractors with the zone lead so that you can know what's going on in your individual zones. And pivot if we need to change messaging for your zones in regards to billboards and radio advertisements.

And as far as contracts are concerned, we're still just missing the ethnic media contract. Everything else has been signed, so we're moving forward with those plans. And I'll update you individually as zone leaders when we meet so that I can give you the whole rundown on where actual billboards are, what radio stations we've gone after. And if you want to change that, we can. We have enough time.

Moving forward, our social media contract that's doing advertisements on Facebook, Google, and other social media platforms, will start next week. We did a

messaging meeting with them this past week with the communications team, so they pulled a lot of stuff from our website, which is up to date.

It has the most pertinent information and those -the only thing that we changed was instead of focusing on
COI meetings, we're now focusing on line drawing
meetings, but everything else seems to be moving forward
nicely. And we should have our first advertisements on
social media next week.

We'll be working on the newsletter this week. It's already the end of the month. It's hard to believe. So the October newsletter will be drafted tomorrow or as soon as I get back to L.A. And I'm also coordinating with the Statewide Database for the launch of the Draw My California District Tool, which will allow Californians to draw their own maps in their own districts.

That is not up yet. And as soon as it is, we'll send out a press release announcing that it's live. I did send over today the paper COI tool educational video. Because we were running out of time, we didn't have time to produce a whole new PSA for the paper OOI tool. What we did was take the educational video that we had for Why Participate. It goes over the whole purpose of participating in redistricting.

But we also included at the end the fact that we're

sending out paper COI tools for those incarcerated

populations and libraries that will be utilizing the

paper COI tool. And it's just a short one and a half
minute video, but it goes over all our work and why it's

important to participate. And that's all I have for

today. I'll take questions.

7 CHAIR SADHWANI: It looks like Commissioner Toledo 8 has a question.

2.3

VICE CHAIR TOLEDO: Thank you, Chair. Thank you so much for the update and for all of the work that your team is doing that you and your team are doing. Just a question about the social media ads that you mentioned. Will those be in -- just in English or are they also in Spanish and other languages? Because I was just curious if you can just speak to the targeting of the social media?

MR. CEJA: Yeah, that's a great question. So we are hoping to do in language ads. We did have one contractor that was doing billboards and they actually did some in Vietnamese, Korean, and Chinese. So we want to take that messaging that's been vetted already by radio stations that speak those languages and use those for social media.

So what I'm going to do once we sign the ethnic media contractors have everyone meet together so that

- they can share content, they can share visuals and
 messaging, and that we can have everything circulating
 through all our channels, through radio, through
 billboard, through social media. And so we'll be sharing
 all those messaging points with every contractor so that
 everyone's speaking the same language and using the same
 messaging.
 - CHAIR SADHWANI: That's great. This is just an incredible amount of work and an incredible campaign. I think people are going to be getting the message that redistricting is happening and they should get involved.
- 12 Commissioner Kennedy?

2.3

- COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you Chair. And this ties into that. Director Ceja, I recall having asked previously about your indication at one point that you would be organizing a briefing for editors, not so much the journalists themselves, the editors.
- And I want to know, I think you mentioned at one point that one of these contracts needed to be in place in order for that to happen, which I didn't fully understand why a contract needs to be in place for that to happen. But I wondered if you could update us on the concept, at least of organizing briefings for editors. Thank you.
- MR. CEJA: Yeah. So the briefings that we have set

1 in place and the contracts with ethnic media are for reporters. I can get started on it at editorial briefing so that we have a select few Commissioners actually 3 4 talking to editorial boards so that they get the gist of 5 what our timeline looks like now that we've updated the timeline. And that's another thing that I forgot to 6 7 mention. It's on our website. We took the liberty of going through the timeline and updating it with the new deadlines that we have so 10 that the public knows what's expected for the remainder 11 of the year. And that's basically what editors will want 12 to know is what's next for the Commission? 13 How much time do you have left? So I'll get on that 14 this week, Commissioner Kennedy. And if I can have a few 15 people volunteer to sit in on those editorial board 16 meetings, I can get those scheduled asap. 17 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah, that would be great. And I'm happy to -- I would think, though, that briefings 18 19 for editors would include all media, not just ethnic 2.0 media. 21 MR. CEJA: Yes, that's correct. 22 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. Yeah. 2.3 CHAIR SADHWANI: Commissioner Turner? 24 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Director Ceja, I 25 had an opportunity to look at some of the billboard

1 advertisements that you sent us, which they look wonderful. And in a different area of my life, we used 3 billboards. And typically when there are pictures and edited photos of people that would be recognizable, we 4 5 typically get a greater response from billboards than just the name. So I just wanted to suggest that in any 6 7 future billboards or planning that perhaps consider putting some of the Commissioners faces on the billboards 8 9 as well. 10 MR. CEJA: Yes. Thank you. 11 CHAIR SADHWANI: I will volunteer your face for 12 these billboards, Commissioner Turner. 13 Commissioner Sinay? 14 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Two things. Following up on 15 Commissioner Turner, I thought you were going to say 16 something else. I thought you were going to say having 17 people take pictures on social media and hashtag it. 18 I would like to see our social media be a little more 19 interactive in that regards. It's very one way just 20 pushing information out. But how can we make it more 21 interactive. 22 On the editors, just you kind of sparked something, 23 Andrew, who's the lead in San Diego, Imperial County, 24 Riverside, in San Bernardino, he organized a meeting for 25 Commissioners at the San Diego County level, City of San

Diego, Chula Vista, Escondido, just kind of a lot of the different Independent Redistricting Commissions. We made it very elite in that way. It's only the independent ones are invited. And I was invited.

And we are with all of us together, we feel that we can really push for the editors to meet with all of us so we can give a message on this is why redistricting is important. This is why it's important in all the different levels. And Voice of San Diego is one of our local digital platforms and they do a big Politifest is what they call it.

And so we're looking to see how we can be involved in that, too, but we're really looking to kind of come out as a unified force, similar to that article that came out in Los Angeles, which I thought was really well done, kind of saying this is why it's important, this is how you can get involved at the State, this is how you can get involved at the County and then listing the different cities. And so I just wanted to share that so that you all knew that we did that. I forgot to share that last week when we met.

CHAIR SADHWANI: It sounds exciting. Any additional comments or questions for Director Ceja? I will insert myself here. I actually have one or two. The first one was just for today's meeting. I didn't see any public

1 comment posted on our website and I just wanted to get an 2 update to see if we did have any.

2.0

2.3

In our last meeting, we had over 50 pieces, 50 submissions, so I just wanted to check in on that. I believe that -- I recall seeing at least one piece come in that was emailed to Commissioners. So I just want to check in on that.

And then the second piece, I know Fredy had mentioned this to me. I actually wanted to just raise this with the full Commission rather than making a decision on this solely. There has been a request that now that we -- some of us may meet in person for the line, drawing from reporters, asking if it would be okay for a reporter to come to our meetings in person.

I wanted to raise that with everyone's -- get a temperature check on the room, see how folks are feeling about that request. And I think a part of it is we are meeting without the public due to COVID regulations. So while I could see the value, I also think that there's some broader considerations I wanted to see if others had thoughts.

Commissioner Sinay, did you have a hand up first?

No. Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I think I'd have to say no to that because we aren't allowing the public, and I just

1 feel that's an equity issue. Thank you. 2 CHAIR SADHWANI: Great. Commissioner Akutagawa? 3 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I would agree. 4 would agree on that, too. Also, on your other question 5 about the public comment and the public input, I am noticing that you do have to go to the separate page on 6 7 the website on a regular basis to check if there is new 8 input on both areas. 9 However, it's not always on our handouts area, so I 10 just wanted to note that there were several pieces. 11 There's public input and public comment on tabs on the 12 website, so you'll have to look at that. There is 13 several pieces on the public comment side as well as on 14 public input from the last time we met. And so I'm 15 finding that it's just better to go there to make sure 16 that you have everything that you know is current. 17 CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you. 18 Commissioner Kennedy? 19 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I would 20 say that I'm more supportive of the idea of a reporter or 21 two reporters in the room. As long as there's an 22 understanding -- first of all, as long as they're 2.3 required to meet our rules as far as vaccination masking, 24 social distancing, et cetera. 25 Second, as long as there is an agreement that they

1 are acting as pool reporters and are going to share what they what they collect with others. Yeah. I wouldn't want one to be allowed in an exclusive. When you're 3 4 dealing with situations where there's limited space and 5 so forth, pool arrangements are usually way around that. So I would I would be supportive of it as long as it's as 6 7 a as a pool reporter. Thank you. CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you. 8 Commissioner Yee? 10 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. I'm feeling open to having 11 credentialed journalists attend. I mean, the public 12 depends on a free press and journalists to observe things 13 and to go to public meetings, go to school board 14 meetings, things that may be open to the public. But you 15 know, the public can be anywhere. 16 There are other meetings where it is limited to 17 credential reporters and not to the general public. So 18 even if it were a equity issue, I think we want to be --19 err on the side of it being accessible and not having the 20 pandemic cost the public yet more access to the workings 21 of their government. So I'd be open to actually more

CHAIR SADHWANI: Okay. Some variation in the room here.

25 Director Ceja?

22

2.3

24

access.



MR. CEJA: Yes. Thank you. I was trying to unmute on my computer. Not necessary. Yeah. What I was going to suggest is that we just come up with parameters. If the Commission feels comfortable maybe having one reporter here at a time, scheduling them far apart, making sure that they're abiding by the social distance, and wearing a mask mandate and conducting all interviews outside.

And if the camera person needs to come in here and should be able to do that quickly and then be on their way. It's not for them to stay here and linger for the majority of our meeting. Just capture enough B-roll to create a story and put it on the air. And then, like I said, have one on one interviews take place in the hallway where it's ample and there's not a clutter of people.

CHAIR SADHWANI: So that sounds like some reasonable parameters that you feel like you could develop.

Commissioner Ahmad?

2.0

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. I think I'm in most agreement with what Fredy just shared. In terms of allowing access variability between the public and reporters. There is no variability. Everything we do is live streamed and open to the public and the press at any point in time. The only difference being if we do end up

interviewing which then becomes public anyways.

So I don't think there's any special access being granted to a reporter versus anyone from the public. So from that standpoint, keeping it clean cut is kind of where I'm thinking. But to Fredy's point, if there's in individual interview requests, having that conducted somewhere outside this space would probably be okay with me.

ATTNY PANE: Chair? Chair, if I could just mention,
I'd like to echo Commissioner Ahmed's point. I want to
make sure that we're treating the press and the public to
the same extent.

