

STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION (CRC)

In the matter of:  
CRC BUSINESS MEETING

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2022  
9:30 a.m.

Reported By:  
Peter Petty



APPEARANCESCOMMISSIONERS

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

STAFF

Wanda Sheffield, Administrative Assistant  
Alvaro E. Hernandez, Executive Director  
Corina Leon, Staff Services Manager  
Anthony Pane, Chief Counsel

TECHNICAL CONTRACTORS

Kristian Manoff, AV Technical Director/Comment Moderator

**Also Present**

Panelists-San Diego County Independent Redistricting  
Commission  
David Bame, Chairman  
Kristina Kruglyak, Commissioner  
Rosette Garcia, Commissioner  
Ken Inman, Commissioner  
Merete E. Rietveld, Senior Counsel

Public Comment

Renee Westa-Lusk



INDEX

	<u>PAGE</u>
Call to Order and Roll Call	4
Introductions	5
Executive Director Updates	9
Staff Update	11
Chief Counsel Report	12
Lessons Learned Panel Discussion	22
Subcommittee Updates	64
Director Report Continued	76
Public Comment	120
Subcommittee Updates Continued	123
Closed Session	167
Public Comment	168
Subcommittee Updates Continued	168
Public Comment	171
Closing	172

P R O C E E D I N G S

December 14, 2022

9:30 a.m.

CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right. Good morning, California. Good morning, everyone. We are in the last meeting for 2022. Welcome. I am going to ask Wanda to take role.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Okay. Good morning, Commissioners and Chair.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Presente. That's for my World Cup. [In Spanish].

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Le Mons?

Commissioner Sadhwani?

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: [In Spanish]. Sorry. I forgot I had to use this mic.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Taylor?

VICE CHAIR TAYLOR: Here. Will be logged on in a second.



1 MS. SHEFFIELD: Okay.

2 Commissioner Toledo?

3 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Here.

4 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Turner?

5 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.

6 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Vazquez?

7 Commissioner Yee?

8 COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

9 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Ahmad?

10 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

11 MS. SHEFFIELD: And Chair Akutagawa?

12 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Here.

13 Okay. Well, it is so nice to see everyone. I am  
14 having flashbacks to last year, December. If any of you  
15 remember what it was like last year. We are definitely  
16 in a much more different state than we were last  
17 December. But it's nice to see everybody.

18 Thanks for all of you who are here, whether it's in  
19 person here in Sacramento or virtually. And for those --  
20 our stakeholders, citizens, residents of California, if  
21 you're logging in to join us or watching us on the  
22 livestream, welcome. Glad to see you.

23 Let me just go through the run up show for today.  
24 So we do have a -- okay. We do have a full meeting. So  
25 we will be starting with director updates. And then at



1 10 o'clock, we will be switching over to a panel  
2 presentation by the San Diego Independent Redistricting  
3 Commission That will be part of subcommittee updates and  
4 announcements. What we'll do is we'll then take a break  
5 at 11 o'clock. And then at 11:15 when we reconvene, we  
6 will then finish --come back to the director updates or  
7 reports and we'll finish up the director reports  
8 beginning at 11:15.

9 We'll then resume the subcommittee updates. We have  
10 Finance and Administration, Website, and Legislative  
11 committees -- subcommittees reporting out. We'll then  
12 break for lunch at 12:45 unless we're able to finish the  
13 reports earlier at which time then we will take a  
14 earlier -- we'll break for lunch a little bit earlier.  
15 We expect, though, that we will not be breaking early for  
16 lunch and that we will need to continue subcommittee  
17 updates after lunch.

18 And then at approximately 2:15, we will plan for a  
19 closed session to cover litigation and personnel matters  
20 and then will continue through until we are scheduled to  
21 conclude at 4:30. And if we can, we will try to end  
22 maybe a little bit early, but we don't expect to end too  
23 early.

24 All right. So with that, I'm going to just ask my  
25 fellow Commissioners if anybody has any announcements



1 that they want to share or make with all of us. Oh,  
2 Commissioner Sinay? I wasn't looking at the screen.

3 COMMISSIONER SINAY: We have to get used to all --

4 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

5 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- again.

6 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

7 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. I wanted just to  
8 make sure that all the Commissioners have seen -- two  
9 reports came out this fall on the 2020 CRC, one by  
10 Catalyst California, called True Representation and the  
11 other one by Philanthropy California, about the funding  
12 for redistricting in California. They're both really  
13 interesting. And they have a lot to share.

14 I would like to make a recommendation, and we can  
15 talk about this during the website, but that all reports  
16 that come out on the CRC have its own location on the  
17 website, kind of post 2020 reports that are written by  
18 others. I know that for the funding we talked about this  
19 one, the Catalyst California.

20 Commissioner Akutagawa, Commissioner Fornaciari, and  
21 I were all interviewed for it and were allowed to look at  
22 just our parts to give comments to representation. I  
23 don't think they interviewed any of us and both of them.  
24 Some of the stuff is accurate and then there's a few  
25 little things that you're like, well, that legally or on

1 our side we might look at it differently. But I think  
2 there are there are great documents for all of us to be  
3 aware of and to be a reminder of all the good work.

4 I also wanted to congratulate all the new all those  
5 who were elected to the new districts. They are now your  
6 districts. They were not until the elections were final.  
7 And watching the elections was very exciting and  
8 remembering the conversations we all had about each of  
9 those districts. I was like, wait, is that the district?  
10 I kind of wanted to like -- I did go back to our report  
11 sometimes and to the maps we created. So it's fun to see  
12 our state legislative districts in action.

13 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you for that, Commissioner  
14 Sinay. Especially, thank you for pointing out those two  
15 reports. Hopefully we'll all get a chance to read  
16 through those.

17 Commissioner Kennedy?

18 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I'll take  
19 the opportunity to do a plug for a book. I went to a  
20 authors talk in Los Angeles last week. The book is  
21 Citizens by John Alexander. He was on a round the world  
22 book tour and he is an author who is part of what looks  
23 to be a broader movement, looking at how citizens can  
24 become more active in their communities, not just being  
25 passive consumers of whatever comes their way, but being





1 active citizens.

2 And to me, the book really hit the mark because the  
3 work that we have done over the last two and a half years  
4 has really, I think, really is an example of how citizens  
5 can step up and contribute to the good of their  
6 community. So I'm highly recommending the book to  
7 Commissioners and to the public. Thank you.

8 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Wonderful. Thank you for that  
9 recommendation. It sounds like it's going to be a very  
10 interesting read.

11 Okay. Any other announcements? Checking the screen  
12 now. Okay. I'm not seeing any other additional hands.  
13 We're going to go ahead and move on to the first of our  
14 director updates.

15 Executive Director Hernandez?

16 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. And good morning,  
17 Commissioners. I wanted to let you know that today  
18 officially is my two-year anniversary. Two years ago, on  
19 December 14th, I joined the Commission. So I just wanted  
20 to note that. It's been a tremendous ride. That's for  
21 sure.

22 Let me get right into it. In regards to the  
23 website, the subcommittee today will provide you some  
24 additional information on the website, so I'll defer to  
25 them. The database we received notice yesterday that DGS

1 has approved the user interface contract. We reached out  
2 to the vendor, will be working with them to get that  
3 going as soon as possible.

4 And now moving on to the budget, I wanted to let you  
5 know that we received an email informing us the  
6 Department of Finance has approved \$70,000 for legal  
7 services through December 2022. These funds are from the  
8 Budget Act of 2021, so they're carryover for post  
9 redistricting process, which included operations and  
10 litigation. So we have those funds for the services that  
11 we've had through December of 2022.

12 They also recommended in their email that the  
13 Commission reach out to the Attorney General's Office for  
14 Legal Services beginning January 2023 and thereafter.  
15 And we're looking into this option moving forward now.  
16 In that same email, they did provide some bad news  
17 unfortunately.

18 They did let us know that the BCP that we submitted  
19 in October of 2021 has been denied. And I'm going to  
20 read to you from that email what they stated, the reasons  
21 why it was denied. For the budget year, and ongoing  
22 proposal, we are denying the proposal at this time, given  
23 the state's current fiscal situation. If the fiscal  
24 situation improves, we can revisit this proposal in the  
25 future. We also believe the current base level funding



1 of the Commission is sufficient for daily operations and  
2 that legal services can go through the Attorney General's  
3 Office as mentioned above.

4 We have let them know that the Commission was going  
5 to be meeting today and that we provide we would provide  
6 a response thereafter. Given this news and in  
7 consultation with the Finance and Admin Subcommittee,  
8 have drafted a document that is posted in the handouts to  
9 review exactly what we have as far as funding and what we  
10 will not have in funding beginning the fiscal year of  
11 '23/'24.

12 I will go over that later today. I know we're  
13 pressed for time, and I want to make sure we have enough  
14 time for the panel. So I will defer that conversation  
15 until later. But essentially, there's a lot of  
16 operational funds that were needed that we had projected  
17 out that they're saying we're not going to get and  
18 therefore it's going to change our direction in how we  
19 are able to function moving forward after June 2023.

20 So with that, I will entertain some questions, but I  
21 also want to move on to the chief counsel. I actually I  
22 want to move on to Corina to provide a brief update on  
23 her activities.

24 MS. LEON: Thank you. Thank you, Alvaro. Let me  
25 turn this on. Okay. Okay. Thank you. And yes, thank



1 you, Alvaro. And good morning, Commissioners. I'm glad  
2 everybody's here and made it. And so my brief update is  
3 on what I've been doing this month, taking over the  
4 accounting and the travel.

5 So I've been doing that, while also Raul's been  
6 providing a lot of the training on contracts and becoming  
7 involved with this UI project that we are going to be  
8 starting up and the website working more often with  
9 more -- with Martin, which has been great. So that's  
10 pretty much -- and just training with Alvaro and Raul and  
11 learning as much about the history and the organization  
12 as possible. And that's been very busy. It's been a  
13 very busy month. Thank you.

14 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Director Hernandez, do you have  
15 anything else that you want to add at this time before we  
16 go on to Chief Counsel's report?

17 MR. HERNANDEZ: Not at this time. If we have time  
18 after the chief counsel, maybe we'll go over the handout  
19 that I referenced.

20 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. All right. Then. Let's go  
21 ahead and go on to our chief counsel update.

22 COUNSEL PANE: Good morning, Chair. Good morning,  
23 Commissioners. I don't have any specific items to update  
24 you. As I mentioned in the previous Commission meeting  
25 on December 7th, the U.S. Supreme Court took oral

1 arguments on the Moore v. Harper matter and probably will  
2 get a decision at some point next year as to the impacts  
3 for that. I'm happy to entertain any questions you may  
4 have, but that's all I have at this point.

5 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right. Let's do this.  
6 Perhaps, Director Hernandez, if we can, take any  
7 questions from Commissioners on either what you and  
8 Corina and Chief Counsel have reported, and if there are  
9 no questions, then let's go ahead and we'll go to the  
10 handout after that as we have a few more minutes.

11 Any questions from any of the Commissioners? Oh,  
12 sorry. Like I have to coordinate my -- where I'm looking  
13 now. Commissioner Fornaciari?

14 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: We need to get the Chair  
15 extra monitors so she can monitor the hands. Yeah, just  
16 for my colleagues on the Commission, the -- Anthony  
17 reached out to the A.G. to see if they could provide some  
18 support. And it sounds like they're going to provide us  
19 legal support. I just want to let you know, we're  
20 working out the details and we should have the final  
21 details worked out by our next meeting.

22 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right. Great. Thank you.  
23 That's good to know.

24 All right. Any other questions? If not, you're --  
25 okay. All right. Oh, Commissioner Andersen?

1           COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you. Am I on?  
2 Thank you. I am wondering, since we did work with the  
3 AG's office previously and they were wonderful. However,  
4 they were -- it did take a while to use them because they  
5 had to find the proper expertise, which we went through a  
6 few people, and then it would work out very well.

7           But then they've also sent us, and I believe  
8 actually in a letter, that there are matters which they  
9 are not the expertise in and recommended we get outside  
10 counsel, which is why we've had outside counsel.

11           So while I appreciate the great work the Department  
12 of Finance does, I do not see at this time how they can  
13 just say, well, use the Department of -- use the AG's  
14 Office, because what do we do then? We have to go  
15 through this whole process again to say the AG said,  
16 look, that's not our expertise. Go out and get someone  
17 else. I mean, that's the cost to the State there is  
18 staggering and it's wasteful. So I do not understand the  
19 rationale behind that.

20           CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen,  
21 for that. I see that Commissioner Fernandez has her hand  
22 up now too.

23           COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Yes. Thank you,  
24 hair. And I thank Commissioner Andersen. As  
25 Commissioner Fornaciari mentioned, there is some

1 discussion back and forth, and that's one of the  
2 questions that we're asking them as one. How quickly can  
3 they respond to our needs. And then two, the concern  
4 that we have regarding their expertise in redistricting?  
5 So we'll be working that out. When I say we, it's  
6 probably not me, it's probably Anthony. But yes, we're  
7 trying. And if there's any other concerns, please bring  
8 those up so that we can make sure we address everything.  
9 Thank you.

10 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you for that clarification,  
11 Commissioner Sinay?

12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: When we did work with the AG's  
13 office in the past, I remember one of the questions that  
14 we kept thinking was, is there a conflict of interest?  
15 And so I do want us -- it's a hard conversation to have,  
16 but we do need to have that conversation because the AG's  
17 job is kind of to be our watch. Kind of a watchdog of  
18 all commissions and such. And so yeah.

19 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you for raising that too.  
20 We'll make sure that Chief Counsel is aware of that  
21 question as well, too, and addresses that.

22 Commissioner Kennedy?

23 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. Just to say that, I've  
24 seen over the decades many Commissions -- election  
25 commissions in other countries, hamstrung by budgetary

1 constraints. And that really is a very common way that  
2 Commissions that are supposed to be independent have  
3 their independence sometimes sharply curtailed. And this  
4 is something that I think is an unfortunate development.

5 I don't think that we are asking for anything  
6 exorbitant. We are all aware of the fiscal situation of  
7 the State. Sometimes it's very good. Sometimes it's not  
8 as good. We are not trying to spend money that doesn't  
9 exist, but we really are, I think, advocating not only  
10 for our own independence, but with an eye to the future  
11 and helping ensure that the future Commissions feel that  
12 they have sufficient independence to carry out their  
13 work. Thank you.

14 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy,  
15 for bringing that that point up. That is definitely a  
16 good point and appreciate your experience on that. I'm  
17 sure that you've seen plenty of situations in which that  
18 has happened, and it's good for all of us to be mindful  
19 of that as well too.

20 Commissioner Yee?

21 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. I'm just curious what the  
22 timeline is for the handout -- hand-off?

23 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: When you say the hand-off, you  
24 mean between our --

25 COMMISSIONER YEE: Our counsel -- yeah, current





1 internal counsel and AG?

2 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Right now, according to what I  
3 heard and what I understand, the funding is only going to  
4 cover us through the end of this month, and that -- the  
5 suggestion has been that we try to find -- or we try to  
6 establish some kind of relationship with the AG's office  
7 to provide us with legal services. So it's basically  
8 immediately, I think, starting January 1 if the details  
9 can be worked out. And perhaps I can invite Chief  
10 Counsel to answer that part.

11 COUNSEL PANE: Yeah. Thank you, Chair and  
12 Commission. Yeah, we are still -- as some of the  
13 Commissioners had mentioned we are still working out the  
14 details, finalizing it. And it what it appears to be but  
15 not quite set in stone yet is the encouragement from  
16 Department of Finance for this Commission to utilize the  
17 AG's office.

18 What might be an option for this Commission, again  
19 once we work out all the details, is that if the  
20 Commission stays under 1,000 hours use of legal services,  
21 there are no fees for that time. That would not be the  
22 case if the Commission exceeds that 1,000 hours. So the  
23 option that the Department of Finance is encouraging this  
24 Commission to utilize is -- has sort of that and I'll  
25 call it a caveat, that restriction condition to it. And

1 so what we're trying to do right now is finalize detail  
2 so that it is an option for this Commission should they  
3 choose to go down that road.

4 The funding request for legal services for the BCP  
5 that was denied was to take effect July 1 of 2023, I  
6 believe. So it seemed, and I would defer to  
7 administrative staff, but it sounds like while the  
8 details might be able to be worked out in January, the  
9 legal services piece would -- that was denied and  
10 therefore was the encouragement of the Department of  
11 Finance was in relation to the BCP, which starts July 1st  
12 of 2023.

13 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Yee, I just want to  
14 check with you. Is that help your question?

15 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. But I think there are two  
16 different issues where there's outside counsel, which is  
17 funded through the end of this month, our own chief  
18 counsel, and there's possible help from the AG. Right.  
19 So it sounds like the help could start as early as  
20 January. But then there could be additional -- we could  
21 try again for a budget change proposal to take us through  
22 June. So it sounds like there's actually several  
23 different options still in play.

24 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yes, I do believe -- my  
25 understanding is that Chief Counsel will at least be with

1 us potentially just depending on what his, I guess,  
2 personal/professional status will be depending on if he  
3 finds another job, in other words. But we do have him  
4 for obviously legal questions. But anything that  
5 requires additional work similar to what Strumwasser was  
6 doing then I think the recommendation of that that does  
7 get requested of the AG's Office is my understanding.

8 Commissioner Andersen, I see that your hand is still  
9 up. I'm sorry. I thought it was just left up from the  
10 last time. But I realize it's still up, so you might  
11 have a question.

12 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I do.

13 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

14 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Actually, just  
15 on that particular point, basically -- and please correct  
16 me if this is -- I'm trying to figure out exactly what is  
17 going on with this AG and the outside counsel versus  
18 inside. It appears that the AG is says great for outside  
19 counsel. Boom. That's it. 70,000 for December 31st.  
20 But we're still on. So we still have services which  
21 we've budgeted for through the fiscal year, which is June  
22 30th.

23 So that would include finishing up what our outside  
24 counsel has done. Or is it really like, no, that's it.  
25 They're supposed to drop outside counsel. We still have

1 our chief counsel and also a retired annuitant through  
2 June 30th; is that correct? So basically, they --  
3 they're coming in and saying, I know we've given you a  
4 fiscal budget, but now we're changing it, so.

5 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yes, that's correct. And I  
6 believe, Chief Counsel Pane, maybe you could --

7 COUNSEL PANE: Yeah.

8 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: -- elaborate more.

9 COUNSEL PANE: Yeah. So I think the issue of  
10 utilizing the AG's Office for legal services was for -- I  
11 think was intentionally for outside counsel, but it  
12 started out of the issue of the BCP being denied. And  
13 the BCP was supposed to start July 1st of 2023. And that  
14 request was for legal services, which I think includes  
15 internal services as well.

16 So the answer to Department of Finance in response  
17 to that denial was my understanding is they said, hey, go  
18 use the Attorney General's Office. And there's a way to  
19 do -- to use the Attorney General's Office without them  
20 charging you anything if you stay under 1000 hours in a  
21 calendar year cap. So I hope that clarifies that.

22 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That did. Thank you because  
23 that was my second. But I do have another question and  
24 it's actually about Director Hernandez's report and the  
25 specifically the handout on what was included, what was

1 not included on the approval of BCP. And is now the time  
2 to discuss that? Or is it under the websites? I mean,  
3 not website, the fiscal subcommittee?

4 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Andersen, that will  
5 be part of the -- both the Finance and then also the  
6 additional report back Executive Director Hernandez is  
7 going to be sharing with us. So if you could hold  
8 that --

9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you.

10 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: -- question and after.

11 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes, yeah.

12 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: That would be helpful.

13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.

14 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

15 Commissioner Fernandez?

16 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. Just quickly, I just  
17 wanted to clarify that your finance approved the 70,000  
18 and they did not -- we still have the funding available.  
19 They're just not releasing the funding for anything  
20 additional. So I just want to make sure that everyone  
21 understood that. And that's for this fiscal year.

22 Again, we're going back or we -- i.e. Anthony is  
23 going back and forth. Various issues came up in terms of  
24 the consistency. Are we going to have the same legal  
25 person from the AG's Office or is it going to be someone

1 new every time? Are they going to be able to be a  
2 support during our meetings? Can they also be like a  
3 watchdog in terms of being aware if there's anything out  
4 there affecting -- regarding redistricting and how it may  
5 impact our Commission? More of a proactive versus  
6 reactive is what we need.

7 Also, we did have the conflicts. So thank you,  
8 Commissioner Sinay. And also how quickly are they going  
9 to be able to respond to our request and of course, the  
10 expertise? So there's still quite a few areas that  
11 Anthony's trying to work out with the Attorney General's  
12 Office. So we're not necessarily convinced at this point  
13 that they'll be able to handle all of the requirements  
14 that we have as a commission.

15 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez,  
16 for that. I am going to call a pause to this discussion.  
17 It is now 10:00 or 10:01. I do want to be mindful of our  
18 panelists from the San Diego Independent Redistricting  
19 Commission that has joined us. I'm going to turn this  
20 over to Commissioner Kennedy and Commissioner Yee. This  
21 is part of the Lessons Learned Subcommittee.

22 So Commissioner Kennedy, I believe you're going to  
23 introduce everyone. Thank you.

24 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. It is a  
25 great pleasure to have with us members and staff of the



1 San Diego County Independent Redistricting Commission.  
2 We had invited them to participate in the Lessons Learned  
3 discussions back in March. That was not possible, but  
4 the invitation remained open and with some patience and  
5 persistence, we've managed to get them with us today.

6 So what we've done is we have offered them the same  
7 twenty minutes that the other commissions Arizona,  
8 Colorado, Michigan, and Long Beach had back in March for  
9 an initial presentation. There will be then an  
10 opportunity for Q&A. And then once we're through with  
11 that, Commissioner Yee and I will proceed with a further  
12 presentation on where we stand with the Lessons Learned  
13 report.

14 So at this point, I'm pleased to introduce Mr. David  
15 Bame, the chair of the San Diego County Independent  
16 Redistricting Commission. And I will ask him to  
17 introduce his colleagues and take it away from here.  
18 Thank you.

19 CHAIRMAN BAME: Well, thank you, Ray. And thanks to  
20 all of you on the Commission, both for having us today  
21 after not being able to connect in March and frankly, for  
22 all the work you've done. And the discussion we just  
23 heard is reminiscent of discussions we've had. But it's  
24 really, really reassuring to hear you still looking at  
25 ways to fulfill your mandates and requirements while also



1 attending to cost and cost efficiencies. So thank you  
2 for that. Thank you for all you've done today and all  
3 you will do in the future.

4 With me today from our County Commission is Co-vice  
5 Chair, Rosette Garcia, Commissioner Ken Inman, with her  
6 excellent artwork behind her, Commissioner Kristina  
7 Kruglyak, and from her counsel team, Merete E. Rietveld  
8 who will be there to just weigh in as necessary if any  
9 legal issues pop up.

10 We thought we'd break this into just two parts.  
11 Commissioner Kruglyak actually was the presenter of our  
12 own Lessons Learned report back at the end of January.  
13 So we were fortunate enough to have her with us today to  
14 do a slightly amended version to make sure that we're  
15 both being consistent and also so that you have the  
16 benefit of her experience and expertise.

