STATE OF CALIFORNIA CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION (CRC)

In the matter of:

CRC BUSINESS MEETING

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 2023
9:30 a.m.

Reported By:

Amanda Self, CER-1554

APPEARANCES

COMMISSIONERS

Derric Taylor, Chair
J. Kennedy, Vice Chair
Linda Akutagawa, Commissioner
Jane Andersen, Commissioner
Alicia Fernandez, Commissioner
Neal Fornaciari, Commissioner
J. Kennedy, Commissioner
Antonio Le Mons, Commissioner
Sara Sadhwani, Commissioner
Patricia Sinay, Commissioner
Trena Turner, Commissioner
Russell Yee, Commissioner

STAFF

Wanda Sheffield, Office Technician Alvaro E. Hernandez, Deputy Executive Director Corina Leon, Staff Services Manager Anthony Pane, Chief Counsel

TECHNICAL CONTRACTORS

Kristian Manoff, AV Technical Director/Comment Moderator

3

INDEX

	PAGE
Call to Order and Roll Call	4
Introduction	5
Executive Director Report	7
Chief Counsel Report	10
Administrative Report	25
Public Comment	40
Subcommittee Reports	41
Closed Session	80
Subcommittee Updates Continued	80
Public Comment	110
Discussion of Future Meetings	111
Public Comment	118
Closing	119

PROCEEDINGS

2 January 11, 2023 9:30 a.m.

3 CHAIR TAYLOR: Good morning, California. Happy New

4 Year. It is 1/11/23 at approximately 09:31 hours on this

5 great day from Southern California. The CRC would like

6 to wish the best to all of Californian's that are

7 | affected by the severe weather. Although water is needed

8 is difficult to bear in such a heavy weather pattern.

9 My name is Derric Taylor. I am your rotating chair

10 | for this meeting, along with Vice Chair Ray Kennedy. We

11 | would like to call this meeting to order.

12 Before we get too far afield, Wanda, can you call

13 | the roll, please?

14 MS. SHEFFIELD: Yes. Good morning, Commissioners.

15 Commissioner Toledo?

16 | Commissioner Turner?

17 | COMMISSIONER TURNER: Let's get this party started

18 in here. Here.

19

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Vazquez?

20 Commissioner Yee?

21 COMMISSIOENR YEE: Here.

22 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Ahmad? No?

23 Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here. Happy New Year,

25 everyone.

1 MS. SHEFFIELD: Happy New Year. 2 Commissioner Andersen? COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here. Happy New Year. 3 MS. SHEFFIELD: Happy New Year. 4 5 Commissioner Fernandez? COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Presente. Good morning, 6 7 Wanda. 8 MS. SHEFFIELD: Good morning. Commissioner Fornaciari? 9 10 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here. 11 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Kennedy? 12 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here. 13 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Le Mons? 14 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here. 15 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Sadhwani? 16 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here. 17 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Sinay? 18 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here. [In Spanish]. 19 MS. SHEFFIELD: Good morning. 20 Commissioner and Chair Taylor? 21 CHAIR TAYLOR: Good morning. Good morning. Good 22 morning. I am present. 2.3 MS. SHEFFIELD: All right. 24 CHAIR TAYLOR: And as an accessibility issue, we 25 must note for the moment we do not have an ASL

interpreter. The period of time that the ASL interpreter is not present, we're able to add in that interpretation post. And we are working on having one available as soon as possible.

2.0

2.3

As a method to plot our course for the day, the run of show is as follows: we will begin with the director updates and chief counsel's report. We anticipate that that will be about fifteen minutes. From there, we will go to the subcommittee reports. We anticipate that until our first break at 11 o'clock. We will return to subcommittee reports.

Those subcommittee reports prior to our break would be Finance and Administration and the Website. The subcommittee reports that we anticipate after the break would be Website, Lessons Learned, and any legislative updates. That should take us to lunch.

We will continue after lunch with any subcommittee updates as needed. We will have a closed session again as needed. And I hope, fingers crossed, to give us some time back before the end of the day. So I don't anticipate this going all the way till 4:30.

So with that, are there any commissioner announcements?