CHAIR SADHWANI: I think that makes sense. So perhaps we can continue to talk a little bit more about whether or not that's possible and if so what those parameters would be offline and come back with a proposal. Okay. Great. Thank you.

Director Ceja, any additional pieces to your report?

MR. CEJA: No, that's it. Thank you so much.

CHAIR SADHWANI: All right. Thank you. And I'll also note that Director Ceja very kindly came and spoke with my class today and did a phenomenal job. And so my sincere thanks to you for that and sharing your many years of expertise and though -- in the world of public policy. So thank you.

Director Kaplan, for your report?

2.3

MS. KAPLAN: Hi, everyone. I wanted to highlight that outreach staff have begun to conduct Draw My CA community trainings and in the handouts for today, I've posted a document that includes the upcoming and past presentations that have happened so far. There's an additional two that are still being scheduled as well.

I also want to highlight that we made some updates to the Draw My CA community presentation to now include the new mapping tools the Statewide Database had presented to the commission last week highlighting they're coming soon, so that will be updated once there actually live as well with the ways to access them.

And we have also included a slide on the timeline which is now posted on the CRC website. The updated version of the scripts and PowerPoint are on the website now in the outreach materials page also. The handout posted today also includes a number of input received through September 10th, which Alvaro had highlighted earlier, and it provides a breakdown as the source type, such as live meeting, Draw My CA community tool, et cetera.

I also wanted to highlight that this Monday at 9

a.m., the requests for appointments for the October 21 to

23 public map input sessions was posted on the meetings



page of our website. Again, this is an opportunity for the public to present district maps to the Commission, and this request form is also distributed through our email list and our social media and outreach staff have also been promoting to stakeholders.

2.3

And just a reminder, filling out this form is not a confirmation or guarantee of appointment. Invitations by appointment time slots will be assigned by the CRC on 10/15/21 at 5 p.m., and maps and written narratives must be submitted in advance to the CRC by October 11th at 5 p.m. Those can come in two different emails, so it doesn't need to be -- they don't need to be sent at the same time, but do need to be received by October 11th.

And I wanted to provide an update to the Commission right now on the sign ups to date, because we did we have -- received a lot of sign-ups so far. So as of this morning, this is as of 8 a.m. this morning, there's been thirty-seven sign ups. Twenty-six of those are small submissions. That's a one to three district map, a six-minute presentation. Seven of them are medium. So this is for four more district maps. Three of those are large submissions, one statewide map and one is extra-large submission.

And so just to give you a sense of like how we're looking and filling up our time of the three-day proposed

meetings, the proposed schedule the Commission created allowed for 780 minutes of public input. So of the submissions we've received so far, that's about 396 minutes. So we're about halfway full in terms of what we're getting. And just wanted to let you know that the sign-ups did trickle in pretty heavily the last two days.

2.3

But just as of this morning from 8 a.m. till right about now, there's only been two more that came in today. So the thirty=seven was from 8 a.m., so maybe it's slowing, but maybe it's not. So just to give you that sense and then we'll -- I'll provide more of an update next week also to see where we're at.

And then just want to add a little bit more to the conversation around the COI paper tool. So staff have been reaching out over a time period, not just recently, but to entities that also serve incarcerated populations to provide communications about the paper COI tool and the redistricting process, to request their support and promotion about information, about redistricting to the communities they serve.

And so we've also shared communications with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation, the California State Sheriff's Association, and the chief probation officers of California who oversee the juvenile facilities and how to prepare their staff for the paper

tools that are coming, the communications to distribute information on the COI paper tool and how that will be getting back to us.

But additionally, how the Commission is hoping to facilitate participation among those who are incarcerated and also really highlighting information with the staff on how they themselves can also participate. And so the COI paper tools developed to allow incarcerated populations the opportunity to participate.

But we still also want to encourage staff at those facilities to participate. And so we're making sure to include that information as well, that they can access the COI tool online, they can access our website, and that they're encouraged to do so as well. And that was it.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Great. Thank you. Any questions for Director Kaplan?

Director Ceja?

MR. CEJA: Hi. I did just get an email a while ago from one of our county partners indicating that since Draw My California district is not up if there are other tools that counties can use to create their maps to meet that December 11 -- or October 11th deadline to submit maps before they present to the Commission? Does that makes sense? Yeah.

1 MS. KAPALN: What are other mapping tools? MR. CEJA: Other mapping tools that they can use 3 because ours is not yet or the statewide databases is not 4 up yet. 5 MS. KAPLAN: I guess that would be for the 6 Commission on what you want to be promoting. 7 It's supposed to be up by COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: the end of this week. So a couple of days versus trying 8 9 to find just a random mapping tool. I would suggest they 10 collect all the information a couple of days and then 11 jump on it as soon as it comes out. Because it -- the 12 one thing about the mapping tool, it does allow you to 13 comment on the particulars of why you're putting your 14 district together, which your standard GIS mapping tools 15 do not. So you have to write a separate report and 16 that's a huge advantage and it is also free. So that's 17 another advantage. And because it does go directly to 18 the statewide database, it'll come directly to us. 19 CHAIR SADHWANI: Oh, Commissioner Fornaciari? 2.0 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Thanks. A couple 21 of questions. The first one, I don't know if you know 22 the answer to this, but it says the organization name is 2.3 San Joaquin County. So is that like to the Board of 24 Supervisors or something or is it just --



I can look that up while we're meeting

25

MS. KAPLAN:

1 | and --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. Just kind of selfishly curious.

MS. KAPLAN: Yes. And that's helpful just to include that clarification in the future.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. And then the other question is, a caller called in earlier and said, can they submit a PowerPoint later? Can you answer that question? And I just spaced out about it or?

MS. KAPLAN: Yes, so they can it just needs to be submitted by October 11 so they can submit their map like on October 4th and then submit their PowerPoint on October 9th. As long as it's before the 11th of the --

MS. KAPLAN: -- the cut-off time.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. And then I guess we're still working on the logistics of how all that's going to work.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Once we have a better sense of how many people -- I'm sorry, Chair, may I? I was looking right at him. That's why. That's the advantages of being in the same room. Right? Once we have a better sense of how many people we have, then we'll start looking at the next step of how we're going to display and schedule everybody. And how the maps -- because some

people may sign up but don't get the maps in in time. So we're still looking at making sure we have a full schedule and coordinating from that point on.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I guess just a question about how we're going to -- who's going to display the map and how we're going to run through all that process we still have to work through. So yes, we do. You already know that.

CHAIR SADHWANI: I will just jump in. And I think,
Commissioner Fornaciari, you could be really instructive
on this. And we don't have to answer this question now,
but this did come up in some of our conversations with
the line drawers. So I want to raise it now, at least to
put it put a pin in it and we can figure it out later.

The line draw drawers are of the belief that it would be easiest if presenters can share their screens and walk us through their maps themselves. Right?

Sometimes even when presenting, you'll try to point to something and you're not really pointing to it because you're not controlling a screen.

So I did want to raise that. I think it's something we need to consider. We certainly did not allow it for the COIs -- COI input sessions. Perhaps these district input sessions are substantively different to some extent, and we might want to consider a change in that

1 policy. So I'll just raise that and hopefully we can think about that very soon. Yeah. Please. 3 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I mean, there are -- we were talking about that this morning with 4 5 There still are security concerns. So maybe 6 there's a hybrid approach that we can take. Maybe an 7 individual presenting a single map. Maybe we can show 8 that. Maybe a group can present their own map. Maybe a 9 group would send us a map, but have a PowerPoint that we 10 could slide through. 11 So there's lots of options that we need to think 12 about, but there is still the same underlying security 13 concern that someone's going to Zoom bomb our meeting. 14 And we really have to understand it a little bit more 15 deeply, I think, than we do right now of how we would --16 how we could manage that concern effectively. 17 CHAIR SADHWANI: I think that would be great. 18 So we'll continue to work. COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: 19 CHAIR SADHWANI: That sounds perfect. That sounds 20 perfect. 21 Commissioner Andersen? 22 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I do want to just bring up a 23 couple of additional points is, remember, for these 24 particular meetings, this is unusual in that everything 25 has to be submitted beforehand. And so we will know

```
1
    what's coming and if we can even have a few second delay,
    if they -- and the understanding that if you vary from --
    start talking about something else, that's it. You're
 3
 4
    gone. Your time is over.
 5
         A couple of things like that because the line
    drawers really fought and these particular meetings,
 6
 7
    they're during as we're trying to do draft maps so it is
    a -- is different and you know we're having different
 8
    criteria very specific. So that's another item to
10
    consider in this whole can we do it? How can we do it
11
    issue. Just wanted to bring that up.
         CHAIR SADHWANI: Director Kaplan, did you have a
12
13
    hand raised?
14
         MS. KAPLAN: I just wanted to follow up with
15
    Commissioner Fornaciari's question about San Joaquin
16
    County. It is to the board and the members of the
17
    public.
18
         COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Oh really? And the
19
    Board --
20
         MS. KAPLAN: Board of Supervisors. Yeah.
21
         COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: At a Board of Supervisors
22
    meeting?
2.3
         MS. KAPLAN: Sorry, I it is I can let me clarify
24
    that. It just says to the board and members of the
25
   public, so let me clarify.
```

1 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. 2 MS. KAPLAN: Okay. I'll come back. CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good. Thank you. 3 Director 4 Kaplan, did you have anything else in your report? 5 MS. KAPLAN: That was it. CHAIR SADHWANI: Great. Thank you so much. And 6 7 thank you also for laying out by the minutes that was 8 really helpful to kind of think about how much time has 9 actually -- that we're allotting and how much time has been reserved. 10 11 Chief Counsel Pane? 12 ATTNY PANE: Thank you, Chair. Oh -- all right. 13 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just did have a question. 14 And I'm going on our website cause I wanted to -- so when 15 we do the public input on our website and we put the 16 date, and then from, and then the area, for me 17 personally, it would be helpful if we also maybe put the 18 county that it's coming from because I don't know all of 19 the cities in the state, but for me that would be helpful 20 if that's hopefully not too much work. I think Executive 21 Director Hernandez is all on board with that. 22 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah. 2.3 MR. CEJA: Can I? 24 CHAIR SADHWANI: Director Ceja? 25 MR. CEJA: Yes, if I can respond to that.