17 After that, deferring to Commissioners Kennedy and  
18 Yee, we'll be happy to take any questions or engage in  
19 any discussion you'd like. So if that's all okay to go  
20 on, I'll turn it over to Kristina.

21 COMMISSIONER KRUGLYAK: Thank you, David. So I  
22 logged in earlier and was able to share my screen. So  
23 that's still the case. Are you able to see my screen?  
24 All right. Thank you, David. So again, thank you very  
25 much for having us. We look forward to sharing our own





1 Lessons Learned experience with you. I, of course, am  
2 representing the full San Diego County IRC, who was  
3 listed here with great thanks to the wonderful county  
4 support that we received over the course of our tenure.

5 I'd like to go through a little bit of our timeline,  
6 which of course mirrors your own to put our Lessons  
7 Learned into perspective. So our IRC formed a bit later  
8 than the CRC. We were a fourteen-member commission on  
9 November 20th, 2020.

10 During the intervening months, we went through very  
11 similar training, public outreach, really learning about  
12 the role that we were going to perform and then really  
13 worked in earnest after the release of the adjusted  
14 census data in September of 2021, with springboard maps  
15 available for review approximately a month later. And  
16 then we worked tirelessly to get to final maps on  
17 December 14th, 2021.

18 And I think the first Lesson Learned that I want to  
19 highlight is really the saying that your own draft report  
20 highlights, which is that independent redistricting  
21 works. And I know I speak for all of my fellow  
22 commissioners when I say we are very pleased with the  
23 final map that we delivered for our county.

24 After approval of the final map, we went into our  
25 Lessons Learned activities where, as Chair Bame



1 mentioned, we had an ad hoc subcommittee that was tasked  
2 with consolidating all of the feedback that we received.  
3 We tried to get feedback both from commissioners as well  
4 as our collaborators, and then really synthesize that  
5 into the main Lessons Learned, which we then delivered as  
6 a report with full appendices, including all of the  
7 feedback that was received. And that Lessons Learned  
8 report was eventually approved on January 12th of this  
9 year.

10       So this is a summary of all of the feedback that was  
11 received. We received a total of 183 comments and you  
12 can see them summarized by Lessons Learned topics on the  
13 right table. This table is appendix one of our Lessons  
14 Learned report. And as I mentioned, the full comments  
15 are listed in Appendix 2.

16       These are just screenshots of the deliverables that  
17 we put together and again are available on the San Diego  
18 County Independent redistricting website with the link  
19 listed below. All of the feedback was summarized  
20 according to topic, but also observations a SWAT analysis  
21 to whether the observation represented a strength or  
22 weakness of opportunity or threat. And then as well as a  
23 recommendation for what could be changed or optimized for  
24 the future.

25       So I put that timeline again on this slide so that I



1 could go through the Lessons Learned kind of temporally  
2 as a function of what part of the entire process they  
3 correspond to. So the first Lessons Learned -- and  
4 again, a lot of these will seem very familiar to you. I  
5 did have the chance to peruse your own very thorough  
6 report last night and saw a lot of similarities.

7       So just in terms of putting together a Commission,  
8 we really thought that the sooner the better. There's an  
9 awful lot of work to be done and starting earlier would  
10 certainly not be unwelcome. The more diverse an  
11 applicant pool, the better off a commission will be. I  
12 think we had a very diverse commission which served us  
13 very well.

14       But not just for IRCs, but generally the more  
15 diverse and group, the better off the outcome is going to  
16 be. So we really recommend working to increase the  
17 diversity of the applicant pool and also working to  
18 ensure that all of the materials are very clear about  
19 what goes into being a commissioner for this kind of  
20 work.

21       I know that I, for one, did not appreciate the  
22 amount of time and that was going to go into this.  
23 Again, I'm so happy with the results, but it would have  
24 been great to have that clear for all applicants  
25 considering this effort.



1 Not sure if anyone remembers, but we started our  
2 work during a global pandemic and so all of our work to  
3 begin with was virtual. And then later in the mapping  
4 phase, we did migrate more to a hybrid meeting format and  
5 we thought that that worked very, very well and would  
6 recommend supporting virtual even beyond emergency  
7 authorizations due to a global pandemic. We thought that  
8 it was extremely effective and didn't take away from our  
9 ability to team build, work collaboratively, and be very  
10 effective.

11 Also in this phase, which I mentioned included  
12 training, public outreach, consultant gathering, all of  
13 these -- all of these very important things in general,  
14 the sooner you start everything, the better off you're  
15 going to be.

16 So a lot of the Lessons Learned were to expand the  
17 training curriculum and to initiate it effectively  
18 immediately upon commissioner selection, began public  
19 outreach, and defined the plan even earlier, retain  
20 whatever counsel is necessary along with whatever  
21 consultants are necessary very early in the process  
22 because you do get squeezed for time as the process  
23 continues.

24 As everyone is aware, the census data was quite  
25 delayed and while there was a delay in the final map



1 deliverable, it was not commensurate with that delay.  
2 And so this is not so much a Lessons Learned as a wish  
3 that there could be some kind of legislative update to  
4 automatically extend the mapping period so that it is  
5 commensurate with any census data release delays.

6       During the mapping phase, we had a lot of discussion  
7 and a lot of Lessons Learned, as you can imagine. One  
8 was that -- just ground rules for working with maps.  
9 Those should be set beforehand because there are a lot of  
10 intricate issues that you might not think about, but that  
11 actually are very important. So I mentioned springboard  
12 maps. Which maps should be the springboard?

13       Should it just be the previous districts, even if  
14 they are completely unequal in terms of population?  
15 Should there be most of the previous districts, but maybe  
16 not just a little bit better for population or something  
17 else? How do you take in maps from the public,  
18 especially when those maps do not cover the full region  
19 that you are going to be redistricting?

20       How do you evaluate them according to the standard  
21 criteria? How do you interpret them as they come in on a  
22 piece of paper? Just what process should you follow for  
23 every single map that you receive. And then how do you  
24 align on how you talk about maps?

25       So you don't want the color or the number of

1 effectively the same district to change week over week  
2 because it can be confusing both for commissioners and  
3 the public. These are just examples of things that would  
4 be great to address before mapping even starts.

5       Additionally, if Commissioners would like to use  
6 topographer provided mapping software, then that  
7 evaluation should be part impartial of hiring a  
8 demographer. We had a fantastic demographer team and the  
9 software was great, but probably not -- but probably best  
10 used by expert demographers. If that is important for  
11 future commissions, it should be evaluated early.

12       And then we thought that progressing mapping through  
13 small groups had a lot of advantages over only working as  
14 a full commission. What about taking in public input?  
15 We were thrilled with the amount of public input that we  
16 received. It was extremely high quality. The public was  
17 extremely engaged in our process, and I know that we were  
18 all very grateful for that.

19       We made sure that every piece of feedback that we  
20 received was read, evaluated and considered deeply. And  
21 I'm very proud of that. It was a lot of work, especially  
22 in the way that public input was provided to us. There  
23 was effectively one PDF file per electronic comment. If  
24 there was any way to synthesize feedback both written and  
25 oral in a way that was easily searchable, easily



1 quantifiable, allowing for a very objective analysis, I  
2 think that would be worthwhile to consider in the future.

3       For public testimony in particular, we recommended  
4 at least the investigation of whether petitions or some  
5 other way to quantify support because many people come  
6 and they want to make similar points. And that's great.  
7 But it also potentially gives less time to people with  
8 alternate viewpoints. And so if there's a way to allow  
9 us to hear all viewpoints and understand the relative  
10 weight of each one, that would be very useful.

11       General comments I mentioned earlier about the  
12 workload and the expectations were extremely significant.  
13 I think that as a Commissioner, I know that that is an  
14 order of magnitude more work for our chair and our vice  
15 chairs. We don't have an answer for how to change that,  
16 but we do think that that should be noted and any  
17 possible avenue to improve that workload or share that  
18 workload would be worthwhile to consider.

19       We thought that our use of ad hoc subcommittees were  
20 always fantastic. The quality of the work was always  
21 exceptional. So making use of those and/or standing  
22 committees we think would be worthwhile. We also had  
23 great success using single point of contacts for working  
24 with consultants. So Ken, who is here with us, was our  
25 single point of contact for the demographer. And he

1 actually had that expertise, that technical background,  
2 and so it worked extremely well. So if possible, we  
3 would recommend using that process in the future.

4 And then, as I mentioned earlier, making use of  
5 small working groups to progress goals outside of only  
6 working as a full commission we thought would be very  
7 effective. So that takes you through our timeline and  
8 are really key Lessons Learned.

9 Another one, which is effective, which is very  
10 relevant for this group, is whether there's ever or in  
11 the future a way to share input from the public across  
12 IRC levels, so the State, the County, and then of course,  
13 we have plenty of cities within our own county. You  
14 know, we get lots of COI feedback.

15 We get feedback on maps. We get public interest or  
16 community of interest testimony. All of this is so  
17 worthwhile. And it's also worthwhile not to make the  
18 same people have to go through multiple IRCs in order to  
19 get their communities presented and shared. So if there  
20 were ways, creative ways to share this type of feedback  
21 across all IRCs moving forward, I think that would be  
22 great for all involved.

23 So I think I went through that pretty quick. I do  
24 like to prioritize discussion. If there are specific  
25 categories you'd like to dive deeper into, they're listed



1 here and we can always do that. But I think we can dive  
2 into discussion with the broader group and take  
3 questions.

4 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Kennedy, if you could  
5 moderate this.

6 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Any questions, comments from  
7 commissioners here? Commissioner Sinay?

8 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Hi. As a San Diegan, I'm very  
9 proud of the work that you all did. And I also -- full  
10 disclosure, I did participate on our county redistricting  
11 process. I think it's important to start off your  
12 presentation, just letting folks know that San Diego  
13 County was one of the first counties to have an IRC, that  
14 this is their second iteration of an IRC. It's not their  
15 first like many -- for many counties, it was their first.

16 You answered one of my questions, but I wanted to  
17 see if there was -- when I interviewed for the CRC, the  
18 California Redistricting Commission, I made it a point to  
19 constantly say, if we have a ten year tenure, we're there  
20 for ten years, I think that we can support local efforts  
21 as they get up and going in independent redistricting  
22 commission and those interviewing thought that that was a  
23 really great idea and were excited that we were thinking  
24 about what can we do outside of that time that we do the  
25 maps. And I wanted to put it to you all and it's a

1 question we've asked others, but how could the CRC  
2 support or share resources or information? Like you  
3 said, sharing COIs could be interesting. And I'll tell  
4 you that we tried to do that. It was brought up during  
5 the process saying, hey, we're getting a lot of  
6 communities of interest. Can we share it with local  
7 redistricting efforts? The experts, they always say,  
8 well, a community of interest that's submitted for at the  
9 State level is not the same as one that's going to be at  
10 the City level. That's not the same as the County. I  
11 would like to start pushing back on that whole answer.  
12 The experts will say a lot of things that now that we've  
13 gone through the process, we're experts. Every time  
14 someone calls me a CRC independent redistricting -- or a  
15 redistricting expert, I'm like, huh? But we are. We've  
16 done it. And I think we can push back and say that  
17 commissioners can figure out what someone is trying to  
18 say in their communities of interest and if it is  
19 applicable or not. And so that is one area that I agree  
20 with you that I think we need to think about how we share  
21 data and how we -- and in our outreach so that, you all  
22 know, we did say you can do your outreach that these are  
23 the other counties or the other independent redistricting  
24 efforts. But I was hoping if there's any other thoughts  
25 that you all had, that would be helpful during the



1 process. And then moving forward, how you think that we  
2 all who have gone through redistricting, including  
3 yourselves, could support other counties? I think it's  
4 important and you didn't share this, but I want to share  
5 with my colleagues, is you all did a heck of a lot of  
6 work with no compensation. And I would like to put on  
7 our shoulders the responsibility to advocate constantly  
8 that if anybody is on an independent redistricting  
9 commission, they do need to receive compensation so that  
10 it can be that anybody can apply, because that does end  
11 up setting up an inequitable opportunity to participate.  
12 So another piece that I would encourage you to put in  
13 your presentation in the future, I know that when  
14 Commissioner -- when we did our presentation in San  
15 Diego, we kept getting this one guy who kept asking us  
16 about compensation. I finally said, hey, yeah, it is  
17 going to be -- that we're compensated. And then you all  
18 did -- you are going through a lawsuit. And I know you  
19 can't talk about the lawsuit, but I think it is important  
20 for us to understand what that means. And is there  
21 anything we can do to support or to help commissions. I  
22 know that from day one, we were told expect to be sued.  
23 So don't not do something or say something because -- I  
24 mean, be careful what you say and do, but you're probably  
25 going to be sued. And that was really good sage advice



1 that we kind of always went back to when we were trying  
2 to think through how we were going to push the envelope.  
3 I know I just threw a lot at you, but I've been thinking  
4 about you guys a lot and thank you so much for your great  
5 work.

6 MS. RIETWELD: And let me just interrupt this.  
7 Because of the pending litigation, we're not going to  
8 comment on any Lessons Learned from it until after it's  
9 completed.

10 COMMISSIONER SINAY: And also, can I say one more  
11 thing? My bad. One last thing I forgot to say that I  
12 think is also important. And I heard this often when we  
13 went -- Commissioner Sadhwani and Commissioner Kennedy  
14 and I went to a conference on Democracy up in L.A. and  
15 one of the things that we heard from the independent  
16 redistricting commissions at the County and the City  
17 level was the struggle with staffing, because staffing is  
18 a county staffing, it's independent staffing, and they  
19 all have other responsibilities. And so if we can hear a  
20 little bit more about that, so we can help advocate in  
21 that area as well.

22 CHAIRMAN BAME: I'm sure we all have a lot of  
23 thoughts, but I would much rather defer to Kristina, Ken,  
24 and Rosette first, and then I'll add any final thoughts.  
25 But any three of you want to comment on any of that?

1           COMMISSIONER KRUGLYAK: I will comment briefly,  
2 which is -- thank you. I agree with everything you said.  
3 We did have a lot of comments to some of the points that  
4 you mentioned and including compensation being one of  
5 them. And that does go a bit to the diversity of the  
6 applicant pool as well, as you mentioned.

7           I will probably defer to Rosette and David, about  
8 county staff, because as vice chair and chair, they work  
9 much closer with county staff. I know that our county  
10 staff did have plenty of other responsibilities. I still  
11 thought they did a fantastic job for us. We did have  
12 comments about potentially supporting or budgeting an  
13 external staff to help with support functions.

14           So a lot of discussion that we had as a Commission  
15 focused on whether an external noncommissioner executive  
16 director could be a good idea, both for those, as well as  
17 to help shoulder the workload that I mentioned for the  
18 leadership. So lots of thoughts there that absolutely I  
19 think would be great are included in our report. Our  
20 broader report. Got it. We would definitely recommend  
21 the next commission consider deeply. Rosette or Ken, do  
22 you have any thoughts on that?

23           COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Yes. With regards to  
24 staffing, our county staff were, as Kristina mentioned,  
25 excellent and worked as long and as hard as we



1 commissioners did. And I think everybody was surprised  
2 at the workload and the time and effort that was  
3 required. But the whole notion of staffing actually  
4 raises an important question, which is that it was not  
5 clear whether or not the IRC had the authority to  
6 actually go out and hire, for example, external staff or  
7 an executive director, because the legislation as  
8 written, is a little bit vague, or at least that was the  
9 advice that we got.

10       So and that's one of the issues that we didn't touch  
11 too much upon and I -- but has to do with advocating at  
12 the legislature for things. Well, I mean, Kristina did  
13 mention one, but sort of tightening up the language so  
14 that it's clearer what it is that the IRC actually has  
15 the authority to do and what it is that we are unable to  
16 do, because it's the County's -- it's within the County's  
17 purview. And that was one of them.

18       So while we do talk about it in the Lessons Learned,  
19 because we had county staff, all of our staff actually,  
20 if I'm not mistaken, and someone can correct me on this,  
21 while they were assigned to us, they were not relieved of  
22 their other county duties. And so that was problematic  
23 at times, even though they were working so hard to meet  
24 the needs of the IRC.

25       So anyway, that just sort of raises the point about

1 advocacy at the -- advocating at the legislative level to  
2 fix some things that we identified were a problem.

3       COMMISSIONER INMAN: And this is Ken Inman. There  
4 are a few comments, one to follow up on, what Rosette  
5 said and what we've reiterated, the County staff where  
6 they worked extremely hard. The problem was they weren't  
7 released from their other duties. The one really  
8 positive about the county staff is they had access to a  
9 vast array of resources that as an independent  
10 redistricting commission, if we hired our own staff, we  
11 never would have had access to. And that helped us out  
12 in a big way to shoulder some of the burden.

13       And that leads to the other comment is this was much  
14 more work than I ever anticipated, especially when we got  
15 down to crunch time. At the end, we were meeting, four,  
16 four, six, eight -- I think we probably had a ten-hour  
17 meeting an hour towards the end and we had to reconvene  
18 the next day.

19       I mean, coming up to crunch time, we probably had  
20 three or four meetings in a week. And just the burden of  
21 that was it was very hard. I'm retired so I could make  
22 it work. But a lot of people on the commission aren't  
23 retired, and it was very hard on them. And the other --  
24 and just I would say we did get fed a few meals, so we  
25 were compensated in a certain way, but that was about it.



1 They fed us Jersey Mike's a few times or something like  
2 that.

3 But no, it was a great experience. The other thing  
4 I would say is being on the data side of things, but  
5 anything that can be done upfront to structure the data  
6 feeds would be extremely useful. We did try to do that  
7 by having categorical pull-down menus for COIs like, what  
8 is your COI? Is it a life style? Is it a faith  
9 community? Is it a neighborhood community. Is that  
10 based on schools where your kids go to sports?

11 If you can have any way to structure that data  
12 upfront, it's really going to help you because we did do  
13 a lot of unstructured searches of data, looking for  
14 phrases, looking for information that we could glean.  
15 You're still going to have to do that because you can't  
16 categorize everything up front and you want to give  
17 people the freedom to comment and just see where those  
18 comments lead you.

19 But any structure you can provide a priority before  
20 you get into the mapping phase and the data collection  
21 phase is going to go a long way. And then the other  
22 thing that we didn't understand or I for sure didn't  
23 understand in San Diego County is an appreciation for the  
24 legal entities and the various planning agencies and  
25 geographies that really matter to people.





1           It was something that we learned on the job and it  
2 would have been helpful to know upfront depending on the  
3 area you're looking at, we have a lot of reservations  
4 here, planning districts that are in place for non-  
5 unincorporated areas, school districts. All these things  
6 that overlap and actually impact people's lives and how  
7 they define their community of interest actually are very  
8 relevant.

9           And we didn't learn that until further along in the  
10 mapping process. And if we would have been cognizant of  
11 those things early, we could have incorporated into the  
12 maps and not had to go back and redo it back and redo  
13 things several times. So those are my comments. And  
14 thank you. Thank you for inviting us.

15           CHAIRMAN BAME: If it's okay, I'd much rather keep  
16 working -- keep hearing other questions and comments,  
17 because we're keenly interested too in what you all have  
18 to say. And I'll just ask to reserve about thirty  
19 seconds at the end to wrap things up and add a comment or  
20 two. But with that, back to you.

21           COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Perfect. Thank you so much.  
22 So in that spirit, let's go to the three commissioners  
23 who currently have hands up, get their questions in one  
24 go, and then you can decide how best to respond to those  
25 questions.



1 So first of all, Commissioner Fornaciari?

2 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Thanks. Thank you  
3 all for this. It's been insightful and helpful and yeah,  
4 it's a lot of work. Ken's comment about the data that  
5 became important and I think our data team did a really,  
6 really good job. And I think we got to a good place  
7 for -- eventually ultimately with our data and our  
8 ability to search and look through the data to find out.

9 But we had a whole team there tagging the data and  
10 working on it. So I think that's important. And I think  
11 looking at the data, you can look at our website, at the  
12 tool that we use to track our data and search our data.  
13 And I think that it came out really well, and I think it  
14 could serve as a model for the future.

15 I just had a really practical question about this  
16 idea of a working group. I would hope -- I'd be  
17 interested in hearing a little more details about the  
18 working groups and what that look like and how you  
19 managed that in the context of, I guess, the Brown Act in  
20 your case.

21 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner  
22 Fornaciari.

23 Commissioner Sadhwani?

24 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. Thank you so much.  
25 And thank you for being here today and sharing all of



1 these Lessons Learned. This is really great. My  
2 question. To some extent piggybacks off of Commissioner  
3 Sinay's question was you've talked a little bit about  
4 receiving the COI input and the testimony from  
5 communities on the ground. And I'm curious if you had,  
6 as we did here at the State level, thankfully a statewide  
7 database had created the COI -- oh, I think my Wi-Fi  
8 keeps going out -- the COI mapping program that was  
9 available statewide.

10 So I'm curious to get a little bit more information  
11 about how you were receiving testimony from communities,  
12 because I've long thought that it would be fairly simple  
13 to create a system that could be used statewide,  
14 especially the legislature had had asked the statewide  
15 database to create that.

16 The legislature is pushing for the creation of  
17 independent redistricting at the County levels. Even now  
18 in the City of Los Angeles, new legislation, is pushing  
19 for an independent commission at the State level. So it  
20 would seem to make a lot of sense for the legislature  
21 then to commission the statewide database or in the  
22 future some other entity, however they want to move  
23 forward to create such a tool that could be available to  
24 counties.

25 So just getting a little bit more information on how



1 you were able to receive that information, what tools  
2 were available would be really helpful. Thank you.

3 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner  
4 Sadhwani.

5 Commissioner Turner?

6 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. Thank you. And thank  
7 you to all for the presentation. I found it very  
8 interesting.

9 Commissioner Kruglyak, when you were speaking in the  
10 presentation, you spoke concerning a conversation you all  
11 had or in the presentation about understanding the  
12 weighting of comments and a desire to incentivize be it  
13 the conflicting individual comments or the group comments  
14 and considering ways to get that done.

15 I'd be curious to know a bit more about how you all  
16 determined that or if it was -- what did you use exactly?  
17 It was something that we struggled with, group comments  
18 as opposed to individuals, and then the repetitiveness of  
19 the comments.

20 So I was just curious to hear more about that and  
21 wanted to join, I think it was Commissioner Sinay that  
22 spoke to the compensation piece in relation to the  
23 fairness of participants and how that is a barrier for me  
24 to participate. So many times we said we want there to  
25 be greater diversity, but recognizing that there will

1 never be the desired level of diversity if there is not  
2 the proper level of compensation to be able to  
3 participate. Thank you.

4 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner  
5 Turner. Those are the questions for now. Back over to  
6 you.

7 CHAIRMAN BAME: Colleagues?

8 COMMISSIONER INMAN: Well, this is Ken. I can speak  
9 to the integration of COI input into our systems and  
10 such. We had a custom solution that our demographer put  
11 out, and it was designed to directly take that input  
12 straight into the mapping tools that they were using. So  
13 it was kind of a -- it was it was internal and it was  
14 plugged straight in to our systems and software that they  
15 were using.