24 Commissioner Kennedy, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Just to

note that I'm going to be traveling some for work and I wanted to check with colleagues and see if it would be possible to shift the April meeting by a week. I believe that I can do it on the 7th, but it would be much better for me if it were on the 14th. So I just wanted to check and see how people felt about that.

CHAIR TAYLOR: That can be -- before we close the meeting, as we plan out our meetings and agenda. That can be an item that we discuss at the end before we close. So please, Commissioners, take that under consideration.

Any other announcements? Going once. Going twice.

I'm going to sell that time. I'm going to give it away.

If there are no further announcements, I'll turn it over to our Executive Director Fernandez. Go ahead.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Thank you. And good morning to everyone. I want to first start off by letting you know, and I think you've seen the email that our student assistant Jovan Lopez has moved on to another opportunity that's presented itself.

So I want to congratulate him and also thank him for his tireless work for the Commission. As I mentioned in my email, he was a utility player. He pretty much wore different hats and did pretty much whatever we asked of him. So I want to thank him for that.

1 On that note, I also wanted to let you know that this will be my last Commission meeting as executive director. My term will be ending at the end of this 3 4 month. So I wanted to reflect a little bit and thank you 5 all for this wonderful opportunity. It's like no other. I don't think I can say anything after this is going 6 7 to be a piece of cake. I'll tell you that much. So I'm very appreciative of the opportunity. I look forward to 8 9 what's next in my life, in my career, and I will keep 10 tabs on what you all are doing as we move forward. 11 So hopefully, things will go well and that we'll be 12 able to connect somewhere down the road as well. 13 appreciate it. I wanted to express my appreciation to 14 you all in that way today. 15 As far as our Website and Database, I'm going to 16 defer to the subcommittee and to Corina to provide a 17 little bit more information and updates in those areas. 18 In regards to the budget update, I'll keep it simple 19 where we're going right now through June 2023. 20 Thereafter, I'm not sure where we're going, but that will 21 be part of our discussion with the Finance and Admin 22 Subcommittee as well. And that concludes my report for 23 today. Short and sweet. 24 We're moving through the CHAIR TAYLOR: Wow.

agenda. With that, any questions for the (audio

1 interference). Commissioner Kennedy, did you want (audio interference)? 3 4 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. 5 Director Hernandez, my recollection is that you've 6 been working on a -- your own Lessons Learned report, as 7 it were, and the Lessons Learned Subcommittee, and I 8 would imagine the entire Commission is eager to receive 9 that. So I just wanted to get an update from you on 10 where that stands. Thank you. 11 Thank you. MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes. I have provided a 12 draft copy to the Finance and Admin Subcommittee. 13 working on the final report which will be provided to you 14 at -- before my term has ended for sure. 15 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. 16 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you. Any other questions? 17 Commissioner Fornaciari, go ahead. 18 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Just Alvaro, I just 19 want to say thanks for all your hard work. I know it's 20 been -- there's been ups and downs. It's been a rough 21 But you stepped in for us when the Commission was 22 at really, really rough place and kind of. Yeah. 23 I mean, it was tough. And you took on a really tough 24 role at that time and helped us work through those rough

patches. And I just -- I just want to say thanks for all

1 your hard work and all you've done and wish you the best 2 in your future career. CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari. 3 I think you said that very succinctly and earnestly. 4 5 From all of the Commission, Alvaro, we would like to say thank you very much. I especially appreciated your 6 7 very -- you're able to connect with people and friendly, 8 wonderful demeanor. And thank you. 9 Anything else from the Commissioners? And with 10 that, thanks to Alvaro, we'll say -- we'll move on to the 11 chief counsel's report. 12 ATTNY PANE: Thank you, Chair. Good morning, 13 Commissioners. I don't have any specific agenda items 14 for you all today. But if you do have any questions, I'd 15 be happy to entertain them. 16 CHAIR TAYLOR: E.D. Hernandez, go ahead. 17 MR. HERNANDEZ: I just wanted to remind you that I 18 wanted to turn it over to Corina after this next 19 questions to our chief counsel. 2.0 CHAIR TAYLOR: Understood. 21 Commissioner Sinay? 22 COMMISSIOENR SINAY: Thanks. Director Pane, and 23 Corina, and I -- on email kind of discussed email use, personal versus CRC emails. And I wanted to see if you 24