1 would love to. But not all entries are the same. all mention counties, some just mention the city. 3 try to guess what county and some of them are actually mentioned multiple counties. So with that, we've tried 4 5 our best to tag them regarding where the input -- not where their input is coming from, but what county it or 6 7 what area it's referring to. Because someone from San Francisco can easily give us input on Los Angeles. And 8 it would have to be tagged Los Angeles. COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. So I would be 10 11 interested as to what -- where the input is, what area. 12 So if it's L.A., it would be L.A., that'd be great. 13 then sometimes it might be multiple counties, which I'm 14 okay with having multiple counties as well. So thank 15 Whatever you can do to provide a little bit more 16 specificity. That's a big word. Yeah. 17 CHAIR SADHWANI: All right. So we are up against a 18 break in just a few moments, but I think Commissioner --19 I keep calling everybody Commissioner -- Chief Counsel 20 Pane is going to get started with his report and if need 21 be, we'll finish after our break. 22 ATTNY PANE: Thank you, Chair. Just to highlight a 23 couple of things. First, you'll note for today's 24 meeting, we have the map requirements that are posted. 25 These are essentially sort of broader guardrails for a

1 substantive policy discussion for later where the Commission is going to be deciding kind of the contours 3 of the calendar for the maps -- for drawing our line 4 drawing. 5 I tried to highlight in there some keywords based on previous Commission questions or thoughts. And we can 6 certainly discuss them at a later time, but I just wanted 7 8 to highlight that for you all. Second, just a preview as 9 well for later, in the Legal Affairs Committee report 10 out, I'll be looking for a recommendation. 11 They'll be recommending just to have a future 12 subcommittee created to help finalize litigation contract 13 negotiations for the Gibson and Dunn contract. So just 14 to highlight that that's also forthcoming. And that's 15 all I had, unless anyone has any questions. 16 CHAIR SADHWANI: If there are no questions, I think 17 we have enough time to go to public comment on this 18 agenda item. 19 Katy, are you available for public comment? 2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I am, Chair. 21 CHAIR SADHWANI: Great. Thank you. 22 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The Commission will now 23 be taking public comment on Agenda Item Number 3, 24 Director's Report. To give comment, please call 877-853-

5247 and enter the meeting ID number 88264383219 for this

meeting. Once you have dialed in, please press star 9 to enter the comment queue.

The full call-in instructions have been read previously in this meeting and are provided in full on the livestream landing page. And we do not have anyone in the queue at this time. And I will let you know when the instructions are complete on the screen, Chair.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Okay. That sounds great. So we'll just hang tight for a minute or two until we can finish -- finish it on the livestream. When we come back from break at 4:15, we will move into subcommittee reports. I know that we probably have some more substantive conversations from the Mapping Playbook Subcommittee, I believe, which I anticipate will be where much of our time will be spent. But we will go through the full list of subcommittee reports.

Oh, Commissioner Sinay, did I miss -- did you have a hand raised? My apologies.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just quickly kind of going back on tagging in the database. I did speak to the student intern who works every day at different times. He's from Sacramento State. But he was saying that they're going back and fixing some of the tags because, yeah, there was multiple counties and stuff. So they are trying to figure out there are they are working on that piece and I

1 thought I would share it with everybody since we were all like, okay, I've read that one five times and I'd rather 3 read something five times and not see it. So it's okay. 4 So I just want to give everyone that update. 5 CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you. And I'm not seeing any callers on this agenda item. 6 7 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The instructions are 8 complete, Chair. 9 CHAIR SADHWANI: Okay. Very good. So we're going to take a little bit of an extra break. We will come 10 11 back at 4:15. That means I'm being very generous and get 12 a couple of extra minutes. Make up for that short lunch. 13 So we will meet back at 4:15. 14 (Whereupon, a recess was held) 15 CHAIR SADHWANI: Okay. Welcome back to the 16 California Citizens Redistricting Commission. We just 17 finished in our Agenda Item Number 3, the Director's 18 Reports. And we will be moving on to the subcommittee 19 updates, beginning with Government Affairs and Census, 20 which is myself and Commissioner Toledo. 21 Commissioner Toledo, would you like to provide -- I 22 don't know if is Commissioner Toledo back? If not, I 23 will provide that update. We have no -- nothing new to

report, so we will leave it at that.

24

1 | and Fornaciari?

2.3

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Let's see, what have we done? We are actually working on the budget right now to provide updated information. Correct? And then we are -- I'm not sure the status of the letter the Department of Finance on -- if you can provide us an update with that please.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Sure. So we are working on finalizing the letter, requesting additional funds for the Commission through the completion of the maps. So we were finalizing that as of yesterday. So we have not sent out the letter. We just want to make sure we dot our T's -- or is it dot our I's and cross our T's? Is that what it is? Something like that. So we're working on that. Should get it out hopefully no later than tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. And then one thing that I did want to bring up concerning the letter, this is for our Lessons Learned, for Commissioners Kennedy and Ahmad. For next time, I would really like to maybe streamline the process. What we currently -- what we currently go through is we have a budget that's approved right by the Department of Finance.

And then we kind of have to go forward and say,

Mother, may I spend this much? And then a few months

1 later, Mother, I spent -- I have yet to work for the agency that has to do that. So hopefully if we can 3 figure out a process where the budget, it is what it is and it's fully available from the beginning. 4 5 And the only time we have to ask for additional money is if we need additional money above and beyond our 6 7 budget. So for Lessons Learned, if we can add that, please. Or do you already have it, Commissioner Ahmad? 8 9 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Oh, I just wanted to clarify. 10 Make sure we document this correctly. When you say 11 streamline the process, you mean -- can you elaborate on 12 that a little bit? 13 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEX: So streamline the process 14 in terms of once the budget is approved for the 15 Commission. We do not have to go back to the Department 16 of Finance and ask for approval to spend it basically is 17 to have that authority because it's already approved. 18 It's already been in the governor's budget and approved. 19 CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good. Anything else from 2.0 Finance and Administration? Okay. Great. The Gantt 21 Chart Committee. 22 Commissioner Kennedy? 2.3 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Good timing. Before we move 24 on to the Gantt chart, I just want to ask Admin and 25 Finance if you have put together a plan for staff

- 1 performance review since we're well into this process. And one of the things that you were talking about at one 3 point was let's get this done before we're so deep in the 4 mapping process that we can't do what we need to do 5 administratively. 6 MR. CEJA: Is that our job? 7 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I think it's something that we would actually direct our executive director to come 8 up with a plan and process, and that would be based on 10 everyone's start date and then how you will go through 11 that performance review process. 12 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, we also need -- we 13 need to give --14 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: The Commission needs to 15 review the executive director. 16 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. So we'll do that piece of it. That's good. But no, we will take care of 17 18 that Director Hernandez. 19 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. Yeah. 2.0 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So no, we'll do that one. 21 But then Director Hernandez will come up with a policy 22 and a process for the other staff members. Sound like a 23 plan? Thank you.
 - escribers

CHAIR SADHWANI: Can I ask, I think that the -- and

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes.

24

I recall that we did talk about the staff evaluations 1 quite some time ago. Do we have a sense of what is the 3 time frame that we realistically think this needs to take 4 place in? We are about to enter line drawing. I 5 anticipate things ramping up just a little bit in the next few weeks and certainly over the course of the next 6 7 several months. Is there a sense of time frame, urgency, 8 et cetera? 9 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I don't know if there's an 10 urgency, I will just go by what the state normally is of 11 one year. So every year -- and there's actually a form 12 that we have that it's pretty standard in terms of the 13 different categories. So I was just going to use that as 14 part of our starting point with the performance review. 15 And it's like I said, it's usually done annually unless 16 it's -- some positions are six months, but for the most 17 part it's annual. 18 Thank you for that. CHAIR SADHWANI: 19 Commissioner Ahmad? 20 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Oh, I just wanted to add to 21 what Commissioner Fernandez stated while we were making 22 offers way back when and we did state that it would be a 2.3 yearly annual review from the start date. Yeah. 24 CHAIR SADHWANI: I think that puts Alvaro as one of

the -- Alvaro and Fredy, right, they're the earlier ones.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

2.3

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, actually, that is my question in terms of a clarification for Executive Director Hernandez, because from a position point of view, his actual then start -- in his current position would actually not take place until after we finish with line drawing.

But if you're talking about from the time he was actually hired in a different role, then that's a different kind of conversation. But I do wonder if then that clarification would be, I think, helpful, because if it's as the executive director, then we -- I would just say we have a little bit of time given that we're going to be a little busy.

CHAIR SADHWANI: It looks like Commissioner Fernandez has a response to that.

negotiation when he went from a deputy executive director to executive director is we did say that from the year that he was appointed as a deputy executive director, we would conduct an evaluation. So we did try to address that issue, but thank you for bringing that up. And we also made the same commitment to Director Kaplan.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good. Alvaro, did you have a -- are you sure? Okay. Any additional comments or

questions. Okay. Great. Gantt chart.

2.0

2.3

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. Gantt Chart. I did update the Gannt Chart and shared it with Commissioner Taylor. I did not hear back from him on that. Plus, we are going to be talking about the map drawing timeline anyway. And so I didn't want to prejudge or predetermine anything in relation to our discussion on the timeline.

So I have updated it, but I did not want to be updated with the dates from the Supreme Court, but wanted to hold off to get the results of our discussion on the mapping timeline to see if further updates were required before distributing. Thank you.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

Outreach and Engagement, Commissioners -- oh, was there

a -- oh, apologies.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIOENR FORNACIARI: Yeah, my apologies. I have to circle back. I think performance reviews in this context are the biggest motivator on the planet.

Colossal waste of time. And in this case are -- I mean, if they're not connected to a raise in pay, then I don't understand why we're doing it. And I know we talked about it that we were going to do it.