16 So that doesn't mean that if we knew upfront kind of  
17 specs and parameters for some other solution, that we  
18 couldn't integrate with that because you could. What we  
19 ended up doing is exporting things as shape files all the  
20 time because we did have to push stuff out. If people  
21 would request certain maps or certain information, we  
22 would convert all that to shape files. But that is an  
23 industry standard. And so things were centralized around  
24 shape files that would be very easy to exchange them.

25 The other thing is the categorization of data and



1 the collection of unstructured data. How are you going  
2 to manage that and put it in? We did try several times  
3 to extract information from your tool and from the City  
4 tool here in San Diego. The problem is there was just no  
5 good way to do it.

6 They were just basically data dumps into Excel or  
7 something with links and such. And we did import  
8 actually a bunch of that data, but it was a lot of work.  
9 So the systems weren't set up to share data. If we set  
10 it up that way beforehand, obviously it would be a much  
11 better solution and take a lot less.

12 I think the other thing that we were concerned about  
13 is disclosing upfront that if somebody provides us  
14 information, we're going to share that with other  
15 redistricting commissions. We didn't do that. I mean,  
16 the -- I think all of our disclosures were about we're  
17 going to use this for our purposes. And so the lawyers  
18 or the legal side of it probably need to get cover to  
19 make sure people understand that potentially this is  
20 going to be shared with other entities that are doing the  
21 same thing. But that's my -- that's what I got to say  
22 about that. If you have any other questions, happy to  
23 answer.

24 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: And I just wanted to also add  
25 that we, the Commissioners, we did ask for our



1 demographers to try and pull data from the State and City  
2 and whatever. And the demographers were also another  
3 group who found the project a lot more time and effort  
4 intensive than they initially expected. And in the end,  
5 it was a tradeoff. They said, well, we can try and see  
6 what we can do about using this data, but there are other  
7 things that might not get done that need to get done. So  
8 we had, we as commissioners, basically had to sort of  
9 back off that request, as I recall. And you can correct  
10 me if I'm wrong.

11 But a couple of other things. The working groups,  
12 we did not use working groups for the mapping process,  
13 but it was part of our Lessons Learned. We felt like so  
14 all of our mapping was done with all of the Commissioners  
15 at meetings. And as with any sort of group dynamic,  
16 there are always the people who sort of speak first,  
17 speak often and sort of lead -- and whose voices are  
18 maybe -- carry a bit more end up carry more weight. And  
19 so there was that that happened.

20 And so anyway, the working groups was something that  
21 I saw that the L.A. County Redistricting Commission used.  
22 They used small working groups, and they were under --  
23 they were like three or four commissioners. And they met  
24 and were assigned specific areas of L.A. County, which is  
25 obviously is a huge county with even more people than we

1 have -- a lot more people. And they met on Zoom and  
2 those meetings were streamed live.

3 So I think that, A, they were small working groups  
4 and they were open to the public when they were meeting  
5 to discuss maps. And then they would then bring the  
6 results of that small working group together and meet as  
7 a full Commission. And that was just a suggestion for  
8 how the Commission might work in the future, because it  
9 was really unwieldy and maybe not optimal the way we did  
10 it. Always all commissioners over a long -- all have  
11 very long meetings.

12 And the other thing I think that I just wanted to  
13 point out was that and I think it's in our Lessons  
14 Learned is for the early public comment to sort of not  
15 get short shrift. As once you start publishing maps and  
16 draft maps, the public comes out and you start hearing a  
17 lot of things that maybe at the end that is different  
18 than or emphasizes different things than the people who  
19 commented earlier on. And so just -- that's another  
20 thing that I recall that we talked about in our Lessons  
21 Learned.

22 And then just finally, really quickly, I wanted to  
23 just clarify something. We actually were in San Diego  
24 County, the first independent redistricting commission.  
25 There was not a previous independent redistricting





1 commission.

2 In 2010, I think there was a group of judges who  
3 were appointed. So it wasn't the County Board of  
4 Supervisors who drew their own maps. It was somebody  
5 else. But we were the first citizens appointed to an  
6 independent redistricting commission. So we were  
7 starting really from ground zero.

8 I don't know, Kristine, if you have anything else to  
9 add.

10 COMMISSIONER KRUGLYAK: I would speak specifically  
11 to the question about how to incentivize group comments.  
12 So, I recall once we had a large number of people who  
13 were really emphasizing the same point. And Chair Bame  
14 handled it, I thought very eloquently, which was -- he  
15 actually sent around -- it was live. Most people were.

16 It was when we had a hybrid meeting and most people  
17 were actually present in the room. And he sent around  
18 effectively a petition so that everyone who wanted to  
19 speak to effectively the same point could sign and say,  
20 yes, I am here to make this same point. I am here to  
21 make this same point. And so we had a record of the  
22 support, the quantifiable record of the support for the  
23 number of people who were there to make that point. So  
24 that was one thing that in that case worked very well.

25 Our Lessons Learned has several ideas. So



1 potentially incentivized groups by proportionally longer  
2 speaking times. If there is only one speaker  
3 representing the group, there is something to that effect  
4 right now where I think speaker groups got approximately  
5 twice as long as individual speakers, but it certainly  
6 wasn't proportional to the number of speakers in that  
7 group.

8       And so often if there were ten people in a group and  
9 they got four minutes or they could have gotten one  
10 minute per speaker, they still end up getting ten minutes  
11 if all ten of them speak individually as opposed to four  
12 as a group.

13       So if there is a way to perhaps more objectively  
14 incentivize group feedback, technology could support a  
15 way to upvote a particular user's feedback if you agree  
16 with it. There are a lot of ideas that are thrown about  
17 and certainly the technology will have evolved by the  
18 next commission, but it's certainly something that's  
19 worthwhile to think about.

20       COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Very good.

21       Commissioner Fernandez?

22       COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. And thank you  
23 all for being on the panel. It's actually great. We  
24 always talk about sharing the pain. So you shared our  
25 pain. And it's nice to see that we did have the same

1 issues and same concerns. So it's really good to  
2 collaborate afterwards. And we did have, I guess,  
3 informal working groups with the mapping because early on  
4 we realized that if we try to do all the mapping online,  
5 it would be twenty-four-hour days, we would have no rest.

6 So we were at one point or some of us were able to  
7 download the, the software and we were able to kind of go  
8 home and try to see if our idea would work, because there  
9 were times when we'd go -- try to go through a process  
10 for an hour and realize it wasn't going to work. So we  
11 were trying to save time.

12 And then at some point there was one or two of us,  
13 no more than two, so that we wouldn't have to -- wouldn't  
14 have to be a public meeting, would actually meet with one  
15 of the mappers and try to come up with solutions, and  
16 then we'd bring that back. So we felt that that was  
17 useful and helpful in trying to move things forward. So  
18 thank you for that.

19 And then also, I believe one of your comments talked  
20 about the chair and vice chair and the workload. And I  
21 guess my assumption is that you had the same chair and  
22 vice chair throughout and we rotated, which was great.  
23 Fortunately, as we were wise enough or I don't know what  
24 it was, but yes, it would have been too much of a  
25 workload issue if you would have kept the same chair and

1 vice chair. But again, thank you so much for sharing  
2 this and for volunteering your time.

3 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner  
4 Fernandez.

5 Commissioner Fornaciari?

6 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I was going to kind  
7 of share what Commissioner Fernandez shared. We found it  
8 was really effective to assign one or two commissioners  
9 to work with the demographers to solve an individual  
10 mapping problem or area and come back with a proposed  
11 solution or proposed solutions. Super effective and we  
12 kept it less than two people to not violate the Bagley-  
13 Keene.

14 But I did want to make sure we captured a point that  
15 came up, if I could offer this to the Lessons Learned  
16 Committee, and that is when in the future, when we design  
17 systems data or data storage systems that we design with  
18 the intent of sharing. I think that's really, really  
19 important. And that that's going to be a key point that  
20 we need to make sure happens next time.

21 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner  
22 Fornaciari.

23 Commissioners Sinay?

24 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. And again, I'm just  
25 a -- kudos to all the work that you all did. And I



1 did --

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Recording in progress.

3 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I did share at one point, that  
4 I really appreciate letting you all created districts the  
5 data the piece that went with that each of the districts  
6 that kind of said these are the assets in that District.  
7 These are the school districts. These are the military  
8 installations, since we have so many in San Diego County.

9 And I wanted to ask you all, did you all come up  
10 with that as part of your criteria on how you wanted to  
11 make sure you were looking at districts deeper than just  
12 the voter information, but really getting a good feel.  
13 How did you come up with that? Because I think in some  
14 ways that was the piece that we were missing and we were  
15 frustrated about a few times.

16 And also, sometimes we forget, why did we make a --  
17 why did we move this line originally or why did we draw  
18 this line? So if you dealt with any of it, if you found  
19 the solution to answering that question.

20 COMMISSIONER INMAN: So it evolved. This is what I  
21 would say. We first started with just like pretty  
22 pictures, maps with colors that looked good with roads.  
23 But we, the commissioners themselves, very soon started  
24 asking questions about, well, did we split this? Did we  
25 split that? The demographers actually came back to us

1 and said, well, you got to worry about certain  
2 geographies, like if you're splitting cities, if you're  
3 splitting planning districts and things like that.

4 And so we very quickly ousted the demographers just  
5 identify any legal entity that's easy to identify within  
6 the databases and give us a list, kind of organize them  
7 somehow and tell us whether or not we're splitting it.  
8 Fire districts, reservations, school districts. And that  
9 became important for us as commissioners. I mean, it  
10 helped us as much as anything else.

11 And that's why we asked for it in the in the packet  
12 that the demographers returned to us so we could  
13 understand just what the heck we were doing. And then it  
14 became part of the report, so.

15 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you.

16 Commissioner Andersen?

17 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you very much  
18 again for all the work that you've done, particularly  
19 when I realized that you didn't get paid for it, because  
20 it's an enormous amount of work. And I completely agree  
21 that because of that, it is a real problem getting  
22 inclusivity and diversity on the commission because you  
23 have to -- essentially you have to be retired, you have  
24 to have another source of income essentially during that  
25 time.

1 But my question actually is quite simple. You had  
2 great demographers. They really were looking out for  
3 you. They were able to get -- we actually were asking  
4 for more information. And a lot of it was just across  
5 the state, where are all the school districts? Think of  
6 trying to get all that information. It was just almost  
7 impossible. Who was your demographer or did you have  
8 several groups?

9 COMMISSIONER INMAN: So we actually had access to  
10 county data as well, which was very useful. The County  
11 maintains a very comprehensive GIS database. And so our  
12 demographers pulled county or school districts and a lot  
13 of local jurisdictions out of the database maintained by  
14 the County. And so that was that was very positive for  
15 us. It was very easy to extract all that information.  
16 And then census maintained just a lot of -- in and out of  
17 area boundaries that they use for mapping purposes,  
18 cities, and jurisdictions and things like that. It is a  
19 senior moment. I can't remember the name of our

20 demographer. How terrible it is that of me? Somebody --

21 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: FLO. Ken, it was --

22 COMMISSIONER INMAN: FLO. FLO. Thank you, Rosette,  
23 for that. Yes. They're based out of Portland, Oregon.  
24 That's where they're headquartered out of. And they were  
25 extremely knowledgeable. They did the prior



1 redistricting work mainly for school districts and some  
2 subcontract entities and things like that.

3 But then they got into the mix with 2020 census data  
4 to do actual redistricting at a higher level. But they  
5 were very -- they were they were great. They would they  
6 would spend as much time as we were spending. I mean,  
7 they would work long hours and overnight so that we could  
8 have product the next day.

9 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Thank you.

10 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Perfect. Thanks.

11 Commissioner Sinay?

12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry, I keep trying to think  
13 of Lessons Learned across both at the local level and  
14 county. And I've done a lot of thinking around this. I  
15 would say one lesson learned was I so appreciated  
16 participating in outreach and engagement with  
17 Commissioner Garcia. I think she and I had -- we had  
18 fun. We learned a lot about each other's process. But  
19 if we all just kind of include in our reports when  
20 possible, try to coordinate or try to do a presentation  
21 together because that worked out. The League of Women  
22 Voters sponsored it and we came up with a whole different  
23 way of presenting versus Here's my PowerPoint, here's  
24 your PowerPoint. And we just interviewed each other  
25 because we thought it would be too confusing if we did





1 two separate PowerPoints for people to understand. The  
2 whole idea of a timeline, and this was one of the  
3 conversations that came up at that state conference that  
4 we went to, ideally, people would get their feet wet at a  
5 city redistricting effort and then go to the county  
6 redistricting effort and then go to the state with what  
7 happened with census. That just doesn't work. And then  
8 I also have learned that you need the state redistricting  
9 efforts to kind of for some of the stuff for at the  
10 county level. So it's tough. But if you all could talk  
11 a little bit about timeline and your thoughts on what  
12 would -- how it could be easier with -- when you have  
13 independent redistricting commissions at the city, county  
14 and state level.

15 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Over to you.

16 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: David? I --

17 CHAIRMAN BAME: Sorry. Yeah, I -- Commissioner  
18 Andersen had her hand up, but that's down. Good. Yeah.  
19 Without any other questions, let me make sure Rosette,  
20 Christine, and Ken don't have anything to add, and then  
21 I'll try to just add two sense.

22 COMMISSIONER GARCIA: Well, Patricia was asking  
23 about collaborating at the -- or how all of the different  
24 redistricting commissions could work together. And I  
25 think, Patricia, what you were saying about -- in an in

1 an entity like San Diego County, where we had many,  
2 actually many -- well, not independent redistricting, but  
3 many commissions working, it might be nice to do a  
4 collaborative meeting with several commissions or  
5 representatives from all the commissions having a joint  
6 public outreach sort of meeting to just raise public  
7 awareness.

8       The truth is that a lot of the public doesn't even  
9 know about redistricting, know that it's happening, know  
10 what it is, know what it means. So just more outreach  
11 and education. And I think bringing the groups together  
12 would get more public involved. Right. Because if you  
13 live in Chula Vista, they might not know about the  
14 county, but they might know about their city. So that  
15 would raise awareness that it's happening at the county  
16 level and that it's happening at the state level.

17       I'm not sure if I'm answering your question,  
18 Patricia, but I think more of that and certainly being  
19 led by the -- by the state commissioners would probably  
20 be a very good approach to take.

21       CHAIRMAN BAME: Ken? Kristina?

22       COMMISSIONER KRUGLYAK: I agree with that in terms  
23 of the joint outreach. And I think that the more that --  
24 if it's not possible to actually build shared data  
25 resources to at least align on format like Ken was saying

1 so that really everything is not just, oh, at least it's  
2 a shared format, we can export easy. If it's truly a  
3 shared resource that everyone's looking at, I think that  
4 would be extremely helpful as well. So from the outreach  
5 through the data analysis, I think more would be  
6 fantastic.

7 CHAIRMAN BAME: Good. So let me offer some thoughts  
8 that build on what colleagues have said that I hope  
9 address some of the questions. But thank you very much  
10 for the comments and questions because we are still going  
11 to maintain a Lessons Learned process throughout our ten-  
12 year mandate. And I'm sure we'll be in touch with you.  
13 I hope you won't mind if we request to come back and have  
14 a further discussion of some of these and other issues  
15 come up.

16 I think one of the key themes, though, maybe the key  
17 theme is work up front and being aware of things as early  
18 as possible and that's across the board, particularly  
19 because this was a new experience for us and for the  
20 county. We are one of two counties with our friends in  
21 L.A. County to be under state law.

22 So it wasn't just a matter of figuring out our  
23 mandate and our bylaws, but to work from the law. And  
24 that required the county staff and county counsel to  
25 figure out what they were operating on. And as Rosette



1 said, that raised some questions that we had to work  
2 through. I'm also very conscious and will continue to  
3 say that each Commission is different.

4 And while I think your model of doing work was  
5 amazing and outstanding, and frankly, my only critique  
6 would be that you should have asked for more money  
7 earlier for yourselves, given the hours and input you all  
8 were putting in.

9 I do think the questions of things like rotating  
10 chair and co-vice chairs, how working groups work, I  
11 think the key is to educate incoming commissions and  
12 commissioners and staffs preparing for those commissions  
13 on what the options are. And that will help them have a  
14 discussion again early on about how that might work.

15 I should note for the record, we actually had two  
16 Co-vice chairs, so I was chairing, Rosette was one of our  
17 Co-vice chairs and Amy Katarina was our other Co-vice  
18 chair. She planned to be here today, but unfortunately  
19 got called away to a meeting.

20 But having that structure was certainly helpful.  
21 Yes, there were a lot of hours, but I think, as you all  
22 saw, sometimes that continuity has some advantages. And  
23 that's where I'd say it's really a matter of what kind of  
24 commission you have and who's on it.

25 And to get to the point, the Commissioner Sinay,



1 Sadhwani, Turner, and I'm sure all of you agree, having  
2 that diverse pool and having the resources that enable  
3 people who want to serve to serve is extremely valuable  
4 and helpful. Compensation is part of that. Getting out  
5 of the pandemic is part of that.

6 I was hopeful right up to the last minute we were  
7 going to hire interns at least to work virtually. Again,  
8 a bridge too far, not necessarily paid interns, but  
9 younger folks who wanted to get interested in this and  
10 probably would be able to serve down the line.

11 In any case, that upfront work also affects the data  
12 question. I do think there's some legal issues that  
13 might be worth a separate discussion down the line on how  
14 commissioners can share data and how that does or does  
15 not meet the requirements for COI input.

16 But I think that could be eased if those early  
17 templates could have things like here are the commissions  
18 that affect your address or your zip code. Which ones do  
19 you want to address with your input? And they can check  
20 a box. Now you've got something that is good from it, or  
21 at least better from the beginning that's a little better  
22 addressed.

23 Where we actually had county staff going back to  
24 people who had said, I want to comment on the change in  
25 this part of California that wasn't actually under the

1 County of San Diego, and they were kind enough to get  
2 back to them. And I think some of that input was  
3 actually resubmitted and rerouted. So it can all be  
4 done. I think there needs to be a fair bit more  
5 discussion of it, but I'm really glad you are talking to  
6 so many different folks about it and we'll be happy to  
7 continue in that dialog.

8 On the question of staff and procedures and all  
9 that, it's really tough. I think our Commission had a  
10 variety of opinions about how the staff did and did not  
11 make themselves available. I was certainly able to call  
12 staff sometimes at ridiculous amounts of time of early  
13 morning hour phone calls. But these were the staff who  
14 were also from the health department working on COVID.  
15 So it really was a conundrum.

16 I think the final result was fine, but I think it  
17 again needs to be a conscious decision early on. And  
18 that, of course, is a little separate from the entire  
19 discussion of counsel and what's involved in that. That  
20 I think deserves a deeper look. You'll see some things  
21 in our report on it. I know you all have worked on it.

22 With regard to ad hoc committees and working groups,  
23 again, I think that's partly up to the Commission. I did  
24 want -- to the individual commission of the time, I did  
25 want to comment that we found the ad hoc committees when

1 assigned a specific task to be extremely productive in a  
2 way to get commissioners into -- who might otherwise be a  
3 little shy to get into the active discussion.

4 And then the final point I'd make is just on all of  
5 this, technology is going to change dramatically between  
6 now and the next census and the next redistricting effort  
7 if you just think of the difference from 2010 to 2020.

8 So being aware and being active on that and again,  
9 to build on your comment that we take the ten-year  
10 mandate seriously, I think taking a good long look at how  
11 technology is working as we get closer, as census work is  
12 formulated and the advantage of the statewide database  
13 whose folks are really, really, really amazing dialog  
14 with the Registrars of Voters, dialog with legislative  
15 staff and encounters with other commissioners.

16 We had calls from city commissioners in the county  
17 asking for advice or to run an idea by. The Patricia and  
18 Rosette show was wonderful to watch. I hope everyone  
19 gets a chance to see that. But the conversations I had  
20 with several of you at different times about things going  
21 on at the State level. All invaluable and if nothing  
22 else, for a chance to commiserate. So strongly, endorse  
23 all of that and really, really appreciate all the great  
24 comments that were made.

25 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so



1 much, Chairman Bame and the other members and staff of  
2 the San Diego County Independent Redistricting  
3 Commission. Thank you for joining us today. Thank you  
4 for sharing your thoughts and experiences. It is time  
5 for our break. I will turn it back over to the chair and  
6 then the Lessons Learned Subcommittee will just need a  
7 few minutes at some point after the break to finish up.  
8 But thank you all for joining us today.

9 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.  
10 Thank you to all of our panelists. Thank you for  
11 joining us. And that was a wonderful sharing of your  
12 Lessons Learned and a great conversation. We're going to  
13 go ahead and take our fifteen-minute break. Let's return  
14 at 11:16.

15 (Whereupon, a recess was held)

16 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right. Thank you very much.  
17 Welcome back, everybody. Hope you enjoyed that  
18 fifteen -- but short break. A fifteen-minute break.  
19 Okay. We're going to resume with our Lessons Learned  
20 Subcommittee. They are going to complete the remaining  
21 portion of their update and then we will after that  
22 return back to our director updates.

23 Okay. Commissioner Kennedy?

24 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. This is  
25 just to highlight that our draft, a very early draft of





1 our Lessons Learned report, was placed on the website  
2 this past Friday afternoon as a handout. We look forward  
3 to having an extended discussion on the draft. Given the  
4 other items on the agenda for today, we are not  
5 necessarily counting on having that discussion today.

6 We do look forward to getting input from  
7 commissioners as well as external stakeholders. Those  
8 can be sent in to the VotersFIRSTAct@crc.ca.gov email  
9 address. And then we would ask that those be into us by  
10 the 31st of December. Commissioner Yee and I will then  
11 work on getting a revised draft out prior to the January  
12 meeting and would look forward to a lively discussion at  
13 that point.

14 So Commissioner Yee, anything further?

15 COMMISSIONER YEE: I do want to mention the use of  
16 the Word version attachments for commissioners. So I  
17 believe Director Hernandez sent to the commissioners each  
18 a Word version, which they can comment in directly. And  
19 so we'll have you each comment on your own copy so that  
20 we don't have everyone working on the same copy that  
21 seemed like that would be too complicated. And then  
22 we'll consolidate all those comments together.

23 So go ahead -- or if you'd rather just make a list,  
24 just make a separate list of that, it's -- just as long  
25 as it's clear, we'll follow that as well if that works

1 better for you.

2 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Excellent. Thank you very much.  
3 Looks like we have a question or comment from  
4 Commissioner Sinay.

5 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes. I think December 31st is  
6 not doable. Could we extend that deadline? We're not  
7 right doing the maps right now. We had a pretty great --  
8 yeah, this next few weeks is pretty busy for everybody.  
9 So if we could extend that deadline.

10 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: My sense on that would be  
11 that, yes, we can extend the deadline. We would not then  
12 plan to have a robust discussion at the January meeting  
13 on the basis of a new version of the draft. We could  
14 certainly have a robust discussion on the current draft,  
15 in which case, if -- I mean, we could extend it to  
16 January the 10th and just have a discussion on the  
17 current draft and not see a new version of the draft  
18 until the subsequent meeting.