could share that information to the whole Commission

1 since several of us are -- have started turning in our Commission phones and not everyone is checking their 3 Commission emails the way they were checking them earlier. And so if you could just clarify in public what 4 5 we should be thinking about and how we should be moving forward and how that affects our decisions of turning in 6 7 our CRC laptops and our CRC phones. ATTNY PANE: Sure. Certainly, the recommended 9 practice is to -- but not a requirement, is to maintain 10 any state resources that are heard in existence. That 11 could include a cell phone, that could include a laptop. 12 And in a perfect world, everybody is doing the work on 13 those devices and personal work on personal devices. 14 Of course, that doesn't always work out that way, 15 and that's okay. You just want to be mindful of that, 16 that if you do end up using personal devices for work, 17 that that may be something that we need to chat about. 18 If there's records requests or things along those lines 19 where we may -- you may need to search your individual 20 devices instead of just the work devices. 21 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you. 22 Commissioner Fernandez? 2.3 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Anthony, 24 I don't know if you wanted to go through or maybe just

like a brief overview, we've kind of been going back and

forth with the AG's Office in terms of them providing legal counsel for us. And I don't know if you wanted to give an update on that or -- we're still in talks and trying to iron things out.

ATTNY PANE: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: But I think it might be helpful for the rest of the Commissioners to hear where we are. Thank you.

ATTNY PANE: Sure. Happy to. So where we're at right now with the Attorney General's Office is they are available to the Commission and they have a bit of a unique contractual relationship with departments. It's what I'll just refer to as a direct debit, where normally what we've had with say for example, Strumwasser is we receive an invoice and then we pay that invoice.

The attorney general's office doesn't work that way. What they do is they debit the money and then tell us what they've debited. And of course, we could -- if there was a question or a challenge to any of it, we could certainly work with them on it, but it works a little bit differently than what folks are used to.

That said, we do qualify. If we stay under 1,000 hours in the calendar year, we qualify for them not debiting money from our account. So we need to stay under 1,000 hours. Once we go above 1,000 hours, then we

are debited their hourly rate. And so I think that's going to be something to keep in mind when we choose to use the AG's Office.

And keep in mind that it applies for anything. It applies for inquiries. It applies for quick conference meetings. It's going to be treated just like a private law firm billing. And so we do have a few more wrinkles to work out specifically who might be devoted to the Commission as any sort of regular counsel should the Commission go that route.

Again, this is an option for the Commission. It's set in place. It's not something that you have to use. It's a lever for you to use if you want. And it is an option for -- I'll just call it the out years. Once you get into July and a new fiscal year --

MS. LEON: Sorry. I am going to present in like two minutes.

ATTNY PANE: -- depending upon what the fiscal situation is, this may be, again, an option that the commission may want to use.

We are still working on details, as I mentioned, specifically about the dedicated counsel that could be used given the particular issues, for example, redistricting questions, might it be a particular counsel if it's for Bagley-Keene meetings and other sort of

1 administrative issues, might it be a different counsel and how that's all going to going to work. 3 We're also finalizing details on any potential 4 issues regarding any conflicts of interest. 5 example, if any issues are adverse -- any Commission issues are adverse to the Attorney General's Office. 6 How 7 do you still have an Attorney General serving as the commission's counsel when their interests might be 8 9 adverse to the office of the Attorney General? And so 10 we're going to work that issue out as well. So those are things that are still sort of pending. 11 12 But I do want you to know that that is kind of where we 13 are right now. It's we're ironing out the details to 14 serve as an option for you all, especially when we have 15 to stay -- when the budgets get really tight after July 16 1. 17 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you, Chief Counsel Pane. 18 Any follow up? Any other questions for Chief 19 Counsel? 20 Commissioner Akutagawa? 21 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sorry, I think I might have 22 missed this. Just for clarification, it's 1,000 hours 2.3 total for the year, or is it 1,000 per month? 24 It's 1,000 hours in a calendar year. ATTNY PANE: 25 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