But I mean, if it's a requirement for the future of state employment for these folks, yeah, but we're going

1 in hot and heavy in line drawing. I mean, if we want to give people feedback, why don't we wait until after line 3 drawing when things are -- and slow down and we can give it a little more of its due and make it more meaningful. 4 5 So just my thought. I was going to keep it to myself, but I just --6 7 CHAIR SADHWANI: But we feel very hot and heavy. COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: It's dumb. 9 CHAIR SADHWANI: Yes. So we're popping around here 10 a little bit. We just finished Gantt Chart. I see a 11 couple more hands. Director Ceja, is it on Gannt Chart 12 or back on the reviews? 13 MR. CEJA: Performance reviews. 14 CHAIR SADHWANI: No problem. Thank you. 15 MR. CEJA: Am I allowed? 16 CHAIR SADHWANI: Yes, please. And then I think, 17 Commissioner Fernandez has --18 MR. CEJA: Yeah. Thank you so much. I was actually 19 going to keep it to myself too. I'm speaking as a staff 20 member for the Commission. Yeah. If you are going to 21 assign any type of performance appraisal with raises then 22 just do it now, of course, because we only have a few 23 more months to go. 24 But if not, yeah, it might actually be a disruption

to the staff and to morale, knowing that our time here is

```
1
    limited and that our positions will be ending soon.
    I do suggest that we do it at the end for those of us
 3
    that want to continue in public service, to have a letter
 4
    of recommendation would be great. To add to our resumes.
 5
         CHAIR SADHWANI: That's really helpful.
         Commissioner Fernandez?
 6
 7
         COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ:
                                  Yes.
                                       And actually, I
 8
    completely understand where you're coming from,
 9
    Commissioner Fornaciari, but it is somewhat tied to a
10
    potential -- up to five percent increase annually until
11
    they reach a maximum. And there are no maximums with the
12
    Commission. So it is associated with the pay -- a
13
    potential pay increase.
14
         COMMISSIONE FORNACIARI: So they just got a
15
    standard --
16
         COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: That is not related to --
17
         COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So it's not related?
18
         COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ:
                                  No.
19
         COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So they have the option of
20
    giving a pay raise related to performance feedback?
21
         COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ:
                                  Yes.
                                        What they received
22
    was a standard cost of living adjustment that was given
23
    to all state employees. That is separate and apart from
24
    an annual performance review.
                                  Sorry.
25
         COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI:
                                  Okay. I still think it's
```

dumb.

2.0

CHAIR SADHWANI: So what I would ask then is if the subcommittee can go back -- we have another business meeting next week, again on October 7th, and come back with a recommendation of how you'd like to proceed. And then we can move forward accordingly. I think for -- on my end, I hear both sides of this.

And certainly if there is a pay increase that's associated, then it would make sense to do it. But if not, then I -- waiting until the end, knowing that we are a time bound enterprise, would make a lot of sense as well. Does that work? Great.

We will move on to Outreach and Engagement,
Commissioners Sinay and Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: We have nothing to add.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. I don't think we have anything. Unless there's something else that's a colossal waste of time that you would like to discuss.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Just one per meeting.

CHAIR SADHWANI: I'm really enjoying being in person with everyone. I think this is really wonderful and just great for moral. I will just note on -- for the subcommittee potentially and I think we have to discuss

it further in the future, but there will be additional public engagement following the draft maps. Certainly, we'll be talking more about that timeline and what that looks like.

But whether that falls here on this subcommittee or the full public input design, I think does still need to be sorted out so that. I just wanted to flag that for your radar. Yeah. Okay.

Materials Development, Commissioners Fernandez and Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And I think the main thing we worked on with Director Ceja was the time -- updated time line based on the information that we have? And I believe that was it. Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: We've begun to stick our toe into the drafting of the final report, the body of the final report. So that's the portion of the final report that describes the legal framework, the process that we went through, the challenges that we faced, et cetera. But not touching, of course, the description of the districts.

But I am hopeful that we will, at some point, be able to provide some recommendations on how those descriptions or what information those descriptions should contain. Having looked at some of them, seemed to

1 me that some of them were kind of slim. 2 And I guess we'll have to speak with the lawyers as to what our boundaries are on those descriptions of the 3 4 of the districts. But we have started the process of 5 getting that initial portion of the final report drafted for the Commission to review well before the submission 6 7 of the final maps. Thank you. Thank you very much. 8 CHAIR SADHWANI: 9 Data Management, Commissioners Ahmad and Turner? 10 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: No new updates from us. 11 CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good. 12 Communities of Interest, COI Tool, Commissioners 13 Akutagawa and Kennedy? 14 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Nothing to report. It was 15 reported by Outreach Director Kaplan. 16 CHAIR SADHWANI: Perfect. 17 Incarcerated Populations, Federal Facilities, 18 Commissioners Kennedy and Turner? COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Nothing significant to 19 20 report. 21 CHAIR SADHWANI: Do we need to maintain the 22 subcommittee on the agenda? It can still exist in the 23 ether of the commission, even if it's not on the agenda. 24 Was there a sense from the subcommittee if you'd like to 25 continue to be included in updates?

think it necessarily has to be there because we're basically going to be working with the Lessons Learned. And the only piece -- and it kind of was reported out on earlier as related to just incarcerated populations, is just to ensure that with the tools that we're using, we are absolutely utilizing the tools to the best of our ability to capture attention.

So again, with video, again, ensuring that they're able to relate to whoever it is that's doing the video.

I always volunteer for that, for that particular population. So I just want to make sure that we are not trying to move past that population. And I know we're not too soon.

But I want to make sure that we've done everything we can so that they are participating and understand why, understanding why they should participate. And so to answer your question, yes, we are. Commissioner Kennedy, unless you think otherwise or I think there's a reason we need to keep it on the schedule. I think we can.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: The only thing standing, at this point is I'm going to be drafting a reply to the Bureau of Prisons and eventually we might receive a response from them to our reply. And I can just submit that as a handout and we could discuss as appropriate.



1	CHAIR SADHWANI: That sounds perfect. That sounds
2	like a great idea. Okay. So we will move forward with
3	that.
4	Lessons Learned, Commissioners Ahmad and Kennedy?
5	COMMISSIONER AHMAD: As Commissioner Kennedy says
6	COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Our database of
7	COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Oh.
8	COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Keep them coming.
9	COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.
10	COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Our database of suggestions
11	continues to grow.
12	CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good.
13	The Security Subcommittee, Commissioners Fornaciari
14	and Taylor?
15	COMMISSIONER FORNACIAFRI: Sure. There was a couple
16	of things. Thanks for changing the title. Oh, that
17	wasn't one of the things, but. So we did talk a little
18	bit about the Zoom meeting, the mapping meetings. So we
19	still need to work on that and come back with a
20	recommendation on how we're going to handle that. So
21	we're working with the team to get that resolved.
22	The other thing is we were working we've got a draft
23	of a of a security plan for in-person meetings. But
24	since we're not having in-person meetings yet we didn't
25	think it was that urgent to bring it forward. We've got

- 1 to finalize the last few details on that. But we'll get
- 2 | that going in the next few weeks and bring it forward.
- 3 | We'll have to have discussion in a closed session on
- 4 that, so.
- 5 CHAIR SADHWANI: That sounds great. Thank you so
- 6 much.
- 7 | Commissioner Turner?
- 8 | COMMISSIONER TURNER: I'm just to the subcommittee.
- 9 Thank you, chair. Having the meeting scheduled and the
- 10 | public, of course, knowing that we are still meeting at
- 11 | the locations that we're meeting at, I just want to as
- 12 | you're considering our security protocols, to think that
- 13 through as well.
- 14 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Well, that's -- I
- 15 | don't know if you noticed, Alvaro was being a little
- 16 vague on where we're meeting and so we're not going to
- 17 publicize where we're meeting, so. Yeah, but we're in a
- 18 secure building.
- 19 CHAIR SADHWANI: Okay. Great. The next one on the
- 20 | list is actually Mapping Playbook. I'm going to hold on
- 21 to that and do Legal Affairs first, if you're okay with
- 22 | that, only because I think that's going to be a longer
- 23 conversation. So Legal Affairs and Commissioner Yee is
- 24 currently the chair of the Legal Affairs Committee.
- 25 COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair. So right now,

1 the Legal Affairs Committee is working on the contracts with the two litigation counsel firms that we had voted 3 to pursue, and that has become a little bit more 4 prolonged than we had expected. We are recommending that 5 the Chair appoint a new subcommittee, the Litigation Contract Subcommittee we're proposing, in order to be 6 7 able to move quickly on finalizing those contracts. Chief Counsel Pane, do you want to give a little more detail about the contract process and where we're at 10 and why that a new subcommittee would be helpful? 11 ATTNY PANE: Sure. Thank you, Commissioner Yee. 12 The reason why we're asking this for the Commission is 13 because, as you all know, contract approval process with 14 the state is not a slow process. And we were -- it was 15 helpful that in the most recent iteration with the Gibson 16 & Dunn, we received a counter from them and we have a 17 proposed response to that. 18 And thankfully we also were able to get input in 19 time from Department of General Services, Office of Legal 20 Services. And as some of you know, that sometimes has 21 been a delay. So if the typical pattern would be to come 22 back to the Legal Affairs Committee and then bring it 2.3 then to the full Commission for a counter that takes up a 24 lot of time to schedule that out ten days in advance for

to Bagley-Keene agendized meetings.

So and of course being cognizant of the time here we are the end of September. We want to make sure that these litigation contracts are in place by the time we need them, which is at least by the final map finalization, if not a little bit sooner.

2.3

So the hope is that the Commission would give its authorization to have a subcommittee of no more than two people to help assist the chief counsel in finalizing any future counters that go back and forth between the firms to help finalize the contracts.

Once that would be finalized, it would certainly come back before you for final approval because there would be substantive changes, but it's essentially to most efficiently use the time and minimize the delay between any sort of counters that go back and forth. That's the theory behind it. Thank you, Chair.

mean, if there -- if something came up that were substantially outside the contractual provisions that we've already looked at and agreed to, then of course, we would bring those to the Commission's attention. But as long as they're still within those guidelines, we want to move expeditiously on the contracts.

CHAIR SADHWANI: That's right. And so in my position as Chair, it would be my complete honor to

1 create a subcommittee at your request for litigation contracts and my hope that it would be that it would include yourself, Commissioner Yee, as well as 3 4 Commissioner Toledo. I don't know that he's on right 5 now, but I think that he would be --COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: 6 Yeah. 7 CHAIR SADHWANI: Oh, Commissioner Andersen has nominated him. Thank you very much. And I know that 8 9 Commissioner Toledo has actually -- as well as 10 Commissioner Yee have worked very tirelessly on these 11 contracts thus far. And I think it would be wonderful to 12 have you both advance them through the end. Unless 13 there's any opposition there, I think Commissioner 14 Fornaciari is in favor of this new subcommittee. We will 15 create the Litigation Contract Subcommittee. Yes. Very 16 good. Thank you very much. 17 COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair. 18 CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you. And then on to the 19 Mapping Playbook Subcommittee with Commissioners Turner 2.0 and Yee. 21 COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. Me back again. 22 Commissioner Turner and I have been hard at work and are 23 pleased to be able to present today finished drafts of 24 two out of three pieces of the mapping playbook.

me go ahead and share screen. These are also in the

1 handouts for today. Okay. Let's see, I'm not seeing it 2 in my screens. Oh, okay. Here it is. I have it. Okay. 3 So this is the main document, the mapping playbook. We've actually discussed an earlier draft of this in part 4 5 last week. And so this now is draft 2.0. fully vetted by our VRA Counsel and we present it to you 6 7 for your consideration today. So the full playbook will consist of this document, 9 plus attachment number I, which will also look at today the consideration of current district boundaries as well 10 as attachment number II, line drawing phases plan, which 11 12 is still being completed. 13 Okay. So I should just talk you through this, I 14 quess. Roman Numeral I, Data, you've already seen this. 15 So of course, we will use the Statewide Database's 16 official California Redistricting Database as our one 17 entire and whole and only source of redistricting data. 18 Roman Numeral 2, the Ranked Statutory Criteria. I'm 19 sorry. Commissioner Sinay? 2.0 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Does that mean we won't use any 21 complementary data? Because every single -- I mean, the 22 report from the last Commission, and I've been bringing 23 this up over and over again, is that there is other data 24 that's not redistricting but can give us a flavor of the

communities. We've got the community interest and we've

got the census data, but we -- homeless, just other
things that when -- if we have questions because legally
we can use that.