19 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I like that idea better. Just  
20 because then we can -- I mean, we're a group that listens  
21 well to each other and does change our minds. And so if  
22 we all send our comments, we don't know what others are  
23 saying. And then that makes it more that -- then the  
24 folks who get the final say on which ones are going to  
25 say yes or no to end up being the two of you.



1 Not that I don't trust you, but I think a robust  
2 discussion on this, we would then be in more agreement  
3 and not to bring in typos and edits, all that you send in  
4 a list, but on topics or something that's been lost.

5 Like if you could send us a criteria on what the  
6 discussion will be and we call each other on when we're  
7 going into the weeds and we shouldn't be there.

8 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. I mean, I would be  
9 okay with that. And Commissioner Yee and I have  
10 discussed this in the in the context of the subcommittee  
11 recognizing that whatever draft we finally table for  
12 Commission consideration is solely a recommendation. It  
13 is not a final action. So any final action on what the  
14 report says or doesn't say is going to be up to the full  
15 Commission.

16 Our function as a subcommittee is to put in front of  
17 you the best draft that we can. But then, yes, it will  
18 be up to the full Commission.

19 Commissioner Yee, anything else?

20 COMMISSIONER YEE: Just to say, I think Commissioner  
21 Kennedy and I actually are really enjoying working on  
22 this. And so to extend it actually is a pleasure, in  
23 fact, and to continue improving it. I should mention  
24 also that Chief Counsel has reviewed this current draft  
25 just so you know, of course, he will continue to review

1 further drafts. He has checked this draft as it is.

2 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I do see two additional  
3 comments or questions that have come up. I'm going to  
4 start with Commissioner Turner.

5 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair.

6 Commissioner Kennedy, can I have you comment on  
7 the -- your thoughts on the benefit or perhaps  
8 problematic nature of two robust conversations, one being  
9 on a one first draft and then a second one on the same?  
10 Do we think it'll be duplicative at all? And I'm just  
11 wanting to understand the value in to robust  
12 conversations, particularly when something may change.

13 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, I think Commissioner  
14 Yee and I see this as a as a project. And the ultimate  
15 goal is to have something that the full Commission is  
16 happy with, not necessarily under any time pressures.  
17 The objective of this is to ensure that the 2030  
18 Commission has an easier time of things than we had.

19 That's always been the purpose of the of the Lessons  
20 Learned exercise, the Lessons Learned Subcommittee. And  
21 so we are mindful that things like legislative and  
22 legislative changes would need to be in place before the  
23 2030 Commission. But again, we're not in a hurry. We  
24 would much rather focus on quality than speed.

25 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Certainly. Let me let me fix



1 what I'm saying Commissioner Kennedy. Speaking  
2 specifically, we have a timeline now and I understand  
3 perhaps the need for pushing it out, extending it beyond  
4 your given deadline of December 31st. And then to  
5 Commissioner Sinay's comment and then response that we'll  
6 have still the first robust discussion anyway and then  
7 have a second one. So I think there is an added in. But  
8 I was speaking about the delay more so than the desire to  
9 have a deep conversation.

10 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. I'm still not quite  
11 following. But I mean, it's certainly true that --  
12 trying to get a full thorough review in the next couple  
13 of weeks is probably a stretch. So delaying things out  
14 just to give everyone time to review and focus and  
15 provide the best feedback possible in the process would  
16 be great.

17 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Kennedy and  
18 Commissioner Yee, maybe it might be helpful for us to  
19 understand the larger context of what the total timeline  
20 is. What is the impact of this delay that's being  
21 requested versus sticking to the timeline as it is right  
22 now? And I'm only saying that in the context of we're  
23 staring down several things. One is we did decide to  
24 calendar monthly meetings, mostly just in case for these  
25 reasons. We also have declared that we reserve the

1 option to cancel if we don't need a meeting. So that's  
2 another thought there too.

3 In addition, we're -- we have budget for the  
4 remainder of this fiscal year, there are going to be  
5 different things that are going to obviously be coming  
6 about. I want to remain mindful of -- beyond the first  
7 draft and the robust discussion that's desired around the  
8 draft, what else is going to be required in terms of  
9 time, in terms of work?

10 What is the intent in terms of what is going to be  
11 the final outcome or the final product going to look  
12 like? I think we may need to think about working  
13 backwards from there. And then that may also determine  
14 whether or not this timeline is going to need to remain  
15 as is or whether or not we have the room to shift.

16 Because I think either way, even if we get your  
17 comments by December 31st, then you get us a new draft, I  
18 think we're just going to have a robust discussion  
19 anyways regardless. I think that's just how we as a body  
20 are and will continue to debate and to discuss whether or  
21 not -- whatever the way it's written right now is  
22 acceptable to everybody. So maybe that might be helpful.

23 And then so with that in mind, I also want to  
24 acknowledge that Commissioner Fernandez does have her  
25 hand up too. So I just want to be mindful of that. So I

1 don't know if that would -- that maybe helps. I think  
2 Commissioner Turner is that kind of along the lines of  
3 what you're asking?

4 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I think what I'm  
5 trying to ask is, is that I'm -- I am very appreciative  
6 and I have had an opportunity to look, and I've had a lot  
7 of comments on the extensive work that's been done. What  
8 I'm hearing is, is that each of the Commissioners, if I  
9 understand the process, will now make -- of course,  
10 respond to what has been presented.

11 Initially, that deadline was by December 31st. We  
12 would have all of those. And we know we typically have  
13 lots of thoughts about anything. And so when we -- when  
14 we receive all of the thoughts, there will be -- or we'll  
15 have a discussion and we've not received all of the  
16 thoughts, and then we will get thoughts and have more  
17 discussion.

18 And to me, it just seems like for the amount of  
19 conversation that we typically like to have, that we will  
20 be having conversation on something that we know is going  
21 to change. And so I was asking about the double  
22 conversation on something that may not even be the final  
23 product because we would not have received the input yet.

24 If we have one robust conversation and then receive  
25 input and then have another one, it will look very



1 different. And I was just wondering if it was beneficial  
2 to have both. And I'm hearing that you think so and  
3 that's okay. But that was what I was raising.

4 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, I think it's going to  
5 depend somewhat on what the actual feedback is. I mean,  
6 whether it's a lot of small things that really don't bear  
7 much discussion, that's easy. If it starts getting into  
8 larger issues that we may not agree about or just are  
9 larger issues and then we'll need more discussion. So I  
10 think it's hard to predict at this point. It really  
11 depends on the feedback that we actually do get.

12 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Fernandez?

13 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I  
14 did kind of want to bring up what you brought up, Chair,  
15 regarding the budget for this fiscal year and trying to  
16 get as much of it done before the end of the fiscal year.  
17 I'm sure you, too, probably want to get it done before  
18 the end of the fiscal year.

19 And knowing my procrastinator tendencies, it doesn't  
20 matter what deadline you give me, I'll still do it all  
21 the way to the end of whatever that deadline is. And  
22 I'll meet it. And maybe it's helpful to understand that  
23 it's a Lessons Learned up until a point in time, because  
24 we still have, what, seven more years as a Commission,  
25 right?



1           And so we may have some additional Lessons Learned,  
2 but as a Commission, if we just understand, it's just  
3 Lessons Learned for the first two years. Right? We  
4 might have a smaller one later on. I think that's easier  
5 for us and more palatable moving forward. And maybe we  
6 take the first half of it -- first half of Lessons  
7 Learned. And that's what we're going to talk about in  
8 January. Maybe the second half will be February, maybe  
9 cut it up in pieces. It might be more doable.

10           But I just want to thank you both for putting this  
11 together, putting all our random thoughts. And I applaud  
12 you for being able to write this into one document  
13 concisely. So thank you so much.

14           COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner  
15 Fernandez. As Commissioner Yee said, it has been a labor  
16 of love. It has been a labor because the database -- the  
17 spreadsheet with all of the inputs from all of the  
18 sources totaled something like 1,400 lines of input that  
19 have been distilled down into roughly seventy-five pages.  
20 And yes, I am very cognizant of the end of the fiscal  
21 year, and I would like to see the final product completed  
22 by then.

23           And on the segment, I think you're right. And this  
24 is why the Lessons Learned Subcommittee had even  
25 organized an initial Lessons Learned discussion last

1 August before we went into the mapping so that we were  
2 closer in our minds and our memories to what we had done  
3 during the education phase and the cumulative interest  
4 phase so that those wouldn't be forgotten. And I think  
5 you make a very good point that coming back to Lessons  
6 Learned in 2028 or something is going to make a lot of  
7 sense for us. So thank you for that. Yeah.

8 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. And I do want to echo  
9 what Commissioner Fernandez said about the work that both  
10 you and Commissioner Yee have done, Commissioner Kennedy.  
11 I think this is this -- my initial read of it. It's a  
12 fantastic product, and I think it's going to be  
13 definitely very helpful. And I do like the idea of  
14 perhaps coming back and doing a end of term Lessons  
15 Learned.

16 Because as was stated, this is just really the first  
17 portion of the work that -- of our life as a commission  
18 that that's been done. And I think this is a very  
19 important part, but it'll be interesting to see what in  
20 its entirety, I think that still gets back to what she  
21 did raise and what would be your recommendation based on  
22 the inputs that you've heard so far around the concerns  
23 around timeline, budget and other things like that?

24 I'm also concerned that we're going to not have as  
25 much staff. And so as much as we appreciate all of the

1 work that you've done, we would hate to see that more  
2 work falls on you when we can try to take advantage of  
3 the staff that we have on right now. So I think that's  
4 where I'm coming from in terms of also asking about  
5 timeline and want to also defer to you, but also try to  
6 get a little bit more of a concreteness in terms of  
7 understanding what's really real. So that I think to the  
8 point that Commissioner Fernandez said, I think we'll all  
9 work to the deadline no matter what it is.

10 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. And at this point, I  
11 would say that if the Chair could give Commissioner Yee  
12 and me some time to discuss these particular concerns,  
13 we'll get back to you with some thoughts.

14 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Perhaps then what we could do is  
15 come back when we reconvene on the subcommittee reports.  
16 We could just have you come back at the end of those  
17 reports to just let us know what you decided, because  
18 then that will include the lunch period as well, too.  
19 And then that way you could let us know what would be  
20 most doable. Since you're closest to this work, we don't  
21 want to artificially say it should be early or later, so.  
22 Okay.

23 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Great.

24 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you so much for that.

25 COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.



1 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Excellent. Thank you. All right.  
2 Let's go ahead. Let's return back -- okay. So I do want  
3 to say we're going to return back to the director  
4 reports. And then at which time, after the director  
5 reports have concluded, we'll take public comment and  
6 then we'll go -- we'll resume the subcommittee updates  
7 and then at which time once all the subcommittee updates  
8 are completed, will then resume, or we will then take  
9 public comment. So I'm going to turn back to Executive  
10 Director Hernandez to take us through the remainder of  
11 the executive director update.

12 MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. I'm going to  
13 refer to the handout, Current and Ongoing Budget Status.  
14 I'm going to share my screen here. So basically when we  
15 submitted our BCP back in February, what you see there on  
16 the top table is what was approved. We had asked for a  
17 lot more.

18 Some of the items that we subsequently requested  
19 again are listed below, and I'll get to that in just a  
20 second. But this is what was approved beginning fiscal  
21 year or current year, '22/'23. Now, we're only going to  
22 focus on this part of it. There is also monies that were  
23 previously allocated in the Budget Act of 2021 that goes  
24 through the June of 2023, but those are for post-map  
25 activities.



1           And so just say that, so that you understand there  
2 is some activities that are being paid for from those  
3 funds, but these are the funds that were allocated for  
4 the current year which include funds for our SSM1, funds  
5 for the website, the initial cost of for converting it to  
6 the new format DGS contract.

7           So that's a lot of the services, contracting  
8 services, personnel, accounting services that are  
9 provided by DGS and other in our agencies. And that  
10 total for this current fiscal year is 243,000. For  
11 subsequent years, beginning '23/'24. So that would be  
12 July one of 2023 through fiscal year '29/'30. This  
13 second column is what has been approved for the  
14 commission.

15           You have the SSM1 salary or benefits. You have  
16 ongoing costs and maintenance for the website, DGS cost,  
17 you have per diem. Now they've only approved the  
18 Commission for four meetings per year and that's just for  
19 the Commission nurse to attend the meeting. They did  
20 include some travel costs because they indicated that  
21 based on possible Bagley-Keene changes that we might have  
22 to be in person.

23           So they allowed this \$14,000 for that travel cost.  
24 What they did not include were the costs for the  
25 videographer services, our ASL, transcription. Some of



1 the other services that we need for Commission meetings.  
2 So that's essentially what we have 216,268 for fiscal  
3 years '23/'24 through '29/'30. So each year we'll have  
4 that same allocation of 216,000.

5 So what we did, because after we looked at that, we  
6 realized there was a lot of a lot of services and needs  
7 that the Commission had that were not approved in that  
8 initial BCP. We submitted a secondary BCP in October to  
9 address the gaps that we identified. One of the major  
10 gaps that we identified was office space.

11 The Commission needs to have office space for a  
12 number of different services where the invoices go. We  
13 can't really have a P.O. box that's not appropriate.  
14 Some individuals or organizations will not mail to appeal  
15 box, especially if you're a state agency. So we assumed  
16 that was going to be a no brainer.

17 Obviously, it was not given what Department of  
18 Finance has responded to. So we have the office space.  
19 We also have the Office 365. Essentially, this is how  
20 all the communication happens with the Commission.  
21 Everything is through the Office 365. We also have our  
22 document storage in Office 365.

23 It's essentially our server for e-file storage  
24 purposes. And then it also is a way for the for the  
25 Commissioners to communicate using teams. So they've



1 also denied that. And that was part of the original  
2 request as well. Then, you have the commission cell  
3 phones, another way for commissioners to communicate.

4 And as we've mentioned before, we're trying to make  
5 sure that the commissioners are not co-mingling  
6 equipment, using the phone, using email and things of  
7 that nature, just to make sure that, if there's ever any  
8 question, it's all within the State equipment that is  
9 being used.

10 State storage, we have a number of boxes, a number  
11 of files from the carried over from 2010 that we have.  
12 We have some hard copy documents from the 2020 Commission  
13 that we need to store. And so we listed the storage cost  
14 based on the square footage that we would need. And that  
15 was also part of what was denied.

16 Retired annuitants -- let me back up. The retired  
17 annuitants is basically for IT, legal, and accounting as  
18 needed. That was just a projection because the  
19 assumption was that we weren't going to have full time  
20 staff. So having retired annuitants in these particular  
21 areas would help the Commission identify or work on any  
22 of the issues that may come up.

23 With legal, you would have Bagley-Keene obviously.  
24 The Department of Finance has recommended that we go to  
25 the attorney General's office. We are looking into that.

1 But as far as the IT support, that would be anything that  
2 needs to be done from a night perspective. Obviously,  
3 Corina has experience there, but she is going to have a  
4 wealth of other activities and responsibilities to focus  
5 on. So we're hoping that that would be available.

6 And then the accounting, depending on how much work  
7 is there, there does need to be someone that can help  
8 Corina when needed to process either TEC's or anything --  
9 other invoices that may come in throughout that time  
10 frame. Postage and office supplies, basic needs.

11 Sometimes we have to mail out information to you, the  
12 commissioners, so we need to have some funding for that.  
13 It's minimal, but it's also necessary for the Commission.

14 And then for actual meetings, you have to have  
15 videography, ASL, transcriptions for those four meetings  
16 that have already been approved for the commissioners.  
17 And so that's where that 31,980 is for to cover the costs  
18 of those activities.

19 Subcommittee work, the assumption is here that the  
20 Chair, Vice-Chair, has to meet with Corina to provide any  
21 kind of direction to discuss any particular issues,  
22 administrative issues that may come up. You also have  
23 subcommittees that need to have conversations with staff,  
24 or I should just say, Corina, that will be your staff, to  
25 discuss anything that needs to be followed up on or any



1 activities that need to be addressed.

2 And so we estimated, based on about four  
3 subcommittees and working with the chair and vice chair,  
4 that amount for hours on a monthly basis. And that's a  
5 total yearly projection. It's minimal. So that is kind  
6 of what we've asked for the ONE. You have a variety of  
7 different vendors, Snowflake being one of them.

8 You have interagency agreements that we have with  
9 the different agencies and other services that are  
10 provided. So that's kind of a hodgepodge of different  
11 services that the Commission needs throughout the course  
12 of its existence. And so we did ask for 222,000 more for  
13 each year beginning '23/'24 through '29/'30 to cover what  
14 I would consider basic office or agency operations. That  
15 is what has been denied.

16 So we are working with just the 216,000 at this  
17 point, unless something changes moving forward. So I  
18 wanted to make sure that you had an idea of what was  
19 denied and what -- specifically what it was for. It  
20 wasn't anything outside of the scope of what needs to be  
21 done within a state agency. So any questions?

22 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: I see a lot of questions. I'm  
23 going to start first with Commissioner Kennedy.

24 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Just these  
25 are it's a flat figure for each year. These are not

1 inflation adjusted. I mean, this is going to get eaten  
2 up by inflation as much as anything else over the next  
3 eight years.

4 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes. It is not an adjustment for  
5 each of the subsequent years. Obviously the Commission  
6 has the option to submit additional BCPs to address any  
7 future adjustments that need to be made.

8 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner  
9 Kennedy? Okay. Thank you. Let's go to Commissioner  
10 Fernandez.

11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. And  
12 thank you for that, Alvaro. It's very clear. You  
13 provide the information clearly. A couple of things in  
14 terms of salaries and wages, COLAS, and benefits. I  
15 believe there's a separate process that each agency goes  
16 through annually. And they identify like COLA or benefit  
17 increases.

18 And we just have to make sure that we insert  
19 ourselves in that process so that we make sure that we  
20 have that additional funding. So that's just a little  
21 heads up, Corina. So please try to remind me that we  
22 have to do that.

23 And also with the funding for the subcommittees,  
24 it's not just meeting with Corina. It's the other work  
25 that has to be done outside of meeting with Corina and

1 outside of the meetings that we have. I don't even want  
2 to guess how many hours. Commissioner Kennedy and Yee  
3 put into the document, but I'm sure it's quite extensive.  
4 So thank you.

5 And also they've rejected it, but we are going to --  
6 there's still other avenues and processes that we can go  
7 through. I agree. I think this really is a barebones.  
8 I think Alvaro did a very good job of presenting it. It  
9 is really is barebones. We're not asking for more --  
10 like, let's go out and I don't know, build a whole new  
11 database that everyone can share information with.  
12 Right?

13 Because there's really no point in giving us money  
14 for meetings and travel costs if we can't even hold a  
15 meeting because we don't have a videographer. Right? Or  
16 I mean, why are we going to have meetings -- yes, thank  
17 you. Why are we going to have meetings if there's no  
18 subcommittee work that can be done in order to bring  
19 forward to the meeting? So there are a couple of  
20 avenues.

21 Hopefully, I know Terri's working on that. So is  
22 Alvaro and Corina's involved as well, potentially a  
23 finance letter or a May revise. So it's just very  
24 important that everyone's aware of it. And we just have  
25 to have further conversations with financing. We were

1 actually talking about this was it Monday we met, I  
2 think, Alvaro?

3 And normally in an agency, you're the main person,  
4 you're executive, they would be the ones that would then  
5 make a phone call afterwards. And they talk. But we  
6 don't have those. We don't have the oomph. That's what  
7 we put it. We have the connections to just call the  
8 director of finance and say, hey, you know, we really  
9 need this money. So we're really going to work on  
10 communicating with finance and also potentially with the  
11 legislature as well with our partners there. So thank  
12 you.

13 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.  
14 Let's go to Commissioner Sinay.

15 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just for understanding,  
16 legally, can we hold meetings with no videographer or  
17 translators or any of that? I mean, legally we can't,  
18 right? So if we don't -- so no conspiracy theories here.  
19 But all you know, I'm always about the elephant in the  
20 room. But okay, so that -- and I think the other one  
21 that's huge is also the CRC Office 365. I mean, one of  
22 the biggest challenges we had was not having the data  
23 from 2010. And basically what they're saying is you  
24 can't store information and I don't want to lose how big  
25 that one is. On the budget, that -- what has been

1 approved, and I agree that you did an amazingly good job.  
2 This is the clearest budget I've seen. I understand it.  
3 When you look at the money that was allocated to us, do  
4 we need to spend it exactly in those line items every  
5 year, which I'm guessing the answer is yes. But if we  
6 don't, is there creative ways that we can fund some of  
7 the stuff below based on this stuff? Yeah, the money we  
8 did get.

9 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Can I can I answer that,  
10 Chair.

11 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yes, please do.

12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thanks. Well, the  
13 biggest chunk is our SSM1 so we really don't have much  
14 flexibility in terms of the remainder is what 20, 40, 60,  
15 70,000 or so to try to fund try to somehow be flexible  
16 with that to fund 222,000 below. It really is a tight  
17 budget. We really weren't asking for the moon here.

18 We were just wanting to continue our operations --  
19 continue to be relevant. I think that's something that  
20 we need to get across to finance again and again, because  
21 I think we've just kind of gone away and know we're here  
22 for another few years. So I think it would be very  
23 challenging to try to not use some of this. The DGS  
24 contract, it is what it is.

25 The 27,500 I mean, that's -- it's a contract with

1 DGS and we really don't have flexibility. I guess we  
2 have flexibility with per diem and meetings if we're not  
3 going to be able to meet or we could use it for something  
4 else. But it's just really tight. I appreciate looking  
5 at going that route. But it's not like these huge  
6 agencies where you'd have salary savings, so you could  
7 actually use it for something else.

8 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.  
9 Let's see. Let's go next to -- sorry, I just moved away  
10 real quick. Let's go to Commissioner Sadhwani.

11 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. Well, this is  
12 ridiculous. I mean, so have a staff member, but no  
13 office or meeting space. Have meetings, but be -- don't  
14 be compliant with the law and have essential services  
15 that are required. Can someone describe a little bit  
16 more for me who makes these decisions?

17 And then the Department of Finance, are the  
18 legislators involved in this at all? Because I think one  
19 of the things I find really ridiculous is that statewide  
20 there's this whole, like, push towards independent  
21 redistricting commissions. People are celebrating up and  
22 down independent redistricting commissions in general.

23 And we're required to serve until 2030. But then we  
24 don't want to have a -- not even a generous budget, just  
25 a just a basic budget in order to actually serve. So I

1 think this is pretty ridiculous. And having followed all  
2 of the stuff in the City of Los Angeles and the push for  
3 independent redistricting there, these are the kinds of  
4 pitfalls, right, that independent commissions face, which  
5 is just ridiculous.

6 My other question for everyone is, has there ever  
7 been any discussion of returning to the State Auditor's  
8 Office? I mean, is it feasible for us to be housed out  
9 of there, for Corina perhaps to have workspace out of  
10 there for us to -- when we have meetings, maybe they have  
11 meeting space available.