1 CHAIR TAYLOR: Commissioner Andersen? COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Quick question 3 on that. Basically, are we just deciding this is how 4 they work with us, or do we have any give-and-take? 5 it just a -- this is how they do it, period? We're just delving into it or are we able to actually work something 6 7 out? ATTNY PANE: Well, Commissioner, we're still --8 we're still working something out, I should say. But I 10 will say this is -- among the options of using the 11 Attorney General's Office, this is by far the most 12 advantageous. We qualify because of the size of our --13 of the Commission. 14 We serve is in sort of a special circumstance where 15 if you -- if your department is small enough and the 16 needs are discrete enough, there is sort of a -- I'll 17 just, for lack of a better term, I'll call it a bucket. 18 You can qualify for this essentially 1,000 hours of legal 19 services without it being debited from you, without being 20 charged. 21 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. 22 This is not available to everybody. ATTNY PANE: 2.3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. And then a quick 24 follow up on that is, would we, because we do have very 25 specific issues, and there would be a huge amount of time

wasted, which we did have before the AG's Office in 1 figuring out what it is we're actually trying to tell 3 them and get, can we actually arrange a dedicated person, or a specific -- we have specific needs. 4 5 So if we need a person in this particular field as opposed to sometimes you go into a general place and it's 6 7 like, okay, here's general intake, we'll see who we can 8 find for you. Is that something that could be worked out 9 or is that a --every time is a hit or miss? 10 ATTNY PANE: Well, that's -- you're right. I mean, 11 and that's what I'm trying to work out now. 12 upon the particular issue, I don't think we will be 13 successful in gaining -- in getting one person from the 14 AG's Office to cover all areas the Commission might need. 15 But I think we-- what I'm trying to push for is a 16 dedicated person depending upon the subject matter, so 17 that it's almost like having a dedicated person --18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. 19 ATTNY PANE: -- or dedicated people. 20 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you. Is that all? 21 Commissioner Sinay? 22 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Really, asking you, Director 23 and my colleague, how do we feel about the conflict-of-24 interest issue? That was one that really came up strong 25 when we were trying to think through if we could use the

AG's Office before we -- when we lost our first counsel.

So I really don't want to lose that piece of it that we are independent. The AG's Office is The State's lawyer in a way. And we've had experience when push

5 comes to shove, the AG's Office will side with The State

6 at all times versus the Independent Redistricting

7 Commission. So I don't want us to walk away from that

8 reality.

1

3

4

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.3

24

25

ATTNY PANE: Yeah. And ultimately, I think that's going to be a policy, as you mentioned, Commissioner

Sinay, for the Commission. This is what I'm trying to do at this point is get -- I kind of ironed out the details of how any conflict -- what the AG's Office would be able to do as far as walling off their attorney from the issue I will say that sort of walling off, as it's called, does occur in other legal circles.

So that is not a unique practice to the AG's Office.

The question is whether the Commission is comfortable with that practice. But I will say it does happen in other legal contexts.

CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you.

22 Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Yes. I just wanted to just highlight that Anthony has also told us it's an option. We could have contingencies again.

- 1 (Audio interference) because of the walling off, I am familiar with that. With investigations, we work with 3 attorneys. If there's an administrative versus criminal 4 investigation, you call it off in terms of the attorneys 5 cannot talk to each other, are in different units in different areas so that there is no conflict between the 6 7 two. But it is -- we are still trying to work all of this out. And when I say we, it's mainly Anthony -- try to work that out with the AG's Office so that we have a 10 11 better idea of what the response time is going to be, if 12 they're going to be able to -- to kind of be our eyes out 13 there to see if there's any potential lawsuits or 14 something that we need to respond to. 15 So we're still working it out. Again, it's an 16 option. It doesn't it mean we have to use it. It could 17 be that we have a different -- we still have the contract 18 with Strumwasser. We just don't have funding in it. 19 let's just keep that in mind. We're working it out and 20 hopefully we can get this ironed out within the next 21 month or two. Thank you. 22
 - CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez, for reminding us that we have options.
- 24 Commissioner Fornaciari, go ahead.