2.3

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, good question. I should have been more precise about that. That is true. In fact, we do reference that later in the playbook. For Roman Numeral I, this involves the numbers that actually count for population numbers for our districts as well as for RPG analysis. And that's the basis for those using those only.

Okay Roman II, our favorite six statutory criteria listed in order of priority and ranked of course and I think I will revise this slightly to specify it's A through F, following in this list. The following six criteria A through F.

Equal population, of course, with Assembly, Senate and Board of Equalization, we actually do have a bit of deviation allowed. We've heard the number of five percent plus or minus. But for purposes of this document, our counsel is recommending that we aim for as close to zero as possible, but with deviation permitted by law.

So that basically gives us a little more flexibility with that. Congressional, of course, less flexibility as close to zero percent as possible. And in quotes there,

1 the language straight from our statutory criteria. 2 Yeah. 3 Commissioner Kennedy, go ahead. COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee. 4 5 I was wondering if under -- I think it's under II, before we get to A, if we could say lower priority criteria only 6 7 apply to the extent they do not conflict with higher priority criteria. Because the -- if when I read that 8 9 it, just completely knocks out lower priority criteria 10 where we might want to be a little more nuanced. 11 COMMISSIONER YEE: Good point. I'll make a note of 12 that. Okay. Down to -- thank you, Commissioner 13 Kennedy -- 2B, VRA Compliance, fulfill all section II 14 requirements. You may recall in earlier draft we had 15 some thought of perhaps putting language there concerning 16 section five. We decided to take that out to retain 17 maximum flexibility. 18 Non-retrogression can be viewed in a lot of 19 different ways and could actually force us to effectively 20 pack the District which would not be a good idea. So we 21 want to retain more flexibility there and -- so 22 mentioning only section II.

Section III, Contiguity, observe absolutely with appropriate consideration for islands and permanent water crossings. We kept thinking of different ways to cross

2.3

24

water. Not just bridges, but tunnels, ferries, so -- and never use point continuity. We went back and forth on whether to add some language there about how that's a violation of traditional redistricting principles. I don't know. In this draft it ended up coming out, but that's where that came from.

Letter D, Cities/Counties, a city and county, which is only one San Francisco. Local neighborhoods and local communities of interest. And as was mentioned before, earlier in this meeting, the following two government units and communities of interest are not ranked the two of them. Which is rather brilliant because if a community of interest crosses the county line, we're free to cross that county line. We don't have to rank one or over the other.

So Governmental Units, 1A, of course, to respect the integrity of any city, county -- city and county local, neighborhood and community of interest. And reminding ourselves a local neighborhood is not just officially designated neighborhoods. The language is simply local neighborhood.

B, Non-statutory Governmental Units, not mentioned in our statutory requirements, but we should consider especially since census designated places. And we talked about this earlier when we previously discussed this

draft -- a draft of this.

Letter C, Current State Election Districts will be considered per the separate consideration of current district boundaries. That'll be attachment 1, which we'll talk about in just a bit. That's the whole question of whether we'll look at the 2011 maps or not. And we will. Oh, I'm sorry. Yeah. Thanks, Fredy.

Okay. Continuing to the second page, Communities of Interest now. First was Governmental Units. Now

Communities of Interest. And of course, we're required to keep those together. And letter A there, it's just the statutory language. Letter B, excluding any consideration of relationships of political parties, incumbents or political candidates.

Section C, where COI submissions conflict? How do we weigh them? Some different ways we might -- whether this one better fulfills other statutory criteria. 2, are more relevant to the District being considered so like a COI concerning military bases might be more relevant to a congressional district than an assembly one.

C, seems to represent a larger segment of the community. D, more closely fits the statutory definition. We've actually had some testimony about groupings that may or may not actually fit that

definition. 5, are given by somebody located in that COI, although of course there's no way of absolutely knowing that. But sometimes people explicitly say, Oh, and I'd also like to comment on some other place.

Commissioner Sinay?

2.3

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Was there any conversation if the person giving the COI is representing an organization versus representing government entity versus just being an individual? I mean, to me, they're all equal. But I know for others they'll have weight.

And I know in one case, one of my friends is a city councilmember, called in but didn't say she was a city councilmember because she thought she wasn't sure if that was going to help or not help. So we've never been clear about that. And I -- maybe that goes in Lessons Learned to help people know how to identify.

But I do know that some people think that if a nonprofit calls and says, I'm from such and such nonprofit, it's going to weigh more. And so I just wanted to put that -- I mean, to me, this playbook -- I'd like to have discussions a little bit on some of these things.

Again, it's a guideline, but just so that we can hear what we're each thinking, because that was part of the idea of discussing the playbook, was to learn from



- each other where we are in our thinking and not to say,

 okay, and go on to the next. And I know Legal wanted it

 this way, but I'm going to push us back to say this is

 about policy. And I would like to hear a little bit from

 my colleagues on what we're thinking.
 - Yeah. In fact, we've had some official government resolutions from cities and counties submitted to us as well. That might be related to number 3 there. It may seem to represent a larger segment of the community, but that's kind of a weak way of getting to it. Yeah.
 - COMMISSIONER SINAY: But does it? Just because it's a few people who all agreed --
- 14 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Because I mean, I just want to make sure that. What does that -- okay. So let me put it a different way. What do we mean by number 3 and how are each of us interpreting it? Because we're I feel like we may get into trouble is that these are written so big in general, we may each be interpreting it differently. And so I -- and I know that's what Legal wants. Right? But I'm going to still push. Sorry, guys. And just for us to have some cohesion about it, because I may be like, oh, it's a government and write it off and someone else might be like, it's a Government, we

let's move forward. And that's why there's 14 of us, because we all have different opinions and we don't have to be all one.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Commissioner Turner?

2.3

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. So good. Good. Thank you. Thank you for that question, and the comment, and the pushing in that. I would add -- so for me and we've just talked about it minimally, but for me, based on who's making the input, who's speaking, who's talking about it, I think should be given equal weight, number 1.

Now, what are they saying? So we have some coalitions that are -- they're actually submitting that this represents 500 people, a thousand people, 200 people, whatever it is. And with that documented -- I guess with that documentation saying that this is a larger number, that in my mind that would be a larger number as opposed to me calling saying I'm from a coalition and I represent a lot of people.

I don't have any data -- anything to attach with it.

And so I think it should be in our minds, we shouldn't be ranking, oh, I'm going to mark this up higher because it's the government, this down lower because it's coalition. I think we should take the testimony as it comes equally. And then based on what it says and what's attached with it, we can then make some other judgment

1 calls based on the value of the testimony. Go ahead. COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, I agree with you. 3 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. You want it in policy 4 form. COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, no, I don't want it in 5 6 policy form. But I do want us to think about it because 7 some of us may have not even realize we have those 8 biases. And I'm really -- one of the things I really believe in is let's put our biases on the table, and that 10 way we can help each other when we are being biased. 11 And so yeah, and that's one of my big questions. 12 We've never walk through our biases as a Commission. 13 it's difficult because we couldn't do it in private. 14 Yeah, we couldn't do it in closed session stuff. But I 15 would hope that all my colleagues would really work hard 16 to thinking through what your biases are. And if you're being called on your bias and to say, 17 18 hey, every time you bring something up, it tends to be 19 focus on X. You don't take it as a criticism, but you 20 understand that we're all -- we're trying to make sure 21 that we're all being open and equal or -- there was 22 another piece to it, and I'm sure it'll come back later. 2.3 COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you. I think Commissioner 24 Turner and I can discuss this more. Actually, I think I 25 probably feel differently on this one than you,

1 Commissioner Turner, which is I'll get in this case. maybe we can come up with an additional point to add to 3 address this. Okay. We are down to Letter D. 4 sorry. Who? 5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sadhwani. COMMISSIONER YEE: Commissioner Sadhwani? 6 7 sorry. CHAIR SADHWANI: Thank you so much, actually. 8 9 Commissioner Yee, I would love to hear your thoughts on 10 that if you're willing to expand. 11 COMMISSIONER YEE: Sure. 12 CHAIR SADHWANI: And I also just wanted to add, I 13 recall I was on a panel at one point with Commissioner Di 14 from 2010, and this question had come up and she had 15 talked about, I'm not going to try to paraphrase exactly 16 what she said, but she had talked in general about the 17 2010 Commission's attempt to really focus on evidence. 18 The evidence that you could find from 19 community of interest testimony. And I think that that 20 sounds like a really great plan. I don't know how one 21 does that in practice, though. Right? For example, when 22 we get COI input, sometimes it's conflicting. Right? 23 Include the city. Don't include the city. 24 We have so much to do with each other. We have 25 nothing to do with this. So I don't know where to find

that evidence necessarily on those kind of more
qualitative components, which is the purpose of the COI
input. So I would be really curious to hear your
thoughts and certainly for the subcommittee to bring back
additional thoughts. But I think it is worth this
conversation.

COMMISSIONER YEE: So my thoughts are related to that number 3. It seems to represent a larger segment of the community, but specifically in the case of a government official, for instance, I would give some weight to the thought, well, you did get yourself elected. So there must be some larger segment of the community that supported you.

Of course, there's also people who didn't vote for you, or really don't like you and want to vote you out.

Well, that's true, too, but you got yourself elected. So that represents something in my mind that I would give some weight. And with organizations as well.

If it's a larger organization. Well, that represents a larger segment of the community, right? If it's a well-known national organization that has been able to grow itself to a certain point, and that represents something. And that's not to say just a lone individual giving some input might not make a very cogent point that has been long neglected and really compels us

to look at it differently.

2.3

But I would want to consider it. I wouldn't just say, well, no, you're just one person, even if you're The County Supervisor. We are speaking to an official resolution of the county. I mean, that would carry some weight to me, that represents something. So I don't know why I didn't think of it.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I should be used to this by now. Okay. Thank you for that. I think for me, like my thinking, I completely understand what you're saying. Like this group came forward and they gave this input, and so we should take it. But what if we didn't? We had a group that had conflicting information.