12 And it would seem a reasonable thing that if the  
13 State Auditor's Office establishes the commission, that  
14 we could go back and kind of be housed out of there for  
15 the remainder of our term after the maps are done. And  
16 if that would be a possible solution, that's something to  
17 think about for future commissions as well, because  
18 certainly others are going to face this moving forward.  
19 Thank you.

20 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.  
21 I do want to also note that I think what you stated is  
22 not too unlike what Commissioner Kennedy had also  
23 mentioned as well, too, in the -- in that sense.

24 Commissioner Fornaciari, did you want to respond to  
25 Commissioner Sadhwani --

1 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah.

2 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: -- from a finance and admin thing?

3 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I do. Yeah. So I was  
4 asking those very same questions when we had our prep  
5 meeting Monday. And so interactions with the Department  
6 of Finance are per their request and essentially  
7 requirement or via letter.

8 And so we write them a letter. They write us a  
9 letter back and forth via letter. No opportunity for  
10 conversation, discussion, understanding why decisions are  
11 being made. I mean, zero opportunity for that. And as  
12 Commissioner Fernandez just said, if we were a state  
13 agency, our head could call their head and have a  
14 conversation and work it out.

15 But we are in this strange place where we've got no  
16 oomph. We get no audience. And so I'm not sure I want  
17 to start the conversation about the letter, but I'll  
18 bring up the letter that we sent the Department of  
19 Finance.

20 I mean, that's -- this is part of the driver behind  
21 that letter. And the hope is -- and what we're going to  
22 push to do is start a dialog with the Department of  
23 Finance to come to a place where we can develop a way to  
24 work together, to work through these things, because this  
25 is just completely ineffective way of working. If it's



1 just we lob our letter over the fence and they lob their  
2 letter back then there's no understanding of what's going  
3 on our side of the fence, so.

4 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari  
5 for that clarification. That was helpful. Let's go next  
6 to Commissioner -- Vice Chair Taylor.

7 VICE CHAIR TAYLOR: Good morning. So again, to  
8 concur with Commissioner Sadhwani, this at best is a  
9 barrier almost reduces our work to nil. Man, I think  
10 it's quite devastating. I mean, just for the simple fact  
11 that we've already suffered a forensic audit of our  
12 emails to think that we wouldn't even have an email to  
13 use.

14 And also, I guess, looking at it in its totality, so  
15 we're asking for around \$440,000 a year in comparison to  
16 the overall California state budget. But that's what  
17 we're asking. We're not asking for millions, just --  
18 it's a real amount. I'm not minimizing that amount, but  
19 that's what we're asking. And yeah, this is quite a  
20 quite a barrier to trying to work at all. Thank you.

21 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Vice Chair Taylor.  
22 Yes, that is definitely. Can you imagine essentially, we  
23 would then be hamstrung? So if we did not meet for the  
24 next, what, seven years and just expected to come  
25 together once, maybe before the 2030 Commission is

1 seated, I think that would just really, I think, negate a  
2 lot of the work and the good intents that we have to  
3 ensure that the continuing process remains one that is  
4 going to be strong for The State of California. Let's go  
5 to Commissioner Turner next.

6 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. Thank you. I'm  
7 wondering, how do we bring much broader attention to this  
8 struggle to California? Some of the groups that's worked  
9 with us throughout the process, because I think the  
10 further we get away from our finalization of the maps,  
11 the less impact it will have.

12 And I do think this is huge as it relates to future  
13 commissions -- independent redistricting commissions.  
14 This coupled with our nonresponse to some of the other  
15 letters, I just think that for most of California, for --  
16 even for a lot of our allies and what have you -- well, I  
17 won't say our allies, all of California's our allies, but  
18 for a lot of the groups that has written and participated  
19 in the process, I don't think they realize that we've  
20 come to this point where we potentially cannot even  
21 continue to provide and complete the service that we  
22 signed up for.

23 And I think it would be a very different result if  
24 more eyes were watching this and was aware of -- because  
25 yeah, I think I think that was a perfect way to summarize



1 it, Commissioner Sadhwani, ridiculous. And I'd raised my  
2 hand earlier, but then some of the same points were  
3 already being made. The very idea that the -- I'm  
4 wondering, I know you sent these itemized and for them  
5 not to even respond with how they think this can occur  
6 without what has been requested to me is nothing short of  
7 ridiculous.

8 And for us to continue sending notes back and forth  
9 or at this point even to meet with someone that thought  
10 this a good idea may not necessarily yield what we'd like  
11 it to. For us, it is plain as day, very clear. I cannot  
12 imagine why you'd come back with anything different.

13 And yet someone thought about a right response to  
14 just say denied for something that has already been  
15 approved. I think this is larger than just at this point  
16 sitting on it, hoping someone will then change their  
17 mind. We know what's going on in the rest of the states  
18 across the nation, and hopefully we don't have to get  
19 there.

20 But I do think as long as this is kept -- and I'm  
21 going to say small at this point, because there's only  
22 very few people that's still following this redistricting  
23 process. As important as it is for us, I think there has  
24 to be a way we will broaden eyes on this. Thank you.

25 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

1 Well said. I am going to go next to Commissioner  
2 Andersen.

3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. I  
4 completely agree. This is absolutely ridiculous. These  
5 are basic services. And more to the point is this is not  
6 the first time we've had issues with the Department of  
7 Finance. And it's not just our commission. In 2010, the  
8 Department Finance also said, well, you know, you don't  
9 really get to have your -- you weren't sued, therefore,  
10 all your legal services were not going to pay for.

11 And then that was a real problem when we were trying  
12 to hire legal services -- legal teams for our commission  
13 in case we're getting sued, people didn't they didn't  
14 apply. And so we can't in good conscience go ahead  
15 knowing their problems existing, such as what we had the  
16 website crashed, we didn't have an office, we lost all  
17 the documents that we were supposed to have to start us  
18 up. And this document is essentially saying tough.

19 That's what's going to happen 2030 as well. And  
20 that's just not acceptable. It's not acceptable for the  
21 public. It's not acceptable for extra costs to the  
22 state. And I believe that we really do need to find a  
23 way to work with the Department of Finance, because I  
24 believe they do not understand that they're affecting  
25 policy on a different level.



1 I understand, hey, you need a car, doesn't mean you  
2 need a luxury car. That's not what's going on here.  
3 You're interfering with our policy interpretations. And  
4 I really appreciate that the Finance Commission really is  
5 working with Department of Finance.

6 But I believe with Commissioner Turner, we really do  
7 need to look at other ways to raise the flag on this.  
8 It's very important going forward. And if you want to  
9 get a more diverse commission, there's no way it'll  
10 happen unless we were able to make these changes.

11 So it's extremely important and I really want to  
12 push any resources out there. And people who are  
13 listening, please raise the flag on this. Thank you.

14 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.  
15 Commissioner Sadhwani, your hand is still up. I thought  
16 it was from before, but I just want. Okay. Thank you.  
17 Commissioner Turner, we'll go ahead and go to you.  
18 Commissioner Andersen, your hand is still up, too. So I  
19 just want to make sure.

20 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. The other point, I  
21 think the concern for me is the fact that the legal  
22 representation that we wanted to remain on retainer and  
23 we've been refused that amount as well. So if this is  
24 not addressed now, I almost feel like you -- someone said  
25 a minute ago, not -- I think it was said Sadhwani -- I

1 mean, Sinay, and other conspiracy theories.

2       Conspiracy or not, it occurs to me that if we don't  
3 have access to legal representation and forced to only  
4 deal with the AG's office, and if they before did not  
5 agree with something we were attempting to do and  
6 therefore not fund it, I don't see that they'd be funding  
7 anything along this lines -- along these lines as well.

8       I would love -- while we still have Anthony here, I  
9 would love to have a document, something that  
10 chronologically lists out everything. Again, something  
11 that would be something that wouldn't be true in a speech  
12 that says and then they did something that was still  
13 professional, legal. And what we should say listed out,  
14 because I think we can and what we what you all would  
15 feel comfortable with us sharing.

16       I would love to send it out to a whole host of  
17 groups that I have access to, to say, I'm just wondering  
18 if this is the picture of their representation and the  
19 complete process not to sabotage anything too soon, but  
20 again after December. And then I think I heard maybe up  
21 through June or so we won't have access to legal  
22 representation.

23       So to me, this is very time sensitive in whatever  
24 our next steps are going to be, it needs to happen now.  
25 And I hope all of them are listening and someone would be



1 so moved to say, oh, I'm sorry, let me do call you and  
2 explain whatever their piece part is. I'm assuming they  
3 have a reason, but because we don't have what their  
4 thought process is, we still stand on ridiculous and that  
5 we are being hamstrung and we're not going to be able to  
6 continue the business at hand and to complete our  
7 commitments. Thanks.

8 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Turner,  
9 for that. I'm going to go to Commissioner Sinay next.

10 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So on the positive, we must be  
11 a very effective group and congratulations to all of us  
12 and kudos. We've been very good at our work and being  
13 independent and thinking outside the box. And so good  
14 job. But there is a track record happening across the  
15 country.

16 And I did share that Michigan's independent  
17 redistricting commission is actually suing their state  
18 house and state Senate for \$3.1 million for a budget,  
19 because they've also-- and they are actually working on  
20 lawsuits. So it's even more complicated. I think  
21 it's -- I appreciate what Commissioner Turner said,  
22 because my question was, what is our call to action?

23 We can always say, I hope people are listening and  
24 stuff, but we need to have a call to action. And I think  
25 I clearly heard Commissioner Turner's call to action to

1 be we need some talking points or a quick one pager or a  
2 letter or whatever it might be, a summary that we can  
3 share with the -- with our colleagues -- with our  
4 colleagues on other priorities, because there is this  
5 expectation that we will support them and that we will  
6 continue to convene them like we heard from San Diego and  
7 others, as well as some of the groups that would -- that  
8 we need to be clear on what is the work that we're hoping  
9 to do.

10       And I think that might be where some of the  
11 confusion is, is what are we working on for the next  
12 seven years and why is this important? And I think the  
13 main thing is we want to continue. We want to ensure  
14 that their success in 2030 and that's the pieces that  
15 we're working on, is to make sure that there's certain  
16 things that are in place so that 2030 can be successful,  
17 be it at the State level and maybe some helping the IRCs  
18 at the local level.

19       But I want us just to be clear on what the call to  
20 action is because -- so that we're not all running around  
21 and doing different things. So thank you for that,  
22 Commissioner Turner.

23       CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you for summarizing that.  
24 Commissioner Sinay. I do have a couple of questions, I  
25 guess, I want to just ask maybe one more for the sake of



1 stating the obvious and making sure that we're all clear  
2 about this. And then I think being able to also  
3 understand to what Commissioner Sinay just brought up,  
4 what that call to action, what's our next steps?

5 So just for clarification, I'm going to ask this  
6 question of our chief counsel. I think it's been stated,  
7 but given the fact that they have budgeted per diems, but  
8 there is no other budget available for all of the  
9 required services that we would need to hold a medium --  
10 or a meeting, it seems then that we would be forced into  
11 choosing not to meet at all if then we're going to be out  
12 of compliance and therefore then subject to any kind of  
13 legal action; is that correct, Anthony?

14 So without being able to provide video services,  
15 without being able to provide ASL and transcription,  
16 legally, we as a Commission would not be able to meet; is  
17 that correct?

18 Counsel Pane: Yeah, I think there's actually a host  
19 of aspects that go into holding a meeting and what's  
20 required, additional considerations for disability access  
21 and things like that. I'd be happy if this is kind of --  
22 this is maybe where Commissioner Turner was headed.

23 I'm happy to kind of get a -- these are the required  
24 statutory requirements related to holding a meeting. And  
25 then with that, is there any budgetary allocation for

1 that function? If that's kind of the chronological list,  
2 I could certainly put that together. We could also do it  
3 a different way.

4 And I could put we could put together in connection  
5 with Corina and Alvaro, something short that says, here's  
6 all the functions that we currently need in a meeting and  
7 whether or not there are -- there's a budget allocation  
8 for that, that would be maybe a little bit more detail  
9 because it would include preparation and post including  
10 subcommittee work and that we can put that together and  
11 see if there is -- and you can also see whether there is  
12 a budget allocation for that.

13 So for an easy example, legal services, currently  
14 right now there isn't any legal services scheduled to the  
15 accompanying exhibition starting July 1 for a meeting.  
16 One option, of course, is to not have any legal services  
17 for the meeting. That I think is a legal detriment to  
18 the Commission. So I mean, I -- what I could do also is  
19 just put some options together for the Commission and I  
20 could provide that to you all and see if that would be  
21 helpful.

22 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yes. Thank you, Chief Counsel  
23 Pane. And I think that that would be helpful. I think,  
24 given some of the other line items that we felt are  
25 critical to our basic operations, and that could take us

1 out of legal compliance, I think it would be helpful if  
2 you could include that, for example, not funding Office  
3 365 it just makes me wonder, not only would we not be  
4 able to meet, we would not even legally be able to  
5 communicate with each other because we would not be able  
6 to utilize the State email services. And then if we were  
7 to then rely on a hodgepodge of what I'll call personal  
8 email -- emails that we would make up for this, it does  
9 seem a little I think, a little dangerous I think from a  
10 transparency point of view, for us to be able to do that  
11 not only from a security, but just a whole host of other  
12 things. And I do have a concern that that also could  
13 pose another legal barrier. And I'm sure that there are  
14 other things. And I think being able to have that  
15 spelled out clearly, I think would be helpful for all of  
16 us, but also for the public to also understand. And that  
17 hopefully that could also be used to have that further  
18 conversation with the Department of Finance, because  
19 maybe it's easy to just say, okay, don't need this, don't  
20 need that, but not really thinking through what the  
21 larger implications are. So yes, thank you, Chief  
22 Counsel Pane, if you could include that as well too. I  
23 think that would be helpful. I think too, let me just go  
24 ahead. I see some additional hands. I'm going to go to  
25 Commissioner Sinay. And then Commissioner Turner after



1 that. And then I also want to just note that  
2 Commissioner Kennedy would also like to share some  
3 additional information as well, too, after perhaps  
4 Commissioner Turner.

5 Commissioner Sinay?

6 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. But I think that  
7 what Director Payne was saying was -- is helpful but not  
8 enough. I think where we have kind of fallen on this is  
9 the why, because it's very, very easy for people to say  
10 this group was put together for the maps. You guys have  
11 done the maps.

12 The raising of a ten-year tenure is because we don't  
13 want you all running for office, so you can't run for  
14 office and that's that. I think we can't make any  
15 assumptions that people understand the why. And whatever  
16 we put together from now on, I think has to be -- clearly  
17 state that the why is for a successful 2030 or whatever  
18 the why is maybe I'm not being accurate on what the why  
19 is which is not that good if I can't articulate it.

20 But we need to say why because there's no -- I can  
21 see why people would be like they're done. What you know  
22 and that's what we're seeing on social media with  
23 Michigan. They keep being asked why. Why do you need  
24 this money on social media? And so let's be clear on our  
25 why.



1 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay. I  
2 think both could be combined together. Most likely, I  
3 think we need both.

4 Commissioner Turner?

5 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I wanted to  
6 respond to Chief Counsel Pane. For the months of  
7 approvals of budgets in the past, I think it's a  
8 challenge for me to understand how they don't already  
9 know what is included and what is needed for a meeting.

10 And so if the thought was to rescind or to reiterate  
11 and further itemize back to the -- with the DOJ, why we  
12 need what we need is not the list that I was thinking of.  
13 I was thinking of one that we would be able to share  
14 because I think outside people outside of the process may  
15 not understand what we're requesting and why.

16 And people engaged because they deeply, like us,  
17 believe in an independent redistricting commission, the  
18 whole of the process. And I think it is important for  
19 them to clearly understand. And as Commissioner Sinay  
20 pointed out, not just California, I don't want to try to  
21 fight someone else's battles, but this is a sticking  
22 point.

23 When we get -- when the matter seems concluded, it  
24 indeed is not yet concluded. And there is still too much  
25 of a fight, an issue to be able to bring this to a proper

1 conclusion at the end of our term. And this is an  
2 example of what we continue to see. I think it's  
3 problematic.

4 I think it needs to be publicized and it needs to be  
5 very much, I guess, public for people to be able to  
6 understand what this is -- not those that are sending a  
7 response back. And if they didn't understand it, who's  
8 responding to say no if you don't already understand what  
9 the request was at this point in the game? So I think  
10 they understand what the request is. I'm saying that  
11 with -- or do that.

12 And in addition to that, I don't want to wait too  
13 late to say, oh, now we asked them five other ways about  
14 Department of Finance. We've asked them five other ways  
15 what's needed. And now we think we need to do -- talk to  
16 California about what's going on.

17 I think we're that much further from the process and  
18 we start to lose impact because already people are  
19 thinking independent what? What did they do? Oh, great.  
20 We have our districts signed by now. I think, again,  
21 time sensitive. I think we should be -- and what we've  
22 done, we've done it's been public already.

23 So I think it does add pressure, but I think that we  
24 should be putting out on a grand scale, this is what  
25 we're asking for. This is what's at risk that we may not

1 be able to continue. And these are the attempts we've  
2 made to understand and make the proper requests. And we  
3 are not receiving what we need or even explanation to why  
4 we're not receiving it.

5 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right. Thank you very much  
6 for that and that clarification. I think that that is a  
7 very important one.

8 Commissioner Kennedy, would you mind if I just allow  
9 Commissioner Sadhwani to make her comment and then we'll  
10 go to you?

11 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. Thank you. I want to  
12 take very seriously this question of why we would need  
13 that additional funding in to make sure that we can  
14 continue to meet and operate. And I think there's  
15 potentially two different avenues to go down. And one  
16 would simply to be to say, okay, if you don't want to  
17 fund us, then please release this from this duty.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah.

19 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Why on earth are we serving  
20 ten-year terms if we're not going to have funding to  
21 actually do anything during this time? And I, for one,  
22 would be perfectly fine if we want to make this a five-  
23 year term and we're done fairly soon. That's okay with  
24 me. So let's make that change. Right.

25 That is one kind of talking point around this that I

1 think that we all have to come to grips with and be okay  
2 with. Because if folks are saying there's no point to  
3 the CRC existing, then fine, then then release us.  
4 Alternatively, I agree with Commissioner Sinay on this  
5 point around preparing preparation for 2030.

6 One of the things that -- I'm looking forward to  
7 reading the Lessons Learned and I'm sure it's probably in  
8 here. At some level, one of the things we've talked  
9 about is having greater cohesion with the census. My  
10 understanding that Marcy, who used to work here at the  
11 redistricting commission, is a part of a new office for  
12 the governor around community partnerships.

13 It's unclear to me if that office is going to be  
14 holding the census work in it in the future. It seems  
15 like the governor's office could also be a partner here  
16 if he wants to prop up and support independent  
17 redistricting commissions, not only here in The State of  
18 California, but perhaps nationwide.

19 He seems to have broader aspirations than just  
20 California, that be perhaps working in collaboration,  
21 possibly even being hosted by such a department out of  
22 the governor's office after maps are done, could be  
23 another alternative beyond a state auditor's office,  
24 perhaps, so that we can have that kind of cohesion with  
25 the census, so that census folks can be thinking about,



1 hey, this is going towards redistricting, that there's  
2 all of this community education that needs to go into  
3 redistricting.

4 I think the Lessons Learned of every county, every  
5 city and of course, our state has been more people need  
6 to know and understand the redistricting process. So  
7 continuing to have some of those partnerships at the  
8 State level to advance, that could be a very good reason  
9 why we continue to exist if -- for this ten-year period.  
10 Thank you.

11 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you for that. And I think  
12 that's a perfect segue way into what Commissioner Kennedy  
13 is going to be speaking about. And I think to your  
14 point, Commissioner Sadhwani, I think I also want to  
15 reiterate just the kind of the I'll say, perhaps assaults  
16 to democracy. And it really highlights the need for  
17 greater education around redistricting and the census and  
18 all other sorts of civic education for all people.

19 So Commissioner Kennedy, I'm going to go ahead and  
20 turn this to you now.

21 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. And first  
22 of all, I had intended to speak to this if possible, as  
23 part of Lessons Learned, but it seems far more relevant  
24 to our current discussion. So I asked the Chair's  
25 indulgence to allow me to speak briefly to this at this

1 point.

2 I've been involved in international electoral  
3 assistance for a third of a century. I mean, it blows my  
4 mind sometimes. But I started in the field 33 years ago.  
5 And one of the things that we very quickly realized as a  
6 field was that funders, whether they were national  
7 legislatures or external funding agencies like the U.S.  
8 Agency for International Development, took a very  
9 episodic approach to supporting elections.

10 An election was seen as a discrete event. People  
11 mark a piece of paper, drop it in a box, you count it,  
12 and you're done without the deep understanding of what  
13 election administration is. Several years later,  
14 colleagues were brainstorming and came up with the idea  
15 of presenting as a tool to help legislators, funders,  
16 civil society and others to understand the cyclical  
17 nature and the great complexity of election ministration.

18 They came up with something called the electoral  
19 cycle approach. And so a week or so ago, it occurred to  
20 me that maybe we need to look at the redistricting cycle  
21 approach. And I have put together a draft and asked  
22 staff to post it. So it was posted last night or earlier  
23 today.

24 And again, I wasn't intending to share it in this  
25 context, but more in the Lessons Learned context. But I

1 do so now in hopes that we can help Department of  
2 Finance, the Legislature, community stakeholders, and  
3 others understand that redistricting is more than a  
4 simple episodic event, that comes to a very clean  
5 conclusion. And you're done. And you have nothing to do  
6 for the next eight years or so.

7       Again, this is a draft. I would welcome comments,  
8 suggestions from colleagues and external stakeholders,  
9 but I've tried to lay out various kind of larger elements  
10 of the cycle and then some of the details. Obviously,  
11 many of these things could go into even greater detail.

12       Again, I agree -- I fully agree with Commissioner  
13 Sinay that the -- one of our biggest objectives at this  
14 point is to ensure that the experience of the 2030  
15 Commission is a more positive one than ours. And so  
16 there's a lot that does need to be done between now and  
17 then.

18       There is planning, there is recruitment, there is  
19 potentially procurement. Someone mentioned a lot of  
20 public education that that could usefully be done by this  
21 Commission before the 2030 Commission takes office.

22       So I offer this as a framework for perhaps helping  
23 us organize our thoughts as to why. We can improve on  
24 this diagram as it currently stands, but hopefully use it  
25 in our efforts to make our case and explain what it is

1 that we believe is important for this commission to do  
2 over the coming years. Thank you, Chair.

3 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you very much, Commissioner  
4 Kennedy. I was wondering what this handout was about,  
5 and I think it's timely to think about it in this context  
6 as we explore this. Why I am wondering -- okay. And I  
7 see that Commissioner Sinay has her hand up. I do want  
8 to perhaps state this. I think Anthony has -- or excuse  
9 me, Chief Counsel Pane has offered to work on this  
10 document.