2.3

25 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, just to follow up on



that really quickly. The other option the AG has is much quicker ability to contract -- if in the out years from when our contract with Strumwasser has ended, if we do need a contract out, the AG can do that much more quickly than we can.

CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

2.3

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think just for clarification, so Commissioner Fornaciari, are you saying then -- and maybe, Chief Counsel Pane, you can clarify, so in the out years, if we go with the option -- and I think obviously it's going to depend on what the details are going to be as they get worked out and once we hear the actual details.

But for the sake of this discussion, Commissioner Fornaciari, are you saying then the AG's Office -- if we go with the AG's Office, let's say we -- just say, okay, we're just going to use them given the 1,000 hours that we'll be able to have with them, at least before getting charged, the AG -- if we should need to get outside counsel because of a conflict, we could then ask the AG's office to hire outside counsel for us to ensure that you know that no conflict exists. Okay. All right. Just want to --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. That end or if



1 there's a lawsuit in the AG can't handle the lawsuit, I
2 believe I'm correct.

Anthony, correct me if I'm wrong.

2.0

2.3

ATTNY PANE: Yeah, I think you're right. It's just I think the issue and I'll just bring it up, the issue is one of payment, how that will work. So typically, the default is using the Attorney General's Office for legal matters for The State.

And if you have an exemption or you get their -essentially the waiver that allows you to then go out and
get your own outside counsel. Commissioner Fornaciari's
point is the AG's Office may say at some point, hey, we
don't have the resources within the AG's Office to
address this issue.

So either we'll go out and get outside counsel or you can go out and get outside counsel, but not -- in either sense, we still have to usually go to the AG's office. That step is obviously taken care of because we're already in communication with the attorney General's office.

But I still think an outstanding question that in that circumstance is who pays for the outside counsel in that situation? And that is a detail to be worked out for sure.

CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you.



Commissioner Andersen, and then Commissioner Sadhwani.

2.0

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you for that. But to not forget the elephant in the room, whoever's paying for it, that's who they're responsible to. So it's just -- locks in conflicts of interest. I understand that you're working this out. But if the reason why we need to not use the AG's Office is because of conflicts of interest, and that they are going to hire an attorney for us, I mean, so who is our attorney working for?

ATTNY PANE: Well, and to your point, Commissioner

Andersen, what I would suspect, although I'm getting a

little ahead of the AG's Office, but I would suspect that
they would do is they would say we don't have the
resources available. Go out and get your outside

counsel.

And then the relationship is directly between the Commission and the outside counsel. And I would assume it would be working essentially, what we have with Strumwasser which is it's a contract between the Commission and the outside counsel.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right. Thank you for bringing that up, because that's -- Yes. So really, it's not if there is a conflict, that's not an option. It's if they have a different field, there isn't a conflict.

They just don't have the expertise. Like the reason why we're using Strumwasser in the first place is that's an obvious easy one. But we still -- then where's the money coming from? So I appreciate you looking through all the options here. Thank you very much.

CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

1

3

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Thank you. And just as we have this conversation, I think maybe I just need some reminding about what is the thought process of what kind of legal counsel do we anticipate that we'll need over the course of the next several years? Is it in meeting Bagley-Keene expertise in which a member of the Attorney General's Office could be present for our meetings or on an as needed basis to review questions that that arise? Or are we are we trying to think more broadly about litigation, which seems pretty unlikely at this point, or some sort of Supreme Court nullifies all maps or something like that to one of these cases that's currently before them. I think, having a better sense of like the scope of our needs, at least for myself and maybe, maybe that conversation happened previously and it wasn't part of it, but would help me to better understand how to proceed because it -- Attorney General's Office seems perfectly well-suited to provide ongoing support on