I think that's why I have a problem putting different types of weight on COI. I would just like to take each one is one. And I realize that some say I'm representing 100 people and thank you so much for gathering the people, but there's so many more we're not hearing from.

So I think that's my concern is we're missing so much of this puzzle. There's more pieces missing than what we have. So to give more weight to a certain group or a certain community of interest is bothersome to me.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Anyone else? Commissioner



Sinay -- oh, Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, thank you. Yeah. I always see this as -- it's you have to look at each one and where they are because this is our fourth criterion.

And you still have numbers. You still have the VRA. And then you look at this and we're going to come back because like in our visualizations, we're looking at this section and then that section and how they overlap.

And I think we're using it as a guideline. We'll actually come down to some, okay, it really is this way or that way. But I think in many circumstances where the conflicting COIs are will dictate the information. I kind of like what Commissioner Turner said about we really need to look at the at the evidence.

What are they saying? Is it economic interests?

Okay. Look at some businesses around, you know, can you verify that? You know, what are they saying? And I appreciate trying to put how we rank them. But I don't know how necessary they're really going to be looking at it in a tight, strict manner, because each circumstance will be a little different.

And remember when we do that criteria 4, then we kind of keep on looking and then, oh, but it might get shifted again, so we'll probably come back again. These will not be hard decisions. And I think we need to --

like Commissioner Sinay said, we need to discuss why we think we should have those, consider it, and eventually will we have to say yes or no.

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

18

- But what kind of -- I don't know if we have to say yes. This is what all these people said and that of the person, just it's straight numbers. It's like, what did they all say? It's like they all say something, but it really isn't valid or are they all asking for the same thing and it can't happen. Well, sorry, it can't happen. I don't care how many people asked.
- So I appreciate putting all these down, but I don't really think we should stick a hard rule and fast rule about this comes first, and that one, then that one, and that one. I think it'll shift around a bit.
- COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. And these sub-criteria are not ranked, so.
- 17 Commissioner Akutagawa and then Commissioner Sinay.

Okay.

I got too many

- 19 buttons here. I'm trying to figure out. How do I lower
- 20 my hand? Which one do I unmute? Okay. Sorry about
- 21 that. I guess, I would -- I have a couple of reactions.
- 22 Part of it is I'm just trying to remember -- I was trying
- 23 to remember everything. Okay. One, I'm having a little
- 24 | bit of maybe, I don't know, kind of a reaction I guess
- 25 I'll just see some of what I'm reading.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA:



I am a little concerned about weighing this COI input because I -- and I know that this could take a lot of time, but I am in favor of us looking. And I think this is kind of like what Commissioner Andersen was talking about is looking at each area individually, each COI individually or each region individually, only because I think there is going to be a lot of different factors.

I am a little concerned about, for example, D, I think this is 2D where says when an individual COI input submission is unclear, inconsistent with itself generally give greater weight to the part that seems more clear, specific and central.

And I guess for clarification, I just want to ask on this, are you talking about the part of the COI input that is more-clear or is it to give greater weight to separate COI input that is more clear? Because I just want to say that not everybody is going to be very well spoken, but that doesn't mean that their COI input is any less valid. And so I just want to just caution against that.

And I think it may be misunderstood, or at least that's the way I'm reading it. So I just want to caution that part. I also have a -- I think this is where I was kind of like having this argument in my brain right now

- 1 is about nonprofit organizations. I work at a nonprofit organization. So I run a national organization. But I 3 also understand that when you are a national 4 organization, you don't really know the local -- the 5 hyper local places. And so that is my caution also about some of the 6 7 organizations, is that where is the input coming from 8 or -- and I like -- and I appreciate some of the larger 9 statewide based organizations that are saying we got X 10 number of people. So it helps to get some context. And 11 it may not be large numbers, but we know that it's coming 12 from real people. 13 Yes, there are people that are not being heard. And 14 15 where we have to try to fill in. But I just want us to 16
 - I think that's part of the challenge. Right? So this is be cognizant of -- okay.

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

Even weighing like nonprofit input, not all is equal and who knows where -- and I feel like the local nonprofits actually know more than, say the statewide nonprofits, even though they may have their local connections. But I think that's where we have to find out how much of it -- anyways. So that's, right now, my initial reactions to what I'm hearing so far.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa. But good thoughts. Just address the first one. Yes, absolutely unclear with itself, not with -compared to others. I can add an individual COI. So
maybe I should add some more language there. A greater
weight to the part of that individual COI.

Commissioner Sinay?

2.0

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to check if

Commissioner Ahmed wanted to share because I think what

you had said I would -- I don't agree. And then we

pushed you to share. And I want to thank you for

sharing, because that is exactly the conversations that I

think we need to be having, is knowing kind of where

we're all coming from.

And yeah, the more we know each other, the more we can actually use each other's strengths. And I know, I'm a firm believer that we all got selected because we have different perspectives and we should have different perspectives. And I've learned so much from all of you, and I wouldn't want us to get into the line drawing now and be like, okay, let me look this up, but just kind of know what our biases are.

And we got to make this fun to a certain extent.

And so to me, being able to say -- there you go Linda

you're looking at the Asians -- thank you for doing

that -- or whatever it might be, is a way to have fun and

being able to support each other. Sorry, I had to call

it. I didn't have to call you out. But I use you as an example, so I want to say thank you for that.

And I really, truly hope that those who are -- that Commissioner Vazquez, and Commissioner Toledo, and Commissioner -- I keep wanting saying Commissioner Ray, sorry. But I want -- Commissioner Kennedy, I want everybody to kind of -- because we've been thinking about this, we've been listening to all these COIs and in our own minds, we have started judging them in different ways. And so I think that piece is important.

I also want to know how and when do we talk about the thinly veiled comments that we've gotten, the thinly veiled political or racial or what it might be, thinly veiled. The article in today's Common Cause was exactly about that. And just for the public, we're all really savvy.

We are kind of chosen because we know our communities and such, but how do we talk in a group so it's open. How do we do -- do we do that in closed session? Do we do that in public session? That to me is a really critical question because a lot of us might not want to say something because we don't know legally where it's going to take us. But we want to make sure all our colleagues know why we're going -- why we're thinking one thing or another.

1 COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: To just jump in as well in

that -- and Commissioner Yee, when you said that you

4 | didn't agree when you spoke, I didn't see the

5 disagreement.

3

6

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay.

7 COMMISSIONER TURNER: I think I'm like, okay, yeah,

8 | that's good. But anyway, in that -- but I also wanted to

9 | follow up and say I really do appreciate having this

10 | conversation to hear where everyone is shaking out as

11 | because, again, when you have a nonprofit background and

12 | I have come from a few different places, but most

13 | recently nonprofit.

14 And one of the things I want to make sure that we --

15 | I guess what I'll voice is that I also want to make sure

16 that we're not penalizing people that did speak for those

17 | that did not speak. The whole purpose for our robust

18 | outreach and trying to ensure that we reached as many

19 | folk as we possibly could under the circumstance was that

20 | so that people could participate.

21 And certainly we are aware based on our -- the

22 | feedback or what we're receiving, that we didn't reach as

23 many people as we'd like to. But for those that did take

24 | the time to respond, I want to make sure that we don't by

25 some means mute their voices or determined that they



didn't count.

2.3

For those that took the time to gather folk where we could not, I don't want to again mute their voices and say that you didn't matter and you're counting one for one. And you did go through hours and days and a lot of effort to gather the information for us that we could not gather. So for me, that matters. For me, that's a — it's something that I do want to make sure that we consider and we're paying attention to.

And yeah, I think evidence -- any time you can find the evidence, that's great. I know that there are -- through our testimony, through our input that we've received, I think that it's evidenced and that there are some groups that has done more gathering than others.

And when it's time to look at it, I think that that information is there and we should consider it and not discounted for what did not occur.

COMMISSIONER YEE: That is a great segway to letter

E. The question of how to count quantity of input. So

if you get a lot of input on one side of one area and

little on another, how do you weigh that? So just as

Commissioner Turner just said, it counts for something.

Our thought is it counts for something that should be

duly considered. But we are not just counting votes.

These are not just votes. We're not just counting

1	up how many of one side versus how many of another. We
2	still have to weigh the quality of the of the COI being
3	described and weigh that against everything else we have
4	to consider. So quantity should be duly considered, but
5	is not decisive is the language we landed on.
6	CHAIR SADHWANI: Yeah, I just wanted to acknowledge
7	I think Commissioner Vazquez was in the line to say
8	something, and I know she hasn't had a chance yet so I
9	just want to
10	COMMISSIONER YEE: Oh, very good. Commissioner
11	Vazquez? I'm sorry.
12	COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Thank you. It's not
13	unrelated to number letter E in that I wanted to just
14	echo and expand on Commissioner Turner's points about
15	sort of my bias, my lens, is also in community work and
16	community organizing. And I think I do give weight to
17	sort of folks who are presenting things in an aggregate.
18	It is certainly sort of, if you think about it from
19	the science perspective, it's certainly a biased sample.
20	Right? But it's still a sample and it's a sample size
21	larger than one. And so for me, that is giving me a
22	particular perspective that I think is necessarily more
23	broad, even if it's specific to a particular subset of a
24	district population.

And I think it's really, really important to

1 acknowledge that. And I also want to acknowledge Commissioner Fernandez's point that there is a lot that we are not seeing, even if we have sort of many community 3 4 groups submitting sort of aggregate testimony that 5 they're -- we do still have to sort of hold in mind this idea that we're not getting a perfect dataset. 6 7 And so I think this is also where I sort of see I think I've said this before, that I very much view this 8 process as much more of an art than I think many of us 10 got into this work hoping for. I think we were hoping 11 for -- especially the way it was framed. Right? 12 relevant analytical skills, I think was one of the 13 requirements. I think we all absolutely have the 14 relevant analytical skills, but can we as a group do the 15 world's most complicated art project? 16 I think that's the -- that's the task before us. 17 This is not a science project. This is an art project. 18 And so I think that's where many of us I think we're all 19 A-plus students and maybe skip some of the fine arts, 20 we're getting a little uncomfortable here. 21 COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez. 22 Commissioner Akutagawa? 2.3 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. So just for the 24 record and for clarification, I do want to make it known

that I am not bashing what the nonprofit said.

from that sector. I know our value. But I think in this particular case, I do want to state that there's a lot of work that is being done at local levels that I think are really good work. And yes, it will be aggregate, but I think they also know their communities.