11 But given some of the discussion that has been going  
12 on, perhaps I could call on Commissioner Turner and I'm  
13 also going to call on perhaps Commissioner Fornaciari to  
14 perhaps work with Chief Counsel Pane to craft something  
15 that I think needs what Commissioner Turner is talking  
16 about. But also I'm thinking about we do need a strategy  
17 in terms of our -- hopefully a future conversation that  
18 we'll be able to have with Department of Finance in terms  
19 of the why and some of the other things like that.

20 And Commissioner Turner and Commissioner Fornaciari,  
21 could I call on the both of you to work with Chief  
22 Counsel Pane?

23 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

24 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right. Awesome. Thank you  
25 very much. And now I'm going to turn back to



1 Commissioner Sinay.

2           COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. I really like the  
3 idea of that visual. I would also recommend that in the  
4 Catalyst California True Representation report that  
5 community puts out there what it looks like for -- what  
6 it look like for them to do redistricting. And one of  
7 the issues that they have and one of the issues that we  
8 have that we've all talked about is it's not episodic,  
9 that it's all connected.

10           And so I would actually like to see it more maybe  
11 linear and including the census as well. How they all  
12 kind of overlap. And I was kind of -- that was one of  
13 the recommendations I wanted to give to Catalyst  
14 California is that they create a figure that actually has  
15 a census in there, along with civic education, along with  
16 voter engagement, because it was all interconnected with  
17 each other.

18           And we need to do a better job to both government  
19 funding, but also the funding report from Catalyst  
20 California brings that up -- not catalyst California  
21 sorry. Philanthropy California brings up as well that it  
22 all needs to be better interconnected. There needs to be  
23 more funding. It can't be episodic because it's hard to  
24 hire people, train them in a short period of time and all  
25 that.



1           And so as much as we can explain this as multiple  
2 things happening at once so that we can have funding  
3 throughout that -- the right funding for everybody to be  
4 able to do this work well, because democracy is not  
5 episodic.

6           CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.  
7 And thanks for bringing up that. That was also brought  
8 up in both of those reports. That's good to know.

9           All right. Commissioner Andersen, we're going to go  
10 to you next.

11           COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you. Yes, I  
12 really like the diagram. That's wonderful. And that  
13 last quarter, like you from 9 o'clock to 12 o'clock,  
14 that's where people think, well, that doesn't exist. And  
15 I'm really looking at the portion from, say, 10:30 to 12.

16           There's a lot more in there that we haven't really  
17 been talking about, which are absolutely necessary, which  
18 is why we did not get as good a start. And it was  
19 because the website crashed. We didn't get a lot of  
20 information.

21           And just in talking about the San Diego County  
22 Independent Redistricting Commission, they had great  
23 demographers. If we want some of those things for our  
24 demographers to be able to do it had to be in the  
25 contract. And we would need to -- you need to add that

1 now as we update all these items before we turn it over  
2 to the 2030 Commission, because they will have no idea  
3 and they will be caught, as has happened in the 2010.

4 And if you just look straight budget to budget, we  
5 went over -- and there are reasons for all of it, very  
6 comparable numbers used on both 2010 and 2030, adjusted  
7 for inflation. But because we had the extra ability to  
8 do that.

9 We can't let 2030 not be set up properly for that.  
10 And that portion is there's a lot more to do, including  
11 updating what we used for technologically, what's going  
12 to be available. And we don't know even what that is at  
13 this point.

14 So while I really appreciate we need to have some  
15 budget going on right now, we're going to have to have a  
16 budget those last couple of years to help the 2030. And  
17 that's what our legislation process right now going  
18 forward is. So the whys are extremely important.

19 And I just want to emphasize that last little bit  
20 though, which we haven't really been talking about, is  
21 the updating for -- yes, we know what our Lessons Learned  
22 are right now, but that's not going be exactly what we  
23 want to tell them in the last year before. So I just  
24 want to add that. Thank you.

25 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. Commissioner Andersen,



1 I think that that's also helpful. And I also want to  
2 come back to something you did say earlier in terms of --  
3 it seems like it's easy to just skimp on the budget now.  
4 But we lived the nightmare, I would say, and the  
5 difficulties of not having been a little bit more long --  
6 kind of like more having more foresight and thinking  
7 about saving money maybe back then ended up causing us to  
8 have to spend more money in the early parts because we  
9 were trying to recreate things and even now we're still  
10 trying to do some of that.

11 So I think I just want to make sure that we also say  
12 out loud not being shortsighted in ensuring that money  
13 spent now to ensure that systems are in place when 2030  
14 comes around will help to ensure that money is better  
15 utilized and less wasted I think when hopefully the 2030  
16 Commission is going to be seated and will be able to hit  
17 the ground running as well, too, due to some of the  
18 efforts that we're putting in now.

19 Commissioner Fornaciari, I'm going to go to you  
20 next.

21 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, thank you. This is  
22 I think this is a really, really good, important, timely  
23 conversation. A lot of this, what we're talking about  
24 now, Commissioner Sinay and I have been talking about in  
25 context of our Continuity/Transition committee, we



1 haven't decided what we're going to call it yet. We have  
2 differing opinions on the name, but that's okay. We'll  
3 work through it. But okay, make a joke. Forget a point.  
4 Okay. So we heard it loud and clear from the last panel  
5 that that we need to engage the -- with the census. The  
6 education outreach needs to be much more deliberate and  
7 much more senior and much broader -- more broadly thought  
8 out. And again, that's a lot of the things that  
9 Commissioner Sinay and I have been talking about.

10 But I think, Commissioner Kennedy, thank you for  
11 this really, really help kind of think through the --  
12 helps, think through the details and what we all need to  
13 include. I mean, Commissioners Sinay said it would be  
14 interesting if it was linear because that would kind of  
15 scale it out.

16 Because if I think about this, the mapping, if you  
17 made it to scale, the mapping wedge would be really,  
18 really tiny compared to some of these other wedges. So I  
19 think looking at it a couple of different ways I think  
20 would be really helpful and really informative. And  
21 really I think we're taking a lot of good steps today  
22 moving forward about how we're going to articulate the  
23 why. So thanks.

24 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you for that, Commissioner  
25 Fornaciari. Let's go back to Commissioner Kennedy.

1           COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. And just  
2 in response to that from Commissioner Fornaciari, the  
3 Lessons Learned report, by the time it's final, will have  
4 very, very detailed Gantt Charts beyond what we had  
5 initially developed as a Gantt Chart early in the process  
6 to give folks a better sense of everything that's  
7 involved and how much time it takes and how it all fits  
8 together.

9           The point that I wanted to make right now is I  
10 continually ponder the extent to which some of the  
11 elements of the current time frame are there. Simply  
12 because in 2008, when the first initiative passed in  
13 2010, when the subsequent initiative passed, there  
14 weren't options.

15           In 2008, it wasn't a very realistic option to say,  
16 we're going to start the term three years ago. Now that  
17 we're this far along and then this goes to commissioner  
18 Sadhwani's point, do we do we need to contemplate whether  
19 it makes sense for the long term to shift the starting  
20 date even more?

21           And in our discussions, I've been much more of a  
22 realist saying that within the Constitutional  
23 constraints, pretty much the best that we can do is to  
24 shift things six more months than what they were with us.  
25 But if we look back to the context when the initiatives

1 passed and look at the long-term future, do we want to  
2 have a more robust, in-depth discussion on whether a  
3 major adjustment to the cycle could be a very positive  
4 step for redistricting in California?

5 So I just wanted to put that on the table.  
6 Everybody can go home and think about it. And thank you,  
7 Chair.

8 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you very much for that,  
9 Commissioner Kennedy. I think that is a very big  
10 question to, I think, ponder, and definitely I think one  
11 that could be an important one, especially as has been  
12 brought up by Commissioner Turner around I think our  
13 relevance post map and perhaps extending the relevance by  
14 starting much earlier rather than extending our time  
15 later. Thank you for that.

16 Okay. Commissioner Sadhwani?

17 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I was just going to  
18 respond to Commissioner Kennedy. I don't have to go home  
19 and think about it. I think yes. The answer is yes. I  
20 think for me, the question is just about the feasibility  
21 of making that change. And also clarifying, I can't  
22 recall any more.

23 I feel like I used to know the statute very well,  
24 but I can't recall if the dates in which the commissioner  
25 is selected is on this date or by this date. Right. If

1 it's by this date, then it's something that we could just  
2 ask the auditor's office to do earlier, but I can't  
3 recall that. So I'm very much in favor of it. Every  
4 single lesson learned that we've heard from is start  
5 earlier, start earlier.

6 We can't adjust the census dates. Those are very  
7 much fixed, but we could adjust when a commission is  
8 seated and the kinds of training that would be available  
9 to them, the kinds of resources that would be available.

10 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you for that. Let's go to  
11 Commissioner Kennedy.

12 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. The  
13 language is in Section 2, Article 21 of The State  
14 Constitution, where it says the Citizens Redistricting  
15 Commission shall be created no later than December 31, in  
16 2010 and in each year ending in the number 0 thereafter.

17 But the part that says and in each year ending in  
18 the number 0 thereafter to me says that it should be  
19 created in each zero year. And what I've what I've said  
20 is perhaps from a realistic perspective, the best that we  
21 can do is to have the random draw on the 2nd of January  
22 rather than the 2nd of July of the zero year.

23 The other problem that I have with Section 2, and  
24 I've stated this in previous meetings, is this idea that  
25 the Commission shall be created every ten years. And my

1 perspective is much more one of we need to move towards  
2 the Commission being conceived of as an institution  
3 rather than as a group of people. In my work, we  
4 distinguish between the Commission as an institution and  
5 the Board of Commissioners as the group of people.

6 And I think if we can pull this apart a little bit  
7 better and conceptualize the Commission as a living  
8 institution, particularly when it comes to obtaining and  
9 maintaining things like delegated spending authority,  
10 make that rely on the Commission as a living institution  
11 that has different boards of commissioners coming and  
12 going.

13 I think that for the long term, that is going to be  
14 a more successful conceptualization of everything. Not  
15 to fault The People who put Section 2 in the  
16 Constitution. But if we can shift mindsets a little bit,  
17 I think we're going to be more successful in the long  
18 term. Thank you.

19 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you for that, Commissioner  
20 Kennedy. I think another interesting concept in terms of  
21 institutionalizing this Commission. All right. We're  
22 going to go to Commissioner Sinay.

23 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. I like both food for  
24 thoughts that you've given Commissioner. I would say, I  
25 would like to -- it's making more and more sense to start

1 earlier. And I would say start earlier than what we were  
2 talking. Right. I would say 2008 and that gives them  
3 the and one of the reasons or maybe is also that -- not  
4 2008, but you mean 08. The other reason is just that  
5 that gets people talking about redistricting even  
6 earlier.

7       And if it's happening even before the census, it  
8 could -- it has its own advantages as well. And those  
9 funders who understood that the census was about  
10 reallocation of money and power -- that understood that  
11 redistricting was actually the piece of power that  
12 without the redistricting piece the census was for not  
13 were the ones who were more who were more likely to fund  
14 the whole spectrum of what's needed.

15       And so I think that that messaging is very is very  
16 critical. I would like to see us -- I like what you're  
17 saying about the group of people versus the living  
18 institution. And I think you're using commission as a  
19 shorthand.

20       But I would like to really talk about independent  
21 redistricting commissioners or California's Independent  
22 Redistricting Commission and the whole idea of an  
23 independent, the IRC piece of it versus the commission  
24 piece of it, because I don't think the commission piece  
25 is as important as independent redistricting. So just as

1 we're thinking about how to name it and put it together.

2 Thank you.

3 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

4 And I want to just be mindful. Commissioner Fernandez,

5 I'm going to go to you next and you'll be the last

6 comment. I want to be mindful that we're now boarding up

7 against our lunch break.

8 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you. Just

9 quickly, when we did have our panel discussion last time,

10 the panel members did note that they felt the current

11 timeline was fine. They have limited resources. So in

12 order to support the redistricting and the census, they

13 just felt that starting earlier -- they didn't have the

14 manpower to really address that. And that's something

15 different.

16 Just the comment is Finance could have gotten off

17 cheaply by just funding 222,000 versus potentially if

18 this -- if we move forward with seating a new commission

19 early, that's going to be more costly than this. So it

20 was just kind of like a comment in case they're listening

21 out there. Thanks.

22 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you for bringing that to our

23 attention and reminding us about that. This did start

24 out of a conversation around the denial of our BCP. But

25 I think that this was a very important and robust

1 conversation. Our one in -- I guess at least we do have  
2 it action that is going to come out of this. And that is  
3 I do want to again thank Commissioner Fornaciari and  
4 Commissioner Turner, who will be working with Chief  
5 Counsel Pane.

6 I think barring any more additional comments, we do  
7 need to take public comment on the director report and  
8 then we will then break for lunch. Okay. And I just  
9 want to say, Commissioner Kennedy and Commissioner Sinay,  
10 you both have your hands up. I just want to make sure  
11 there's no additional comments. Okay. Thank you.

12 Kristian, I'm going to turn to you to help us take  
13 comments.

14 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Sounds good. In order to  
15 maximize transparency and public participation in our  
16 process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment  
17 by phone. To call in, dial the telephone number provided  
18 on the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When  
19 prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on the  
20 livestream feed. It is 83776954326 for this meeting.  
21 When prompted to enter a participant ID simply press  
22 pound.

23 Once you've dialed in, you'll be placed in a queue  
24 to indicate you wish to comment. Please press star 9.  
25 This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it's





1 your turn to speak, you'll hear a message that says the  
2 host would like you to talk press star 6 to speak. If  
3 you'd like to give your name, please state and spell it  
4 for the record. You are not required to provide your  
5 name to give public comment.

6 Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream  
7 audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your  
8 call. Once you're waiting in the queue, be alert for  
9 what it is your turn to speak. And again, please turn  
10 down the livestream volume. And there are no callers at  
11 this time, Chair.

12 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: We'll for the instructions to  
13 finish. I will say that this is one of those times that  
14 I wish there were callers.

15 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And those instructions  
16 are complete, Chair.

17 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right. Thank you very much.  
18 Okay. So with three minutes to spare, we're going to go  
19 ahead and we'll take our lunch break, at which time we  
20 will come back, resume our meeting. We will resume --  
21 now move on or move back to our subcommittee updates and  
22 we will resume with Lessons Learned starting us off. And  
23 then we'll go to the other subcommittees that will be  
24 reporting. Thank you.

25 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Chair?



1 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Kennedy?

2 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Sorry, I thought we were  
3 going to be last when we got back to subcommittees?

4 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: I'm sorry. Yes, we will have  
5 Lessons Learned come last. So actually, when we  
6 reconvene after lunch we will start with Finance and  
7 Admin, and maybe that's actually good because that will  
8 just segue from this conversation to anything that  
9 Finance and Admin may want to speak about. Okay.

10 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you.

11 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: And the Lessons Learned will be  
12 last.

13 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you.

14 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.  
15 We'll return at 1:45 for lunch. Thank you.

16 (Whereupon, a recess was held)

17 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right. Welcome back from  
18 lunch, everyone. I hope everybody enjoyed that hour long  
19 break and had a nice lunch. We are resuming our  
20 California Citizens Redistricting Commission business  
21 meeting where we left off. We had just taken public  
22 comment. We're open for public comment on the director  
23 reports.

24 We are now going to come back to our subcommittee  
25 updates and we're going to start off first -- actually,



1 I'm going to -- we're going to start off first with  
2 Finance and Administration, and then we will go on to  
3 Website, Legislative, and then finish up with Lessons  
4 Learned. So with this, I'm going to turn to Commissioner  
5 Fornaciari.

6 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. So I just wanted to  
7 touch on a couple of -- a couple of things. So as you  
8 all saw in the handouts, we sent a letter to the  
9 Department of Finance and that letter focused on funding  
10 for our legal services. And there's a difference in  
11 interpretation between us and the Department of Finance  
12 with regard to several things that are outlined in the  
13 letter. And the bottom line of the letter was a request  
14 to get together with the Department of Finance to get  
15 some clarity on that for the future.

16 But as per our conversation earlier, with regard to  
17 the budget, it's a much bigger -- there's bigger things  
18 that need to be talked about or additional things that  
19 need to be talked about with the Department of Finance.  
20 And so Chair Akutagawa has asked myself, Commissioner  
21 Turner, and Anthony to put together a story for them. So  
22 we will work on that.

23 Second thing I want to touch on is just -- I want to  
24 make sure I was clear about budget at this point,  
25 especially with regard to legal budgets. So the



1 Department of Finance had approved -- Director Hernandez  
2 mentioned seventy(K) for legal fees. We've spent roughly  
3 forty-eight(K) of those seventy(K) with Strumwasser so  
4 far. And but that seventy(K) only goes through the end  
5 of the fiscal year. Let me be clear, they have released  
6 seventy(K) of the 200(K) that was approved by the  
7 legislature. So --

8 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Or it was -- actually, it  
9 was -- I want to look at Alvaro, but it was in the  
10 millions that was approved for litigation and.

11 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Oh, right.

12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So there is still funding  
13 that's available and budgeted that hasn't been released.

14 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. And then. And then  
15 we did talk about the AG and the working earlier. We  
16 talked about working with the AG, and we're figuring that  
17 out. But we do just -- I just want to be clear for  
18 everyone that there is flexibility in our budget to  
19 continue to have legal support through the in our  
20 existing approved release budget through the end of this  
21 fiscal year.

22 So we'll have time to continue to have continuity  
23 with legal support while we work through that support --  
24 the future support from the AG. Is that clear, first of  
25 all? And does that answer any questions anyone has?

1 Okay. And I think that's all we have. Is there anything  
2 else?

3 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: It looks like. Yeah, Executive  
4 Director Hernandez has --

5 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes. Just to clarify, Commissioner  
6 Fornaciari, the 70,000 that was released is through the  
7 end of December, not the fiscal year.

8 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Oh, yeah. Sorry.

9 MR. HERNANDEZ: So thank you.

10 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So Commissioner Fornaciari  
11 and Commissioner Fernandez. Anything else that you want  
12 to report on? Nope. Okay. All good. All right. Thank  
13 you. That was a very efficient report.

14 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: That's us.

15 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right. Thank you. Okay.  
16 Let's go ahead and let's move on to our Website  
17 Subcommittee, Vice Chair Taylor and Commissioner  
18 Andersen.

19 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: All right. I think I'm  
20 going here. So the website -- just a quick summary where  
21 we are on the website. The last time we met, we were  
22 basically saying, what's going on is we do have  
23 permission. We still have authority access to the 2010  
24 website and all their -- that whole document. We were  
25 able to bring that over to our -- the dot ca dot gov



1 website.

2       And basically, essentially it's like in a sub pocket  
3 because the reason it's in a sub pocket and not just  
4 available is because it does not meet the ADA  
5 requirements that are in existence. However, and then so  
6 that's what we did. And we have then been -- well not we  
7 staff has been doing lots of time basically migrating all  
8 of our current -- well okay, back up to a minute.

9       The website that the 2020 Commission has been using  
10 and that everyone has been looking at is the  
11 [wedrawthelinesca.org](http://wedrawthelinesca.org). What the State will continue  
12 supporting for us is [wedrawthelines.ca.gov](http://wedrawthelines.ca.gov). That's where  
13 the 2010 website was. So what we need to do is we've  
14 taken the 2010 website essentially put in a little  
15 pocket.

16       And we were taking the 2020, which is the dot org  
17 site and shifting it to the dot ca dot gov site. And the  
18 staff has been working on this. It is available. You  
19 can go in and look at right now the [wedrawthelines.ca.gov](http://wedrawthelines.ca.gov)  
20 and you will see basically how our 2020 website has been  
21 shifted.

22       There are errors in it, not a lot, but -- and there  
23 has been some restructuring. And so I -- we're asking  
24 essentially, too -- for any public who's out there, who  
25 is interested and the commissioners to have a look,



1 because right now you can pull up both websites, the dot  
2 org and the dot ca dot gov and make sure there's  
3 something that -- if you aren't sure, like what happened  
4 to it, I can't find this. Let us know. And the let us  
5 know date is before the next meeting, January 10. So I  
6 think the meeting is going to be January 11th. So  
7 basically, take it for a test drive, kick its tires.

8 Don't think there's be much you'll find. But if  
9 there is anything, please -- actually, please let the  
10 staff know. And the web site subcommittee will be doing  
11 the same. There are a few things that we will -- the  
12 Website Subcommittee will fix.

13 And in terms of how long we can leave these Web  
14 sites both functioning, we only found out that the user  
15 interface for the data has just -- that contract has just  
16 been approved. We don't know how long it's going to take  
17 to actually get that up and running and then move the  
18 data from where it is into -- in Snowflake to actually  
19 look like comparable to what it's going to look -- what  
20 it looks like right now on the on the dot org website.

21 It'll shift and what's on the dot org website will  
22 come from the dot ca dot gov. And the plan is to then  
23 just one day it'll shift and it'll be like this new user  
24 interface. But to get that going and up and up and  
25 running, we don't know how long that will take yet.



1           So in terms of how long we need to have both, we  
2 have to get -- see what if staff has any more idea on  
3 that yet which I don't believe they have yet. So that's  
4 the only thing. And I see Martin has raised his hand,  
5 so.

6           CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Martin, if you could add  
7 some additional, I think, detail to what she just  
8 reported on.

9           MR. PINEDA: Yes. Do I mute the -- okay. Okay. So  
10 yes, so the website is I want to say that a good eighty-  
11 five percent finished. Everything has been mirrored from  
12 the dot org website to the new one. I constructed it  
13 from scratch. So yeah, essentially I just need help,  
14 feedback. It's a lot of stuff, especially like the past  
15 meetings page that took like a couple of months because  
16 so many documents.

17           So yeah, just any feedback on minor things like  
18 maybe this picture shouldn't go here or the font size or  
19 this doesn't look right. Esthetically, there's not that  
20 much I can do to it, so I'm not those kind of  
21 suggestions. I can take them, but there's only so much I  
22 can do. So just kind of just kind of keeping that kind  
23 of stuff in mind.

24           So right now it's just a moment where I'm just  
25 accepting edits on it, and then once we feel like we're



1 in a good place to just -- that it's ready, one hundred  
2 percent ready, then we're going to redirect the dot org  
3 website. So what whatever web address you choose, it'll  
4 take you to the same website. And then we can finally  
5 let go of the Nation Builder.

6 So that's where I thought at the moment. And  
7 there's just -- needs a couple more things to do. I need  
8 still need to transfer some of the shape files and the  
9 final map files. We're still working on that part, but  
10 that's very minor in the back and that doesn't affect  
11 like the editing process.

12 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, that's perfect.  
13 That's exactly. So it's just if you have comments and a  
14 little is like, misaligned or specifically though if you  
15 you're looking for a connection on the dot org and then  
16 you can't find it on the dot ca dot gov or it doesn't  
17 quite click through, that's important to let us know.  
18 But I haven't found those just yet. So as I said, it's  
19 in good shape.

20 Commissioner Yee?

21 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. Thank you, Subcommittee,  
22 for your good work on this. One functionality, I'm  
23 wondering if it could be added, which is a search  
24 functionality and especially since sometimes I think of a  
25 great handout we saw in a meeting, but I just have to go



1 down memory lane and try to narrow down when was that  
2 meeting and maybe look at my notes and then figure out  
3 which meeting it was and finally trying to air it out.