1 issues around transparency or should there be requests for documents or something of that nature. If it's a 3 redistricting matter, then I think that might be 4 different, but I think the likelihood of that is fairly 5 limited. ATTNY PANE: Yeah. So to your point, Commissioner 6 Sadhwani, that's exactly the discussion we're having. We 7 8 sort of -- to put it probably a little too broadly, but 9 we've -- we have it in two buckets, sort of -- I'll just call it administrative law and then administrative issues 10 11 and redistricting, specific niche issues. And so we're 12 trying to iron out maybe who might be any dedicated counsel for sort of those two buckets. And that's sort 13 14 of where we are right now with it. 15 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you. 16 Commissioner Kennedy? 17 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. Yes, I would 18 generally agree with Commissioner Sadhwani. However, I 19 might also propose a third bucket that we need to 20 contemplate separately from routine administrative law 21 and some eventual actual redistricting litigation. And 22 that is the legal reform. 2.3 We're not finished with legal reform, and I think 24 that we do need legal support in that. I'd be interested

in Chief Counsel Pane's thoughts on how much legal

support we might need in that. So I would very much like to see us focus on that as a as a third bucket. And yes, I do want to avoid conflicts of interest. And I would agree with Commissioner Anderson that it's -- walling off and everything is there as a -- as an option.

2.0

2.3

But I would see it as a last option because, yeah, whoever's paying for it. And there's just -- there's always potential for walls to crack or whatever. So I would be much more comfortable with us having independent counsel when we need it.

And I would point out to anybody listening that Government Code Section 8253, Subsection A, Paragraph 5 says the Commission shall hire Commission staff, legal counsel, and consultants as needed. So I think we have legal basis to, as needed, hire outside counsel.

And it would be incumbent upon the legislature to provide us the funding that we need to hire legal counsel as needed with the authority that we have under The Government. Thank you.

CHAIR TAYLOR: Commissioner Sinay? You might be our last commissioner related to this topic unless there's something novel to the discussion.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I originally raised my hand because I wanted to do exactly what Commissioner Kennedy said, that I think for me, the conflict of interest when

I see a conflict of interest is more around the 1 legislative side and the legislative changes that we'd like to see. And we want to make sure that whoever works 3 4 with us is -- understands how to understand -- is 5 independent and is helping us work to get those legislative changes to the best of our needs and not to 6 7 the needs of The State or other politicians. So I think 8 that third bucket was where I was really focused on. 9 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay. 10 Chief Counsel Pane, that concludes your reports? 11 ATTNY PANE: It does. Thank you. 12 CHAIR TAYLOR: Always. Appreciate it. And let's 13 welcome to the agenda with her admin update, Corina Leon. 14 MS. LEON: Thank you. Thank you, Chair. 15 morning and happy new year. Glad to be here. Let's see, 16 my update for this month has been I'm catching up and 17 processing new contracts and invoiced TECs. 18 So I think we've been working on getting all of 19 those caught up and sent out to you, closing accounts, 20 transferring admin responsibilities to myself and the 21 move to the suite, which Jovan and Wanda managed and 22 completed the move. 2.3 They did a fabulous job. I really appreciate that. 24 They took care of it so well and efficiently. It was an 25 immense relief for myself and so I want to say thank you

to Jovan and Wanda for -- and everybody, actually. We all did a bit. But they took care of -- they took on a big, big project there.

I've been taking on course the human resources off boarding pass, getting to know the HR support staff and working through the project, working with Tim on Form 700 and he'll be circling back with him for a second session. In regards to the budget, I've been continuing training with Terri.

In addition to budget tasks, he's helping with maintaining our expenditure reports right now while I'm and I've been delving more into the website and UI projects. So she's been taking that on. I appreciate that. State Archives, there was a little bit of hiccup, but we found an alternative download option.

It's a very time-consuming task to download all the files, especially videos, and Paul's been taking care of it beautifully. Thank you for that. And he provides very concise and informative documentations on the files. Very helpful.

And so he's also -- he's already handed off the COI and website files to State Archives. And now he's working on our videos. So that's being taken care of and it should be done in a couple of weeks, maybe a week or so.

With the website, we've been looking into finding alternative for storing and accessing our videos. We have a plan. Martine's been working very hard on that. I think he's researched -- we've researched alternative storage and he's been testing out a few options.

I don't see Martine on the call, but I wanted to share. He's actually been able to use YouTube and it looks like that's working out very well. And of course, we want to put it through some testing with the Website Subcommittee.