And I think that gets to my other point about,

Commissioner Sadhwani, wanting what you said there. The

former Commissioner Di had said about evidence based.

And I think when I hear evidence base, I think there is

an importance to evidence base.

However, I think we should not believe that all evidence has to be quantitative, that qualitative evidence is also really important. And I think that's part of what we're getting here too. So it's just more of a reminder that there's some things that we're not going to be able to learn from the quantitative kind of evidence, right, about communities? And that's why we look for communities of interest, testimony and input.

And that that's what I've always said, gives us the nuance. And hopefully as people are listening, there will be continued input from more members of communities as well as nonprofit organizations and other representatives. I do also want to just note that in terms of interesting and very coordinated communities of interest input has come from Long Beach, where you have

heard from almost every various segment of the Long Beach community, from the business to the nonprofits to government.

2.3

- I mean, they have done a really interesting and excellent job in terms of really coordinating their input. Not judging good or bad. I'm just making a comment that it's been interesting to hear from multiple segments of the Long Beach community.
- CHAIR SADHWANI: Great. And Commissioner Yee, if I may just interject really quickly. We'll try and -- wherever we're at in this conversation, I'll try to pause at about 5:30 so that we can take a final public comment for today and we can certainly pick up again tomorrow as need be.
- COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair. Okay. Should we push on? Commissioner Fornaciari?
- COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I just want to say I really loved Commissioner Vazquez's comment. The world's most difficult art project, is that -- something like that. And I'm just -- kind of share my thoughts on this. Yeah, I don't know how this is all going to go, you know? So I'm just trying to -- trying to kind of think how it's all going to fit together.
- What I just -- the way I think is I am trying to integrate the input into themes, if you will, and kind of

1 see what themes are coming out. And you probably see that in the requests that I made for visualizations that 3 was based on themes more than specific COI input. But I 4 think, I mean, for me, it's important to kind of be open 5 and see how the whole process is going to play out. Because I think, you know, a lot of -- I feel that a 6 lot of this may be driven by the -- by criteria number 2, 7 and that there may be places where we are just not able 8 9 to accommodate the COI input that we're getting based on 10 prior criteria. But I don't know that for sure. I'm 11 just trying to see how it goes, I guess. 12 COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner 13 Fornaciari. Okay. Should we go back to the outline 14 then? Let's see we're the letter F, I believe. 15 letter F is a special case of letter E. So multiple COI 16 input not only about the same area and taking the same 17 position, but actually seeing the same very same words, 18 very same points. 19 And how do we do that? Well, the focus on the 20 merits of the COI itself and just weight it, do note of 21 the quantity, which means something. But not let the

merits of the COI itself and just weight it, do note of the quantity, which means something. But not let the quantity be decisive. Letter G, be open in ways that heterogeneous region -- a heterogeneous region may nevertheless share common social and economic interests.

We're not just we've had some COI input concerning

22

23

24

1 that and not wanting to split communities that how they at first glance might seem to be split, wanting 3 communities to share more than they currently share. So 4 to be open to that where it may apply. Yes. 5 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Quick question on that. you have an example. I mean, I don't know what you're 6 7 talking about there. Can you have a little bit more description? 8 9 COMMISSIONER YEE: So I don't know if I should cite 10 a specific example. 11 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: (Indiscernible) town. 12 COMMISSIONER YEE: We had just example from the 13 Coachella Valley. There's kind of a way of splitting it 14 kind of at first sight how it would seem to split 15 economically, maybe even racially. 16 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: 17 COMMISSIONER YEE: But maybe actually, if you look 18 at who knows --19 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Okay. 2.0 COMMISSIONER YEE: -- environmental concerns, maybe 21 those cut right across race and class concerns and 22 actually might predominate in our consideration of 2.3 something like that, so. 24 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Got it. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Letter H, I give appropriate care

and consideration to the possibilities of covert motivations. That speaks to the question of possible office holders or candidates going incognito. Of course, on the other hand, we're not allowed to consider office holders, candidates or political parties. So maybe they should stay incognito. I don't know.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, I think on that one, we've all said everyone gets a voice. And so I'd rather they be overt versus covert. But either way, they do get a voice. There are some, though, that it is a whole -- there's a movement behind it all that we also -- so there's different ways.

I don't want people -- I don't think that just because someone's a politician, they can't call in. We said -- we talked about this at the very beginning when we were talking. Will we present will we do a presentation to a politician or not? And if there -- and we had a long conversation about it and at the end we said, hey, you know, this is about all Californians.

So I just want to put it out there that we're not saying no. We're saying, please, we would rather know who you are. And it's only one voice. You're not get extra because or whatever it is. I mean, we had one politician who said, I'm running and she called in five

times and told us all about San Francisco. So --1 2 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. COMMISSIONER Sinay: -- I'm just saying -- let's not 3 4 make it seem like it's a bad guy. 5 COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. Sure. And just because you don't identify yourself doesn't mean you have covert 6 7 motivations. COMMISSIONER SINAY: COMMISSIONER YEE: Negative covert motivations. 10 right. 11 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. I just wanted to add in 12 to on this particular one where it says give appropriate 13 care and consideration to the possibilities of covert 14 motivations and sources of COI input. 15 Commissioner Sinay, earlier you mentioned about when 16 will we discuss or talk about sometimes there's been 17 thinly veiled racial comments or what have you. Some of 18 that could also possibly be covert motivations that we'll 19 be looking at. 2.0 COMMISSIONER YEE: Commissioner Sadhwani? 21 CHAIR SADHWANI: Yeah. I just wanted to note how 22 timely this conversation is, given the CalMatters piece 23 that came out this morning, and actually also to kind of 24 give some credit to CalMatters and to other members of 25 the public for following along. I actually think it was

fantastic that they were able to identify people who were candidates or partners of current elected officials.

2.0

2.3

I completely agree with Commissioner Sinay. I think from the get-go we have said and as I said to the reporter, there's a space for everybody here to submit their comments and their concerns about communities of interest and as we move forward and with their district plans as well.

But I think this is what the whole process is for.

It is open and it is transparent so that CalMatters or anybody can follow along and help us identify the individuals who are calling in and make sure that we do have our eyes wide open. So that's kind of my perspective on it is like we can't stop anyone from doing that, nor do we want to, right?

We said that this is an open process and all
Californians can participate. But I think that that is
the role of the media as well as casual observers to help
us identify those blind spots that we might have.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Full disclosure, one of my daughters works for CalMatters, although she did not have any role in this morning's redistricting story. We're very proud of her.

24 CHAIR SADHWANI: As you should be. As you should 25 be.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Let's see, Commissioner Vasquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I just also wanted to note that I maybe have an overly optimistic view of sort of the idea of elected officials calling in to give testimony in the sense that, especially because I worked for so long with a school board members two former school board members are on our Commission.

I think elected officials, particularly those who aren't currently in a state elected office or Congressional elected office, are civic leaders in their communities. And so in many ways have gotten elected because they are very in touch with sort of their local communities and what they need.

And so for me, I -- I'm not sure if I give more weight, but I think I'd be looking and hoping for a bit more of the flavor in that testimony of the community. Again, knowing this is an art, right, knowing that they may or may not have an agenda to pursue office in that community, a higher office, the State office or a Congressional office.

But I think for me, I see those civic leaders maybe not exactly the same, but thinking about sort of like a faith leader or you know, just some someone who is -- someone who's in the know about their community, right? And so they have a particular perspective.

And so for me, I find that helpful. And so I'm hopeful to at least hear of a particular type of testimony from an elected official that can help either validate or offer up a different perspective than what we're hearing from elsewhere in the community.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

So the last item there letter I. If testimony alone is not -- is insufficient to fully define a COI, it may be helpful to seek other information. We just talked about that earlier. This is interesting because actually the 2010 Commission in its reports mentioned a couple of times regret that there was not more time and energy to do outside research on communities and the feeling that it would have filled in a lot of holes in that, quite as somebody didn't -- that COI testimony left and quite a strong regret that they weren't able to do that.

On the other hand, we've been advised that actually a lot of that info, for instance, the American Community Survey is a sample. It's over time. It gets old very quickly. And if you rely on that to try to fill in holes, you may be deceiving yourself. That sample may not even have involved at all this particular city that you're looking at.

So it's kind of a mixed note there. Certainly be open to further investigation, especially in-person



visits to see that eroded beach sand in Long Beach. But maybe not to count on it too much.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I completely disagree with that. I think that local communities spend a lot of time writing very good reports and very good information about the needs of their communities, about who's in their community. I'm sorry if it's not at an academic level or it's not using census -- well, it does use census data.

A lot of times I'm not talking about access data.

I'm talking about like the United Way's report that they
put out for the whole State of California on living wage.

I know that's not something that maybe the Statewide

Database uses or VRA lawyers use and stuff, but that is
very legitimate data. I will tell you, I just did a road
trip. Hashtag Redistricting Road Trip. No, just
kidding.

The number 1 thing I saw everywhere was homeless populations. It did not matter. I saw a homeless encampment in Walnut Creek. I saw a homeless encampment in Tulare, I saw one -- every stop I did I could quickly see one. That's not going to come out in the ACS.

That's not going to -- food deserts, those type of things aren't going to come up in the ACS.

But you can quickly get a report from that community

- 1 and understand some of that. That will help us understand what the COI meant. People may be using 3 terminologies we don't understand or might have been 4 telling us a story we don't get, but we can quickly read 5 something about it. So I'm going to push back on this whole idea that 6 7 it's not legitimate. It's not this. It's very 8 legitimate to those communities. And they've worked very hard. And I've been one of those who's written on some 10 of these reports, especially around refugees. So many 11 LGBT -- I've written for -- no, I'm sorry. 12 COMMISSIONER YEE: Commissioner Turner? 13
 - COMMISSIONER TURNER: And just wanting to add the way "I" currently reads it says, If testimony alone is insufficient to fulfill to fully define a given COI, it may be helpful to seek demographic, economic, historic land use reports written by Commissioners Sinay and other

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

data.