4       There's no ability to just find it. Handouts are  
5 not indexed. And the same is true for meeting  
6 transcripts. I mean, if you can narrow down what day it  
7 was then you can search that in the meeting transcript.  
8 But there's no universal index or search capacity, which  
9 would be so handy. I'm sure that would be very difficult  
10 to implement.

11       MR. PINEDA: Yeah, mostly because other documents  
12 are PDF that they were uploaded and they're hyperlinked,  
13 they're not integrated on the website. So if you do a  
14 search it'll probably try to find the file name, but it  
15 doesn't -- you wouldn't be --

16       CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Martin, were you on your  
17 microphone at the time? You might have to repeat it, so  
18 you could be heard.

19       MR. PINEDA: Yeah. So a lot of the documents are  
20 uploaded in PDF and they're hyperlinked. So a search  
21 doesn't always work the best because sometimes it'll try  
22 to find it by the name of the file. But since there's so  
23 many documents, it's really hard to do a search just  
24 because that's the way we had our website.

25       COMMISSIONER YEE: I wonder if we could develop even

1 just a catalog of handouts? I don't think that would be  
2 incredibly hard because there's only so many meetings,  
3 but an index of handouts, something like that. I could  
4 work on that. We might want to add that.

5 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: I think that's a question for  
6 either the Website Committee. Or Martin, is that  
7 something that would complicate things if Commissioner  
8 Yee is volunteering to index?

9 MR. PINEDA: I guess it's just a matter of  
10 discussion how that would look in how the implementation  
11 would take because we are kind of at the end of the road  
12 on the website. So it's something to explore, but we can  
13 definitely see if it's possible. I guess, I just need to  
14 visualize it more what that would entail.

15 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I do want to say the  
16 dot ca dot gov does have a search option and  
17 unfortunately that might be a little misleading because  
18 their stuff was more searchable and that -- I think that  
19 is still one of the options on the dot ca dot gov. So we  
20 should better look into it. But it might be a -- that's  
21 something will need funding for to do because we're sort  
22 of out of budget on this one.

23 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.  
24 Commissioner Taylor, if you --

25 VICE CHAIR TAYLOR: Yeah. Commissioner, we'll



1 continue to bring that up in our Website Subcommunity  
2 reports and see if there's some development we can make  
3 on that search functionality. I actually had that as a  
4 tab on when I was going through the website, actually  
5 sort of keyed in on that as well. Maybe not to the same  
6 degree you did, but some of the functionality of the  
7 website. So something we'll keep in mind and bring up in  
8 the subcommittee meeting. Thank you.

9 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I also see Commissioner  
10 Turner.

11 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I'm wondering, can  
12 you remind me what happens with the dot org when someone  
13 searches that after it goes away? What is the  
14 notification that's received? And coupled with that, I'm  
15 asking specifically because as I look at the new dot gov  
16 site, I think you've done a great job moving everything  
17 over.

18 But obviously all of the videos and any of the docs,  
19 any of the -- everything that's connected will still show  
20 dot org. And so I think if it gets separated from the  
21 website, people will still search dot org. So I'm  
22 wondering what is the tie back or is there a general  
23 banner or something that shows -- that says disregard all  
24 references to dot org. You're in the right place as dot  
25 gov. How do we handle that?



1 MR. PINEDA: So yeah. So once the switch happens  
2 there will like, let's say you do type in the old  
3 website, the dot org, it will redirect you to the new  
4 website so it wouldn't get lost. And I know the CDT is  
5 going to do something in the backend with -- I don't know  
6 what it's called or what it entails, but it's something  
7 with Google so that if you Google it, like you'll still  
8 redirect to the new website.

9 But as far as every single document, everything has  
10 been uploaded onto the new website server. Whatever you  
11 see on both website, it's mirrored. So they're on both  
12 websites right now. It just serves as a like -- serves  
13 as a purpose to be able to compare and contrast at the  
14 moment while we're still editing.

15 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you for that.

16 Commissioner Kennedy?

17 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah, just a question.  
18 There's also been interest expressed in folks having  
19 access -- researchers, whoever having access to materials  
20 from the Shape California's Future website. And I just  
21 wanted to ask if there's perhaps a link or instructions  
22 on how to access that content. Thank you.

23 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I would say -- I'd love to  
24 say yes. No, I haven't had any luck with that. I  
25 haven't pursued it actively, but if anyone else has any

1 other -- I think I might give Director Hernandez.

2 MR. HERNANDEZ: We did request that information. It  
3 is no longer available and we requested it from The State  
4 Auditor's office. They don't have that information  
5 available, the website or what was on the website.

6 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: It's completely shut down?

7 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes.

8 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Commissioner Kennedy?

9 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Again. Just as for the 2010  
10 Commission's content, it may be as simple as giving  
11 people instructions on how to use the Wayback Machine to  
12 access it. And I've done that. And interestingly, the  
13 recruitment website for the 2010 Commission was the  
14 wedrawthelines.ca.gov.

15 That was used both for recruitment as well as for  
16 the Commission. And so the Shape California's Future  
17 website. This was the first time -- this cycle was the  
18 first time that URL was used, but you can access content  
19 from that Shape California's Future website using the  
20 Wayback Machine. And so maybe we just need to include  
21 similar instructions on how to do that so that those who  
22 are interested can reach it. Thank you.

23 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: We'll definitely add that to  
24 the Website Subcommittee's task. If that's indeed the  
25 only way, then we'll add that.



1 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

2 MR. PINEDA: Right now, we do have a 2010 landing  
3 page, which includes a lot of general information, a lot  
4 of links to the former commission, and instructions on  
5 the Wayback Machine, and also just instructions on tap  
6 for any requests for The State Archives.

7 So if you go to about us, there's a 2010 California.  
8 And then we do still have the old website in the back end  
9 just for our reference in -- if we log in.

10 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right. Thank you very much  
11 for that. Okay. And I'm not seeing -- oh, Commissioner  
12 Sinay? Okay.

13 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I know I mentioned this  
14 earlier, but I just want to make sure since we were --  
15 we're talking about website, is just to have a new tab  
16 that has new the reports that come out about the 2020  
17 redistricting either written by us or by others, but just  
18 so that people can quickly find that especially future  
19 Commissioner -- potential future Commissioners who want  
20 to read about what it was, because I think that's when we  
21 all first started looking for those reports.

22 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you for that reminder  
23 that -- I guess that's going to be -- we'll see if we'll  
24 have budget for that continuing. So while we can we  
25 should put that on. Thank you.

1 All right. Commissioner Taylor and Andersen,  
2 anything additional before we move on to our next  
3 subcommittee update?

4 VICE CHAIR TAYLOR: Again, please stress test it for  
5 us and provide the feedback. Thank you.

6 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Great. Thank you. All  
7 right. Let's move on to our next subcommittee update.  
8 Legislative Subcommittee, Commissioner Fernandez?

9 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It's me. Two documents are  
10 posted as handouts. The first one is the proposed  
11 legislative changes move forward. It's basically the six  
12 items that as a Commission, we have voted to move  
13 forward. The first one has already been signed by the  
14 governor. So at least we have had some success.

15 And so items 2 through 6, we will just work with our  
16 subcommittee to try to find an author to move these  
17 forward in the next legislative cycle. Any questions  
18 with that one? If not, we'll move on to the second  
19 document. Five, four, three, two, one. Okay. No  
20 questions. There you go.

21 The next one is the colorful potential legislative  
22 changes. And as we move through this document, it was  
23 our living document and we've added stuff to it and we've  
24 actually grouped items with it as well. So the first  
25 page, the very first item that's just showing that the



1 first item moved forward has been signed by the governor,  
2 and that's related to the requiring the allocation of  
3 state incarcerated people to the last known place of  
4 residence. So that's great. Great job, everyone.

5 And then the next five items that are in that, I'm  
6 going to call it a hot pink color. Those are the items  
7 that have already moved forward and are on that first  
8 spreadsheet that we went through. And then still on page  
9 2 in blue, items 2 and 3-C, those are two areas that have  
10 been I guess redirected to other subcommittees.

11 The first one having to do with defining fully  
12 functional has been assigned to the Continuity  
13 Subcommittee and then the 3-C, which is the strike by the  
14 legislature not being transparent that one has been  
15 assigned to Government Affairs for them to address.

16 And after that, we move to the salmon color. I'm  
17 trying to think of colors here. I'm not a good color  
18 person, but the salmon color items are those items that  
19 we've discussed and we as a commission have just -- have  
20 decided to leave it as is and to let future commissions  
21 address it as needed.

22 So page 4 is the one that I like to draw your  
23 attention to. And that one, the first three items on  
24 there. The first one is three-days public notice three  
25 months prior to the final map. The second one, 3-A is

1 clarifying taking public comment during regular non-  
2 mapping business meetings does not constitute receiving  
3 input on redistricting matters. And then the third one  
4 that's on page 5 is an earlier start date for the  
5 commission.

6 So in November, I'm getting my month mixed up. We  
7 did have a panel discussion to discuss these three items.  
8 And so what we'd like to do now is bring this up for  
9 discussion again and hopefully come to some sort of  
10 consensus as to how to move forward with this.

11 The first one is -- Alvaro, can you share the  
12 document any -- I just realized that'd probably easier to  
13 share a document. Thank you. I appreciate that. E is  
14 three days public notice three months prior to the final  
15 map. And what we've summarize in terms of what the  
16 panelists -- their feedback was, they were not in support  
17 of increasing the three-day public notice period due to  
18 the time needed to organize the community -- their  
19 communities.

20 Again, during this -- oh, it's the -- its potential  
21 legislative changes and obviously our work around as well  
22 as the 2010 Commission work around was just to have a  
23 post an agenda every single day and if we need it, we  
24 need it. If we don't, we can cancel the meeting or -- so  
25 it's on page 4. Alvaro, thank you. One more?



1           Okay. So at this time, if there's any comments  
2 regarding that. Speak now or forever hold your peace or  
3 something like that. So Commissioner Sinay.

4           COMMISSIONER SIMAY: Thanks. I was a little slow.  
5 I didn't mean to raise my hand on the other. The first  
6 one too. But if I was slow, you weren't. My question  
7 is, when we are looking for someone to sponsor a bill,  
8 can it be can it be Senate or Assembly?

9           COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, it can be either side.

10          COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. I just wanted to confirm  
11 that. And then on the three-day question, we had a kind  
12 of a middle ground on this one where we had said from the  
13 draft maps on. And I was just hoping that we could bring  
14 that part back up in the discussion, because I think  
15 that's a compromise.

16          I can understand why three months -- no, three  
17 months prior, we were still doing visualizations and all  
18 that. And I know it'll be different once that the data  
19 is on time, but I hope that they do spend some time  
20 visualizing without census data. But I would like us to  
21 consider the crunch time really being once the first  
22 draft maps have been released, then we can go into three-  
23 day.

24          COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. I thought we -- I  
25 thought we did bring this up to the panel, and they still

1 weren't in agreement with it -- with the.

2 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, that's okay if they're  
3 not in agreement.

4 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

5 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm saying, can we discuss  
6 it --

7 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

8 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- as commissioners who had to  
9 go through it, discuss it.

10 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No, that's fine. I didn't  
11 understand what your question was.

12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry.

13 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And so I'm going to take  
14 the questions or the comments first and then we can  
15 discuss it.

16 Commissioner Turner?

17 COMMISSIONER TURNER: I wanted to -- thank you. I  
18 wanted to just show support for the panelists. They had  
19 very strong reaction and felt that this change would  
20 negatively impact their ability to communicate and get  
21 the information out and organize their communities. And  
22 I find that -- I feel like we did find the work around  
23 for it, so it did not impede our ability to get it done.

24 I think this -- if it worked as well for the  
25 communities that had a response to it, I think that would



1 be great. But if it -- since it seems like it's going to  
2 so greatly negative or negatively impact what they're  
3 attempting to do. I'd like to not have that change and  
4 leave it as it is.

5 COMMISSIOENR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

6 Commissioner Sinay?

7 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes, we found a workaround, but  
8 to me it was inauthentic in that the law is still set the  
9 way or the rules or whatever is set the way it's set.  
10 But our workaround was just to say there is an agenda  
11 every day and then just pop -- if we needed the meeting,  
12 we had it. So to me, that wasn't an authentic way to  
13 allow the community to engage.

14 At least if we did three days and got -- and said,  
15 let's hopefully not do that work around, that's being  
16 more authentic to the community of one we're going to me.  
17 So to me, yes, we had a workaround.

18 I don't think it worked for the community because if  
19 we would have met every day, that would have driven  
20 them -- so unless I'm totally misunderstanding the  
21 workaround, but my whole thought was we put the  
22 workaround in there because we didn't want to stick to  
23 that, having to put out the agenda two weeks ahead of  
24 time. And so now we're saying let's not have a work --  
25 well, they may still use the workaround. But I'm just



1 looking for a more authentic way to do this.

2 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Any other comments  
3 regarding this item?

4 Commissioner Kennedy?

5 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. Yeah, part of  
6 what I see looking at the way things are currently set is  
7 that with the three-day notice period limited to  
8 essentially the last two weeks of the process, we know  
9 from our experience that the last week of the process a  
10 good part of that is taken up with the final maps sitting  
11 for three days for public comment.

12 And so the Commission does not end up with being  
13 able to use that authority to agendize a meeting with  
14 three days' notice for a full two weeks. And it really  
15 ends up being not nearly as useful as I believe it needs  
16 to be. And so yes, I would like to see it somewhat  
17 longer.

18 Maybe, we also consider that we could do it with  
19 five days' notice instead of three days' notice if  
20 that's -- if we could say, you know, there's that sort of  
21 trade off. We want we want to be able to use the  
22 authority effectively for a longer period of time.

23 But recognizing the needs of community stakeholders,  
24 we would be willing to extend it from three days to, for  
25 example, five days. Let's look at this in all of its



1 dimensions, not just one dimensional. Thank you.

2 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Any other  
3 comments? Okay. I guess I'll provide my comment. And  
4 they did also note that they appreciated the run of show,  
5 which kind of would give them an updated look as to what  
6 we were going to be discussing that day.

7 I will say that I was a huge advocate of this -- of  
8 moving the three-day period longer to longer period --  
9 time period. But after listening to the panelists, I  
10 would agree with Commissioner Turner that I would want to  
11 support what they are envisioning, trying to organize  
12 their communities and the three days doesn't provide them  
13 sufficient time to organize. So at this point, I'm  
14 leaning towards just leaving it as it is personally.

15 So Commissioner Andersen?

16 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I basically agree with  
17 that. There's a real reason and there's a need to have  
18 more flexibility that last time and the three-day was  
19 really needed. I agree with Commissioner Kennedy. That  
20 is over the last two weeks really doesn't hit the mark  
21 because it's really ten days and it really isn't even  
22 that. It does need more extended time.

23 But this is a big hill to fight over the ten-day,  
24 three-day, five-day and that last period of time. And I  
25 understand completely why our -- the panelists were



1 against the idea, and I respect that. I think we have to  
2 work this to stay with this work around, because I don't  
3 think there's an easy fix on it at this point. And we  
4 have a lot of other battles that we need to put our  
5 energy into. So I would agree with the Commissioner  
6 Fernandez that we just leave it as it is for now and use  
7 our legislative power in other directions. Thank you.

8 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Any other questions? Or  
9 not questions -- feedback, comments?

10 Commissioner Fornaciari?

11 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I just say I kind  
12 of we're where Commissioner Andersen is at. I agree it's  
13 not optimal, but we or they can agendize every day and  
14 use the run of show to provide clarity to the public as  
15 to what actually is going to be discussed that day. I  
16 just don't see the battle that we would have to go down  
17 this road is going to be worth it.

18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Any other comments? So I'm  
19 thinking at this point, Chair Akutagawa -- I'll make her  
20 make the decision. But it sounds like there's a lean  
21 towards leaving it as is.

22 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I would agree. That's what  
23 I'm hearing as well, too. And I think then that would go  
24 into the let the next commission decide bucket.

25 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. The coral color,





1 how's that? Okay. So we will move on to the next item  
2 and that was E. Okay. The next item is 3-A. And that  
3 has to do with clarifying, taking public comment during  
4 regular non-mapping business meetings does not constitute  
5 receiving input on redistricting matters.

6 In terms of the panel discussions, the summary  
7 that -- was that they weren't in support do the time  
8 needed to organize their communities. I'm sorry did  
9 you -- go back up, please.

10 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Right there.

11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right there. Oops. There  
12 we go. And again, they appreciated the run of show  
13 timeline. Do we have any comments on this one? And I  
14 have to -- I'm just going to admit I'm not exactly sure  
15 they understood we were coming from a ten-day versus  
16 fourteen days.

17 So because we were very clear as to saying what  
18 we're talking about is if it's a regular scheduled  
19 business meeting, the intent of that meeting is not to  
20 receive input, but if we receive input, we're going to  
21 take it. But it's not -- you don't have to adhere to the  
22 fourteen-day. So I think there might have been some  
23 confusion as to what we were discussing. But with that,  
24 I will pass it on to comments.

25 Commissioner Kennedy?



1           COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah, I think -- I don't know  
2 whether we want to change the wording here on the table,  
3 but the statutory language says, meetings held for the  
4 purpose of. And I think you're right that we need to  
5 focus the attention on that.

6           It is admittedly a fine distinction between meetings  
7 organized for the purpose of receiving public input and  
8 meetings organized for other purposes during which public  
9 input might come our way.

10           But if we can keep the focus on that very fine  
11 distinction, then I think, yeah, I think we do need to  
12 kind of continue pushing in this direction of a lot of  
13 clarifying that if the stated purpose of the meeting is  
14 not to solicit public input into the maps, then  
15 commissions should be allowed to post those agendas ten  
16 days in advance rather than fourteen. Thank you.

17           COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

18           Commissioner Sinay?

19           COMMISSIONER SIMAY: Yeah. I mean, I can understand  
20 where the confusion is. Advocates will always advocate  
21 for more time no matter what it is, because that gives  
22 them more time to look at the agenda, prepare for the  
23 agenda, get people around it.

24           And I think on this one, I understand where they're  
25 coming from. But I think when we were doing the business

1 meeting, sometimes we just needed a meeting and we  
2 weren't going to get input. And that's going to be even  
3 more true with a shorter timeline. But I definitely  
4 see -- at first I was like, why are they answering the  
5 same way as the one above?

6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.

7 COMMISSIONER SINAY: But really they're answering  
8 the same way because that's always going to be a trigger,  
9 kind of like, hey, you're shortening the amount of time  
10 that we can prepare.

11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Any other questions  
12 regarding this item? Okay. So I will turn it back to  
13 Chair Akutagawa. And I think I --

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible).

15 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Pardon? No, no, we're --  
16 I'm still on this one. Yeah. Just deciding what we're  
17 going to do with this one. How's that?

18 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. I got it. Thank you.

19 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. And I guess for my  
20 own personal opinion, I do feel that I would agree with  
21 Commissioners Kennedy and Sinay that further clarifying  
22 it would provide clarity to all of our partners.

23 And again, I'm not sure in terms of them having to  
24 organize the community for a business meeting, in terms  
25 of providing input, because again, this would be a

1 business meeting, not an input per se meeting. So I'm  
2 not sure, Chair, if you just want to take a pulse to see  
3 if we need to move it from one bucket to another or what  
4 we want to do with this one.

5 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Can I just ask what would be our  
6 alternative if we decide to not just leave it as is?

7 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: If we leave it there, what  
8 we could do potentially as a subcommittee is we could go  
9 back and maybe start providing some definitions on how to  
10 clarify it. And then come back to the Commission with  
11 some options of how we could rewrite it. And then at  
12 that point we could decide whether we want to move it  
13 forward or whether we want to leave it as is or go back  
14 to the drawing board.

15 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. So then I think that's what  
16 we should offer.

17 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: A, B, C.

18 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I think we should just offer  
19 those two options. We either leave it as is, or we can  
20 ask if the pulse of the commission is to just go back and  
21 clarify it. Because I think I heard those two comments  
22 from both Commissioner Kennedy and from Commissioner  
23 Sinay, so.

24 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And what I meant by going  
25 back to clarify is we would actually, as a subcommittee,

1 come up with some potential language that hopefully would  
2 provide clarity, and then we could come back at the next  
3 meeting. Is that okay? Okay.

4 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yes, that sounds good.  
5 Commissioner Sinay?

6 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So just a reminder, though,  
7 that just because it's a business meeting doesn't mean  
8 that the advocates wouldn't want to be --

9 COMMISSIOENR FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.

10 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- engaged because they were  
11 very engaged when we did Language Access or prisoner --  
12 so people who are incarcerated. My memory is mud today.  
13 But I think most of the time it -- for other commissions  
14 and government entities it's ten days, not fourteen.

15 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes.

16 COMMISSIONER SINAY: And that's the main reason we  
17 want to go to ten. And I would actually put that in the  
18 language that we want to follow precedents of other  
19 government entities or whatever it is. Because if we  
20 don't, I'm afraid if we don't do that, then it does feel  
21 like we're taking some opportunity away from organizing  
22 because their input is critical throughout the whole  
23 process. It's the input piece that we want to be  
24 respectful of giving that extra time for.

25 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you. So we'll

1 take this one back and we'll work on some language --  
2 potential language. Okay. So the next one, Alvaro,  
3 is -- yes, that one, 5-B. This one is a earlier start  
4 date for Commissioners would also impact the start date  
5 of the application. In terms of the panel feedback that  
6 we receive, they said the timeline should be fine.

7 They actually were pretty strong in their suggestion  
8 that next time we do a better job with the training  
9 provided to the Commissioners. So I think we actually  
10 probably all agreed on that part for Lessons Learned. So  
11 any comments regarding this one?

12 Commissioner Kennedy?

13 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. And with respect  
14 to the stakeholders their -- we understand what their  
15 function in this process is. They have to understand  
16 what our function in this process is. We're the ones who  
17 had to go through this from our side, from our  
18 perspective.

19 And we are advocating for what we are advocating for  
20 because of our lived experience, understanding that they  
21 are advocating what they're advocating based on their  
22 lived experience.

23 The bottom line is the maps have to be done. The  
24 commission has to survive the process. And some of these  
25 things are, you know, based on our very real lived

1 experience. We have included in as an annex page 109 of  
2 the Draft Lessons Learned report, a potential -- a  
3 conceptual timeline, a revised timeline for recruitment  
4 and installation of the next Commission and potentially  
5 future Commissions that essentially moves everything six  
6 months.

7         So where the random draw was held on the 2nd of  
8 July, it would instead be held on the 4th of January, and  
9 everything essentially moves back. Now, there have been  
10 some discussion within the Lessons Learned subcommittee.  
11 Can this process start with the initial application  
12 period opening in a year beginning in eight, or can it  
13 only start once we're into the year beginning or ending  
14 in nine?