And yeah, we're working with them, Commissioner

Andersen and Taylor on that. So he's been working really
hard on that. And I think he's got -- I think he's
pretty happy with the YouTube option, but he's testing it
out.

With the UI project, we're reviewing snowflake database and structure. So I did that and worked with Snowflake and Paul to set up the database on Snowflake, and we were able to create the table and files for the COI data. However, we're needing to review that option because it's limited.

So we're reviewing our database needs and options.

And last month Commissioner Akutagawa suggested that I
may hiring R.A. possibly to assist looking into D.B.

options so that we can present to the commission options

- that are secure, maintainable and adaptable to the
 Commission's needs. So I do know -- well, he's been
- He's a D.B. subject matter expert, and I'm hoping to interest him with our project to help out if the Commission would like his help. So that's where I am
- 7 with that. So I was not sure how to go about that, but
- 8 | if we can, I think we need to vote to hire him.
- So I mentioned that to Commissioner Taylor and

 Kennedy about that. So that's where I'm at, just getting

 on board -- I mean, getting used to more tasks and taking

 on HR and getting more involved with the UI project and

 the website. Thank you. Do you have any questions for
- 15 CHAIR TAYLOR: Commissioner Yee, go ahead.
- 16 COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, sir. And thank you,
- 17 | Corina. Your multitasking capacity just amazes me.
- 18 | Wondering if you could just say a little bit more about
- 19 | the Snowflake situation? I think the last we heard, it
- 20 | sounded like a fully adequate solution, but it sounds
- 21 | like it's turning out not to be. So I just want to hear
- 22 a little bit more about that.
- MS. LEON: Okay.

3

14

me?

retired two years.

- 24 CHAIR TAYLOR: So if I can stop you just for a
- 25 | second. So we have the Website Subcommittee on the



1 Agenda. We can get to that topic shortly. We'll be able to answer more of those questions. So we're going to 3 venture down that path shortly. Hang on to your 4 comments. Hang on to your question to try to lump that 5 all together. 6 COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. 7 CHAIR TAYLOR: Commissioner Fernandez, go ahead. COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. And I 9 apologize if I'm going in and out, but it's the land of 10 storms. So I'm doing the best I can. So I can -- I 11 don't know if we need to vote because an R.A. is a 12 temporary position. So I don't know. 13 Anthony, do you know the answer to that in terms of 14 being able to hire? 15 I mean, I would recommend that we ATTNY PANE: Yes. 16 do that as we have done with other R.A.'s, because, as 17 Commissioner Kennedy briefly mentioned, the Commission 18 does hire and this would be a hiring decision. 19 And we would -- it can be done, certainly done at 20 the appropriate time. It can be done in closed session 21 under the personnel issues exception. But we would want 22 a vote and it would need to be a super majority vote. 2.3 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you. 24 Commissioner Sinay?

Thank you. I was curious.

Ι

COMMISSIONER SINAY:

realized there's been so many different articles around redistricting and independent redistricting Commissions and our social media presence has kind of become null and void, except, nothing on -- except for when we have meetings, maybe.

2.3

And I wanted to know if we had -- if that was a conscious decision or if we need to have a conversation about -- we're still meeting for ten years. And if people are following us, it is an opportunity people engage on the thought on what independent redistricting Commissions mean.

And I was a little disappointed that we didn't have anything out the day that was the official first day of The State Legislative Districts that we drew. There's so many different opportunities that we've missed to keep people engaged on why independent redistricting commissions are important and about the work that we've done.

And so I just wanted to put it out there and I didn't know if this was the right time or not to have the discussion on -- I know it's a staffing -- but it doesn't seem like it would be that difficult to do some of these.