And then it says though -- note though, that such data -- sometimes some of that data is unhelpful. that still stands true. Some of it is outdated. However, the it's here because we it's saying that sometimes it is insufficient to fully define and it could be helpful. So start with the high note. It could be helpful.

```
1
         COMMISSIONER SINAY: I hear that. But I just want
    to make sure -- I'm just putting my bias out there that I
 3
    will be pushing back on our -- those folks that we've
    hired to tell us, hey, let's stick to this, because I
 4
 5
    know from working in the community that a lot of that
    data is very helpful, even if it's not academic, even if
 6
 7
    it's not, whatever it may be, it is very helpful.
         COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.
 8
 9
         CHAIR SADHWANI: You're not allowed in my classroom.
10
         COMMISSIONER YEE: Well said. Perhaps Commissioner
11
    Turner and I will consider whether or not maybe we might
12
    take out that the parentheses there. I don't know.
13
    Yeah. Okay. Just a few minutes left in this segment,
14
    but then not much more to cover, actually. Compactness.
15
    Oh, I'm sorry.
16
         Commissioner Vazquez? Yeah.
17
         COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sorry. I forgot to lower my
18
    hand.
19
         COMMISSIONER YEE: Oh, okay. We all do that.
20
    Compactness and nesting. Those are just straight from
21
    the statutory criteria, so we don't really need to
22
    discuss those. Exclusions, likewise, that's statutory.
23
    Coming down here. Yeah. Exclusions are statutory.
24
    Mapping sequences, not statutory.
25
         So and we've discussed this. So this is the same
```

1	order that we've discussed previously, starting with
2	varied districts moving to the Assembly plans, since
3	that's the most detailed since districts are the
4	smallest, most intricate, most difficult to draw, go from
5	there to the Senate having the Assembly plan fresh in our
6	minds, BOE which should go fairly quickly and then the
7	Congressional plan.
8	So that's the thought. Just in theory, since we've
9	never done this before, it seems to make sense. But who
10	knows? It could change depending on how things go. But
11	that's the initial intention. And then the \$64,000
12	question where to start. And this is a language from our
13	VRA Counsel.
14	Start with the more complex and less flexible
15	geographic areas such as those in L.A. County. I saw a
16	little wiggle room there, but naming L.A. County. And
17	we'll move towards the areas where there are less complex
18	and most less complex and most flexible. So discarding
19	that whole North to South thinking that was previously
20	mentioned.
21	Commissioner Andersen then Commissioner Akutagawa.
22	COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. I actually want
23	to quickly just go back on compactness and the nesting.
24	COMMISSIONER YEE: Um-hum.

And compactness, I really

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN:

1 want and this is for the public more so. Remember, this is all the way down at number 5. You don't look at --3 that does not -- so many people say that is not compact. 4 You don't lead with compact. Okay. You lead with 5 population, VRA, cities, counties, communities of 6 interest. And once you figure those out, then you go, 7 okay, now I need a few more people. Then where you grab them from is the compact area. Okay. It's not that --8 it isn't like you do a compact first because you'd 10 violate all the other criterion above it. So I just 11 really want to say that it's really important because we 12 get a lot of people say -- and remember and I want this 13 compact district going, that's nice. But let's look at 14 everything else that is legally required to be considered 15 before that. 16 And then nesting, I was looking at, well, it's 17 pretty good. You look at your two assembly districts. 18 Okay. Great. We got those worked out, the VRA and 19 everything. You put them together. I did not realize 20 that, no, the VRA for the Senate, you have to look at the 21 Senate races. It can be very different, very different. 22 The VRA might not work if you put those two assembly 23 districts together. It doesn't work of the Senate level. 24 And I did not realize that. And I want the public to --25 I didn't realize it. And I'm kind of working with the

1 line drawing. There are a lot of other people who also are not that aware of it, and it's a very, very important 3 thing to do. Oh, you think, oh, nesting. That's easy. 4 Just go those two, those two, those two, those tend to 5 move right on. You have to reevaluate that for all the different 6 7 criteria. And so that is why because I was wondering why do we have these assembly districts? And then the Senate 8 is kind of this obscure little piece over here. That is 10 why. So I just want to kind of really bring that up. 11 COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Anderson. 12 How about Commissioner Akutagawa? Then I think we 13 need to go to break. 14 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I just really more 15 of a clarification question. Is there a reason why -- I 16 don't know, maybe I missed something here, but is there a 17 reason why Congressional plan is before Board of 18 Equalization? I would think that that would -- the Board 19 would be easier because they're so big and there's only literally like, what, four of them or something like 20 21 that. 22 COMMISSIONER YEE: So the thinking was that we would 23 have the Senate plan fresh in our minds and it would help 24 us just that tiny bit in the nesting criterion rather

than just leaving it off, leaving it off and circling

- back and having to remind ourselves. But yeah. We're
 told it probably will take a day, maybe two, the BOE
 plan.
- Thank you so much, CHAIR SADHWANI: Great. Commissioner Yee, for leading us through this and the process to develop this. I think this is really helpful. For me, it raises a whole bunch of questions actually, as well. But we can make sure that we have some time tomorrow to get back to this document. It probably won't be until tomorrow afternoon.

I'll just let you know that we do have Karin

MacDonald coming tomorrow morning at 10 a.m. She's going

to be talking a little bit about what to expect next week

as we enter into the visualizations and line-drawing

phase. So some of these questions may be relevant and I

think all of it's going to come hopefully coming

together.

I mean, even as even as we read this and I'm thinking about our visualizations for next week, I'm thinking, well, should we start with Assembly and look at those visualizations first if we're going to work in that order? So I think it's posing a lot of questions for me as well. But I really appreciate your work on this. And there's just another document, is that correct, that we still need to go through?

1	COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. So maybe I can encourage
2	you overnight to give you a little homework to read
3	through the attachment number one mapping playbook.
4	Attachment number one is in your handouts, which was
5	the primary author was actually Karin MacDonald. And
6	it's pretty work. It's a more-wordy document and so I
7	don't want to read it to you tomorrow. So maybe if you
8	have a chance to look at it before tomorrow and then we
9	can highlight different issues.
10	CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good. So we all have a little
11	homework to do tonight. Okay. Excellent. So I see a
12	couple hands raised. Are those current hands or former
13	hands? Current? Former?
14	COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I can ask my question
15	tomorrow if you're going to are we going to come back
16	to the subject tomorrow?
17	CHAIR SADHWANI: We will. But if you have a burning
18	question.
19	COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, it wasn't a burning
20	question. It's just more of a comment in 3 with the
21	mapping sequence. And I realize the line drawers, this
22	is what they want to do is that they describe it as more
23	complex and less flexible areas, which would be L.A.
24	I guess I have a different way of thinking because I
25	tend to feel like a stepchild because now I am considered

1	more flexible and least complex where I live out in the
2	middle of nowhere. And I'm thinking of like L.A. City of
3	L.A. and the surrounding. And that's where you get into
4	the grabbing communities, potentially, that have nothing
5	in common with the big cities, right?
6	So I just and I know we're going to be flexible
7	as a Commission, but I just want to put that out there as
8	I don't want to look at my community as being more
9	flexible. How's that? Is that okay?
10	CHAIR SADHWANI: So maybe some different terminology
11	there. Yeah, fair enough. Fair enough. I think that's
12	fair. Yes. We're all very complex individuals and
13	identities and communities. Very good. Okay. So we
14	will be coming back to this again later tomorrow
15	afternoon.
16	For tomorrow we are we are about to go to public
17	comment to close for the day. For tomorrow, though,
18	before we do, I just wanted to point out again, we have
19	Karin coming at 10 a.m. to talk through what to expect
20	for next week. We also have the census timeline
21	conversation to have.
22	Commissioner Andersen has gone ahead and laid out a
23	document identifying some potential dates for us to
24	consider. Again, homework. If you haven't had a chance

to look through that calendar, make sure you have a read

- 1 | through it and come prepared for that conversation
- 2 | tomorrow. And it sounds like the community also will
- 3 have plenty to discuss.
- 4 I'd also just like to discuss a little bit about how
- 5 | we'll run the meeting next week as well, particularly
- 6 some items around public comment and how we want to
- 7 handle that to ensure that we can maximize the amount of
- 8 time that we have during those days and potentially we
- 9 could end a little bit early tomorrow, which would be
- 10 lovely.
- 11 Okay. So with that Kristian and Katy, could we go
- 12 in for a public comment?
- 13 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. The
- 14 | Commission will now take general public comment by phone.
- 15 Four items not on the agenda. And that -- is the
- 16 previous agenda item over as well, Chair?
- 17 COMMISSIONER YEE: No.
- 18 | PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I'm so sorry. No, that's
- 19 okay. Is it just for items not on the agenda at this
- 20 | time?
- 21 CHAIR SADHWANI: It is for general.
- 22 ATTNY PANE: I think we could do general, because
- 23 | that's what we skipped earlier today. Is that right,
- 24 Chair?
- 25 CHAIR SADHWANI: Yeah.



ATTNY PANE: Yeah.

2.0

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Okay. So it's just general public comment. The Commission will now be taking general public comment by phone. To give comment, please call 877-853-5247 and enter the meeting ID number 88264383219 for this meeting.

Once you have entered the --once you have dialed in, please press star 9 to enter the comment queue. The full call-in instructions have been read previously in this meeting and are provided in full on the livestream landing page. And we do not have anyone in the queue at this time. And I will let you know when the instructions are complete.

CHAIR SADHWANI: Very good. Thanks so much, Katy.

While we wait for those instructions to complete and potentially for any callers, I wanted to give a big thank you to Alvaro and to the staff for coordinating this day to day. This has been just super incredible to have the -- finally the opportunity to meet so many of you.

And I know it, of course, took a lot from Kristian and the videography team and all of the staff, Ravi who put together so much of our snacks and our dinner tonight. So I really wanted to just acknowledge everybody who helped out in planning for today and for all of us who took the time out to travel and come here

1	today. I really appreciate that. Hashtag Redistricting
2	Road Trip.
3	PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Those actions are
4	complete, Chair. And we do not have anyone in the queue.
5	CHAIR SADHWANI: All right. Thank you so much,
6	Katy. Well, I think I learned a lot from former Chair
7	Fornaciari about learning about how to end a meeting
8	early. And so I'm very excited that in my first
9	meeting oh, Commissioner Turner?
10	COMMISSIONER TURNER: I just wanted to say, for the
11	record, you did learn and excel. You kept the meeting
12	early and we got full breaks and lunches. Very good.
13	CHAIR SADHWANI: Come on. Commissioner Turner was
14	giving me some kudos here. Let it be. Let this
15	COMMISSIONER TURNER: One of those breaks were
16	twenty minutes.
17	CHAIR SADHWANI: That's right.
18	COMMISSIONER TURNER: This is a very generous.
19	CHAIR SADHWANI: That's right. Exactly. All right.
20	So we will close for today and be back tomorrow morning
21	at 9:30. Thanks so much, everybody.
22	(Whereupon, the CRC Business Meeting adjourned
23	at 6:00 p.m.)
24	



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.

Gunden Barton

November 17, 2022

JENNIFER BARTON