15         So that remains in my mind the only open question  
16 here could the initial application period start December  
17 1st and go through February 19th, or would it have to  
18 start January 1st and go through February 19th or  
19 something a little bit later than that? But this  
20 generally respects the timeline that was in place for the  
21 2020 cycle. Just shifting everything by six months.  
22 Thank you.

23         COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. And again, it  
24 would shift it so it would still stay in the year ending  
25 in a zero. So it would not require a Constitutional

1 change. It would, however, require, as Commissioner  
2 Kennedy taking a little dive into what the State Auditors  
3 language looks like, because they would have to start  
4 their process earlier as well. Okay. Got it. My brain.

5 Commissioner Andersen?

6 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I completely agree  
7 with Commissioner Kennedy. And I can understand this  
8 panel. They're like, okay, no, we don't want to have to  
9 deal with the redistricting commission at this point. So  
10 we don't want to change your timeline. But there's a lot  
11 the Commission has to do to set themselves up before they  
12 start working with the people.

13 And that's the part that we were considering that  
14 would really help in more training, which they really  
15 totally agreed with. And this would this would give the  
16 panel that time and to get all the administrative stuff  
17 going on, particularly given contract -- amount of time  
18 contracts take.

19 I know we have it here that we'd like to change that  
20 statewide rules. I don't think that's going to happen,  
21 in which case we need that extra time. So I completely  
22 agree. And I did not see this page 109. I really like  
23 it. I think that's a great thumbs up.

24 So anyone who's -- have a look at it, mark it, tab  
25 it. So I agree with this completely and I respect the



1 panel's idea, but I don't think they really particularly  
2 cared about it. Yeah, okay. You start earlier or  
3 whatever. That's kind of what I got on it and that they  
4 really want us to be better trained.

5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I think part of their  
6 concern was like, how much earlier were we going to  
7 start? Because they didn't want it to conflict with the  
8 census and they're advocating and organizing the  
9 communities for the census piece of it. But again, as  
10 Commissioner Andersen pointed out, there's other -- even  
11 hiring, you can even do your hiring ahead of time.

12 Commissioner Sinay?

13 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just want to clarify that  
14 these groups were also doing the outreach for  
15 commissioners. They did a lot of the recruitment for  
16 commissioners, getting it out, doing training. They  
17 invited former commissioners to come and speak at the  
18 recruitment efforts, not trainings, but just like what is  
19 a commission and stuff.

20 I hear they're concerned that they would be doing  
21 census and they would be doing this. But I'm going to  
22 push back on that argument and say, look, if this is  
23 happening closer to census, it'll be easier to educate  
24 funders about the importance of funding this completely  
25 as one whole package.



1 Part of the problem is that we've had to go to  
2 funders and say, hey, here's census, and they give a lot  
3 of money for census. And we say it's for redistricting  
4 and power. But the truth is, the power comes with the  
5 redistricting piece.

6 So if we're able to say census and redistricting  
7 next time and you're funding a staff person who's going  
8 to go all the way through, you might be able to get more  
9 funding to get the right people in place, which was the  
10 number one complaint within their report that it was  
11 episodic.

12 No, that it's -- that it was a stop and finish, stop  
13 and start, stop and start. So I hear their concern, but  
14 I also think it would -- another piece that came out in  
15 their report was it's really hard to hire -- to train  
16 their staff.

17 So as much as they were saying we needed more  
18 training or training better, every ten years, nonprofit  
19 employees, very few of them stick around for ten years in  
20 the same nonprofit. And so that institutional memory is  
21 gone. And so that part is needed as well.

22 So I think in the long run they may benefit from us  
23 starting earlier because they'll have more time to have a  
24 better argument to fund a position for both census and  
25 redistricting and train their staff on redistricting.



1 And the message is a lot better when it's about both  
2 together.

3           COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. There's one  
4 thing that I recall us talking about earlier and another  
5 benefit of even starting six months earlier is that you  
6 weren't -- the Commission isn't starting as census is  
7 rolling off and you're trying to get some of that  
8 knowledge from the census. And they're basically packing  
9 up and moving out. Right.

10           So it would allow for some transition time or in  
11 some knowledge transfer from the census to the Commission  
12 and potentially maybe even like some staff -- we just  
13 never know. So any other comments?

14           Okay. So I'm thinking -- let's see, Chair  
15 Akutagawa, on this one, it sounds like there might be  
16 some consensus on maybe like a six-month type of earlier  
17 start date, which again would not require a  
18 Constitutional change, but it would require maybe some  
19 conversation with The State Auditor.

20           Because then you back that up to then there's going  
21 to be a conversation with the legislature and finance to  
22 finance them earlier and yada, yada, yada. So it's a  
23 domino effect. So it looks like there is some traction  
24 unless anyone would like to talk -- speak against it to  
25 pursue this further.

1           And I'm just trying to think of the best avenue to  
2 pursue this further because it will require discussion  
3 with The State Auditor. We could keep it with our  
4 subcommittee, if you'd like, or --

5           CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I'm thinking that right now  
6 there's still some groundwork that needs to be done  
7 before perhaps this gets spun off to maybe a separate  
8 subcommittee. We should find out from The State Auditors  
9 if this is viable.

10           I also want to just come back to the earlier  
11 conversation that Commissioner Kennedy had brought up  
12 about starting even more significantly earlier than the  
13 six months. And I know that that does require a  
14 Constitutional change, and perhaps that is also  
15 additional exploration that bears some exploration time  
16 as to whether or not that may make more sense, only  
17 because of the earlier discussions that were brought up  
18 around one, not only standing up the commission, but also  
19 in terms of the budget implications, it's going to be,  
20 yes, more expensive because they'll be starting up  
21 earlier. But I'm also thinking it gives them more runway  
22 to do some of the work that perhaps -- or may allowed  
23 them the runway to remain relevant a little bit longer if  
24 they start earlier. And then when they hit the ground  
25 running, perhaps it may not require as much of the time

1 that it required us. So perhaps that's in --

2 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

3 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: -- conversation that we can also  
4 explore and bring back to the rest of the commission the  
5 next time. Okay.

6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Sounds good. Thank  
7 you. And wait, how much time do we have for this? I'm  
8 sorry. I lost track of my time. Okay. Well, so 5-D --  
9 thank you. Thank you, Alvaro. That one is to expand the  
10 mandate to support local redistricting efforts.

11 And this one we did not discuss with the panel.  
12 That's more of a discussion within the Commission. So  
13 we've had prior discussions and we've. It's been a  
14 consensus or a decision that the -- that our current  
15 mandate isn't to support local redistricting efforts and  
16 that this would be if that's something that we want to  
17 move forward to try to change our mandate.

18 I believe this would also -- I'm not sure if it  
19 would be a Constitutional change. I'm thinking it might  
20 be, but we'd have to have our chief counsel look into.  
21 But if there's any comments on this one? Yeah.

22 Commissioner Sinay?

23 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I don't know if this -- if we  
24 need to clarify the language of what we're saying here,  
25 there's kind of two different pieces, right? There's



1 expansion to support local redistricting processes, like  
2 during the redistricting process, like what we're talking  
3 about today about the database being able to speak to it,  
4 work together, making sure that people know if they're  
5 getting data to one, it might be used by another one.

6       So there's that piece that isn't clear. And maybe  
7 we don't need to put it and change the legislative we  
8 just need to put it in the Lessons Learned. But it would  
9 I think it would be good to actually kind of mandate to a  
10 certain extent that some of this stuff will happen, like  
11 when The State won't -- like Commissioner Sadhwani was  
12 saying, we need to create a database.

13       A database needs to be created. It's already been  
14 mandated. But let's work with it so that it's mandated,  
15 so it's workable for others as well, so that the  
16 information is shareable. And I think technology is  
17 going to get better and better so that you can -- what I  
18 call translate from one data source to another.

19       The other question is post maps drawing and new IRCs  
20 that are created at the City on the County level. And I  
21 think that's a different conversation. But I think it's  
22 a critical conversation because more and more in the next  
23 few years, I think we're going to see a lot of counties  
24 and a lot of cities in The State of California, we might  
25 want to be clear here that it's just support local

1 redistricting efforts in California or help get them  
2 started up or whatever. But I think it's going to come  
3 up. And I just feel sorry whenever people have to  
4 reinvent the wheel.

5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Sorry, I was  
6 just writing the comments down.

7 Commissioner Sadhwani?

8 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Thanks. I mean, I  
9 love all of these ideas. I think the reality, though, of  
10 making Constitutional amendments is extraordinarily  
11 difficult. It would require either a ballot initiative  
12 or the legislatures approval and then go on the ballot  
13 and to be approved by the people of California.

14 Maybe we could go the legislature route. But I  
15 think us getting the signatures necessary to appear on  
16 the ballot is like slim to none for any of these changes.  
17 And certainly, typically folks doing that have huge  
18 multimillion dollar budgets, too, even just for the  
19 signature collection.

20 So I think, even in things like the making the date  
21 earlier that as we discussed earlier, as Ray you and I  
22 had talked about, certainly the January of the zero year  
23 seems totally doable but the switching the Constitutional  
24 requirements less so.

25 In terms of the data sharing concept, to me, I mean,



1 we've talked about this kind of loosely for a long time,  
2 even while we were in the process of how nice it would be  
3 to be able to share data. My sense is that that's a  
4 conversation we should have with Karin.

5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.

6 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think she probably played  
7 a really big role in securing the funds from the State  
8 and getting the mandate from the State to create all of  
9 those web tools that we had. If we don't have her buy  
10 in, I'm not sure that it's going to move forward in all  
11 honesty, if we're just realistic about how these kinds of  
12 things work.

13 But otherwise, if we can get her buy in and it seems  
14 like a pretty reasonable, doable thing to create one tool  
15 that can then be used and shared and a data portal that  
16 could be shared, city, county, state for 2030.

17 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.

18 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I mean, there's plenty of  
19 time to create such a tool.

20 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, I agree with that. I  
21 know we've talked about it a few times and talking with  
22 the statewide database about having their data ability to  
23 be shared, it does it does directly impact us because  
24 we've got these other redistricting efforts, the local  
25 redistricting efforts. We would love to get their





1 information for sure.

2       So it's going both ways. It's not just us at The  
3 State level wanting to share with the local. It's like  
4 we want their information as well. So I do believe that  
5 that would be something that is within our mandate. I  
6 guess somebody could correct me if I'm wrong, but I  
7 think, you know, we can we can link it to our mandate and  
8 start a conversation with Karin and the statewide  
9 database and Jamie. I think that's doable. Let's see.  
10 Any other comments?

11       Commissioner Ahmad?

12       COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you. Just chiming in  
13 here on this conversation specifically to 5-D. I'm not  
14 quite sure if this fits in what the purpose of our  
15 commission is responsible for. And I'm specifically  
16 saying this because local redistricting efforts have  
17 their own processes, their own regulations they have to  
18 follow. And trying to combine the two might be a little  
19 bit more cumbersome for a 2030 commission than it  
20 currently stands. And from the tech perspective, it's  
21 here. The future is now. We are talking to robots. So  
22 I don't think there is an absence of the technology to do  
23 this. It's more so the communication from agency to  
24 agency, from local government to each other. And in  
25 local government to the State government. Just my two

1 sense.

2 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Any other comments?  
3 My computer's way slow.

4 Okay. Commissioner Kennedy?

5 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. There are some  
6 distinctions that we need to pay close attention to as we  
7 proceed with this discussion. So one is the difference  
8 between supporting the creation or advocating for the  
9 creation of independent redistricting bodies on the one  
10 hand. And the other being data sharing.

11 The data sharing part, I think we might be able to  
12 hang that on the hook of the existing Constitutional  
13 language, where we are to respect the geographic  
14 integrity of any city, county, city and county, local,  
15 neighborhood or local community in a manner that  
16 minimizes their division to the extent possible.

17 So to me, that's potentially a hook on which we  
18 could --

19 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.

20 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- hang the whole issue of  
21 data sharing --

22 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right.

23 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- the more -- the better  
24 we're able to share data with county redistricting  
25 bodies, municipal redistricting bodies, water districts,



1 school boards, any other redistricting effort, the better  
2 we're able to share data with them, the better we're able  
3 to comply with our mandate, as already set out in the  
4 Constitution.

5 So yeah, I think the case is definitely much  
6 stronger for us to pursue cooperation in data sharing  
7 than it is to pursue an explicit mandate to advocate for  
8 independent redistricting in the state. Thank you.

9 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

10 Commissioner Sinay?

11 COMMISSIONER SINAY: So I think there's three. And  
12 it might be that advocating people are -- what I was  
13 saying wasn't about advocating for IRCs. I know I'm --  
14 I'm on volunteer time doing that nationally but I was  
15 saying more providing technical assistance.

16 And yes they have their own laws and stuff. But I  
17 spent time talking to -- a lot of us got calls from local  
18 IRCs just saying, hey, how are you doing this? Or How  
19 are you doing that part? And sometimes we had the  
20 answers, sometimes we didn't.

21 And I wasn't putting it on 2030. I was actually  
22 putting it on us between now and at the end of our term,  
23 our tenure, there will be some -- there will be efforts  
24 at the local level to redo redistricting.

25 The first time you redistrict doesn't always happen



1 at the census. So sometimes you're forced to redistrict  
2 by a lawsuit or whatever. And it happens between the two  
3 censuses. So my thought was more around technical  
4 assistance, not advocating.

5 So just being able to sit down with whatever staff  
6 person from Health and Human Services like in San Diego  
7 County was this fell on their lap and kind of walk them  
8 through it and some of the questions they may want to ask  
9 and how to think about it.

10 So it was very different than advocating or getting  
11 into what their laws are, but just helping them see what  
12 the whole process is and what they may need to put into  
13 place.

14 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you for that  
15 clarification.

16 Commissioner Fornaciari?

17 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Just to follow up on the  
18 data conversation, I think it's essentially zero cost for  
19 us to work with the statewide database --

20 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.

21 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- work with other  
22 redistricting commissions that exist already, and come up  
23 with some kind of reasonable platform, independent data  
24 format kind of concept that we can use to share data and  
25 then work with the statewide database to have them think

1 about this and help them work through the next  
2 instantiation of the COI tool, right. And make that  
3 a, -- can we push -- help push to make it a broader tool  
4 for all levels of redistricting and data can be shared  
5 and that sort of thing. So not on the 2030 Commission,  
6 but ready for the 2030 --

7 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.

8 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- Commission to take  
9 advantage of.

10 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. We'll take one  
11 more because I think I'm running behind. I just got a  
12 message saying I'm running long on my -- I see how it is.

13 Commissioner Andersen?

14 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Just to tag you on to  
15 Commissioner Fornaciari there, and also, the legislature  
16 is the ones who pay for the statewide database and it's  
17 their directive. So this would actually help from the  
18 legislator's perspective. They would be doing this for  
19 all of their constituents and it would be beneficial to  
20 us as an addition to all the others. And the statewide  
21 race is absolutely the location for this because they  
22 know what they can and can't do. And the security issues  
23 involved in what you can share and what you can't share.  
24 And there are also portions of this which are not  
25 actually statewide database, but they would know who



1 would be in charge of that particular type of data. So  
2 it could be shared properly. So whatever subcommittee  
3 or --

4 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.

5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- through you to create  
6 one. That's where they should go.

7 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: All right. Thank you.  
8 Thank you for the conversation and the feedback.

9 I think, at this point, Chair Akutagawa, what I'm  
10 hearing is I think we could probably start a conversation  
11 with Karin with the statewide database in terms of  
12 providing the feedback that we've received and also we've  
13 received it from the local efforts as well. And then  
14 also in our subcommittee meetings with the legislature,  
15 we can also bring this up. That's how I am recommending  
16 that we move forward.

17 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I agree. I think there's a  
18 little bit of additional research that could benefit this  
19 conversation and then perhaps we could try to come to  
20 some kind of conclusion on it at the next meeting.

21 And I also do want to just put out there that we  
22 should also be mindful of what our future budget is  
23 looking like and that we will most likely have to make  
24 some choices as to priorities given limited budgets too.  
25 So but it doesn't hurt to at least have this

1 conversation. It may be something that can be done  
2 independently of us as well, too. And this is just  
3 planting the seeds, so. All right. Thank you,  
4 Commissioner Fernandez. And I do believe that concludes  
5 your report.

6 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Those were the only  
7 ones that we're going to go through today.

8 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Thank you very much. I  
9 know that we do have a list of others, but I think just  
10 in the interest of time, what we'll do is we'll continue  
11 on with the other items on the list at the next meeting.  
12 That, by the way, Commissioner Taylor will be chairing.  
13 I thought I'd just put that in there.

14 Okay. I know that we are coming up against a break  
15 in roughly about twenty minutes or so. We do have  
16 scheduled a closed session. I think what we could do is  
17 perhaps as a Commission, we could take a quick five-  
18 minute break and then resume in closed session at 3  
19 o'clock. Okay? So we'll go to closed session. We'll  
20 take a five-minute stretch break. We'll resume in closed  
21 session and then hopefully that will only last us -- 4  
22 o'clock. Being real, 4 o'clock.

23 (Whereupon, a recess was held)

24 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right. Thank you. Thank you,  
25 everyone who is rejoining us after our closed session. I

1 will just report that we only spoke about personnel  
2 matters and the only action we took was to revise the end  
3 date of two of our staff. And it will now be January  
4 31st instead of the previously approved January 15th.  
5 And with that, we are going to come back to subcommittee  
6 updates and we will finish that up with public comment.

7 So Kristian, I'm going to turn this back over to you  
8 to read the instructions.

9 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Sounds good, Chair.

10 The Commission will now take public comment, general  
11 public comments. To give comment, please call 877-853-  
12 5247 and enter meeting ID number 83776954326. Once  
13 you've dialed in, please press star 9 to enter the  
14 comment queue. The full call-in instructions are read at  
15 the beginning of the meeting and are provided on the live  
16 stream landing page. There is no one in the queue at  
17 this time, Chair.

18 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Oh, and also my apologies.  
19 Lessons Learned Subcommittee. I'm sorry, I promised that  
20 we would come back to you on the revised date for comment  
21 on the Lessons Learned report and path forward.

22 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.  
23 Commissioner Yee and I did have a chance to speak during  
24 the lunch break on this. So we are now proposing a  
25 January 20th -- Friday, January 20th date for any





1 comments to get to us. We would then, as I understand  
2 it, have three weeks before our February meeting, by  
3 which time we would have gone through all of the  
4 comments, come up with a summary that we would present to  
5 the Commission.

6 The Commission would tell us whether we got it right  
7 or not as far as our understanding of the instructions.  
8 And then we would come back to the March meeting with a  
9 revised Lessons Learned report. At which point, if that  
10 draft is acceptable to the Commission, the Commission  
11 could prove it. At that point, we would move into  
12 production. Thank you.

13 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right. Great. Thank you very  
14 much. And as was mentioned by Commissioner Kennedy at  
15 the last meeting, we did discuss calendaring monthly  
16 meetings at least through this fiscal year. And we'll  
17 reserve the right that if it's not necessary to hold a  
18 meeting, we will cancel it.

19 I do want to announce that I believe, Corina, you're  
20 going to be having the -- those dates, those monthly  
21 meeting date posted onto the website. So I just want to  
22 let everybody know to check back to see when those dates  
23 are going to be posted. For all of those who are  
24 listening in via livestream and or anybody who was  
25 listening in in another way.

1           With that, Kristian, do we have anybody who has  
2 joined us in this interim to make public comment on our  
3 subcommittee reports?

4           PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: There are no callers in  
5 the queue at this time, Chair.

6           CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Great. I do see that we  
7 have two comments from commissioners that want to make  
8 comments. So Commissioner Turner, let's start with you.

9           COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. Wanting to  
10 do lift Commissioner Vazquez' requests, you talked about  
11 setting future calendar dates and she has let us know  
12 that Wednesdays is a day that she will never really be  
13 able to join the full meeting or at least have  
14 difficulty. So I just wanted to lift that in case there  
15 was an opportunity for us to shift days so that she can  
16 join us for full meetings.

17           CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Good news. We have done that  
18 because once these are not great. However, for January  
19 there was a request to retain a Wednesday date due to  
20 Commissioner Yee's request. So only in January are we  
21 looking at a Wednesday date. But all the other meetings  
22 going forward will be moved to Fridays. Okay.

23           Commissioner Fernandez?

24           COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Corina, could  
25 you also send out a meeting notice for this meeting date

1 so it can get on my calendar because I'll forget to look  
2 on the website. Thank you. I appreciate it.

3 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Calendar invites to all the  
4 commissioners would be good so that it just populates our  
5 calendars. Thank you.

6 All right. Commissioner Turner, any follow up to  
7 your previous comment?

8 COMMISSIONER TURNER: I'd like to graciously say  
9 thank you. But no.

10 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: All right. Thank you very much.  
11 Seeing that no other comments and we have no additional  
12 public comments --

13 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Just a moment, Chair, we  
14 do have caller.

15 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

16 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: All right. Caller 2829,  
17 you have the floor. The floor is yours.

18 MS. WESTA-LUSK: Hello, Commissioners. Hello,  
19 commissioners. This is Renee Westa-Lusk calling in. I  
20 got to just hear a very small part of your meeting today.  
21 I heard the discussion a little bit on the allowing the  
22 sharing of information, I guess, to help local  
23 redistricting on the local level, maybe for cities,  
24 counties, et cetera. If that sharing of information  
25 could be done with state database, I think it might save



1 cities and counties a lot of money, those that are  
2 required to do a similar redistricting like the CRC is  
3 doing. Is there any comment you could give on that?

4 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Hello, Renee. It's nice  
5 to -- nice to hear from you. It's Commissioner  
6 Fernandez. Yes. We're actually going to reach out to  
7 the statewide database and we're going to start that  
8 conversation that hopefully for the 2030 redistricting  
9 efforts, that they will have a database that's sharable  
10 with the local cities and counties. Thank you.

11 MS. WESTA-LUSK: I just want to say that it would be  
12 most money saving for smaller redistricting efforts  
13 because the cost is pretty high to do that on their own.

14 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Yes. Thank you very much, Ms.  
15 Westa-Lusk. It's nice to hear from you again and a great  
16 point. Thank you.

17 MS. WESTA-LUSK: I want to say Merry Christmas and  
18 happy New Year to all the Commissioners.

19 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Thank you and same back to you as  
20 well too.

21 MS. WESTA-LUSK: Okay. Bye.

22 CHAIR AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Seeing that we have no  
23 other -- that was nice. Seeing that we have no other  
24 public comment now, I believe we are ready to adjourn  
25 this meeting with six minutes to spare. Thank you very



1 much, everyone, for a great conversation today. And  
2 happy New Year and merry Christmas to all. Happy  
3 holidays to all who are celebrating the holidays. And I  
4 look forward to seeing you all either in January or  
5 possibly February. I think it depends on if you're going  
6 to be back with us in January. Thank you. Meeting  
7 adjourned.

8 (Whereupon, the CRC Business Meeting adjourned  
9 at 4:30 p.m.)

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25



## CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 29th day of December, 2022.



---

PETER PETTY, CER-493  
Certified Court Reporter

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified transcriber and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.



JENNIFER BARTON, CDLT-247

January 2, 2023

DATE