CHAIR TAYLOR: Commissioner Sinay, I think we can -I would be willing to take a few minutes since you
presented that question to go over your inquiry. So

1 specifically, you want to know whether or not we should be active in the promotion of independent redistricting; is that correct? 3 4 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. I mean, it might be --5 that might be the question or it might be an administrative question. Do we still have a 6 7 communication plan? We used to have a social media 8 communications plan. 9 And do we still have any plan on how we keep us in 10 sharing information about the California Redistricting 11 Commission and our efforts and the outcomes from our 12 efforts. I don't know how to word a better. 13 CHAIR TAYLOR: And so my question would that have to 14 be an agendized topic for a later Commission meeting? 15 Commissioner Akutagawa? 16 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'm just going to comment. 17 I think this is -- I'm going to call it a people resource 18 kind of conundrum, I think because we might be able to do 19 minimal. But I think going forward, in fairness to the person who's going to be our sole staff person, I think 20 21 that may be an unrealistic expectation to add on top of 22 many other things. 2.3 I think the only suggestion I'll make, and I think -- I don't know if there needs to be a legal 24 25 opinion on this is perhaps the formation of a

subcommittee who would then take over communications 1 duties and do what you're suggesting, Commissioner Sinay. But I think that that is going to be up to the Chair. 3 4 And then whether or not that kind of official communications -- what the processes and the -- I guess, 5 what that would need to entail given that then it would 6 7 be on behalf of the entire Commission. So just a 8 thought. 9 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa. 10 Any other thoughts regarding this topic? 11 Commissioner Sinay? 12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thanks. I quess I was --13 there's two pieces to my question. One was moving 14 backwards, why did some of that not happen? Because we 15 have had the staff for it over the last year and then 16 moving forward as, Commissioner Akutagawa has stated, the 17 2010 Redistricting Commission, they actually took over --18 the commissioners themselves took over all social media 19 just to make sure that -- I think a presence is really 20 important, especially if we want to keep people engaged for 2030. 21 22 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you. 2.3 Any other thoughts regarding this? 24 Commissioner Kennedy? 25 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.

1 would be very much supportive of Commissioner Akutagawa's idea of setting up a subcommittee to take on the communications function. And we can continue to hear 3 4 from Corina about her workload and whether there is any 5 of this. I mean, if it's a matter of subcommittee creating 6 7 content and then Corina would be the one posting it, 8 maybe she would have time to do the posting, but not the 9 actual message development. So I think that could be a 10 useful division of labor on that. Thank you. 11 CHAIR TAYLOR: So I'm hearing a possible need. 12 hearing a need for a Outreach Subcommittee, almost like 13 reinstating what we had. Would I have volunteers for an 14 Outreach Subcommittee? 15 Commissioner Sinay, go ahead. 16 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I don't know if -- oh, there's 17 Commissioner Fornaciari. Commissioner Fornaciari does 18 not want to do it. So I do think that there are certain 19 people that have a really strong presence on social 2.0 media. Commissioner Sadhwani. 21 And it makes sense in some regards, Commissioner

And it makes sense in some regards, Commissioner

Vazquez, those who know I don't know how to make memes

and all of that, how to make a lot of the digital stuff.

My thought would be to have -- I'll tell you where this

all came from. I was embarrassed that the redistricting

22

2.3

24

- hub or whatever, whichever one that was, it wasn't the hub, came to me to say, hey, today's the first day that the maps that you all approved are actually active at The
 - And I was like, oh, well, we should have known that.

 And we should, we should be the one announcing that. So anyway, I just wanted to say, some of you who have an active presence, it would be great.
 - CHAIR TAYLOR: So that sort of falls into that for -- our wider view of what we think should be our stance as what our stance as the Commission has been.
- 12 Commissioner Andersen, go ahead.

2.3

State level.

- COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'm clearly not the person to be doing this. I'm not on social media period.

 However, I think this is a very, very good idea. We're having an issue here about are we relevant? The finance Department had said we're not. And we understand we do have -- legislatively we have things we have to do to set up the 2030 Commission.
- I think this is actually a very good idea. And I'm fully in support. However, I'm one of those people. I'm backing you up 100 percent. I cannot do that because I said I'm not on social media, but this is a very good idea and I do believe it's really necessary. And I can think of a couple of issues going on right now where it

- would be nice to have this communication ability. So thanks for bringing it up.
- 3 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you. I'm going to ask
 4 Commissioner Sadhwani, Commissioner Vazquez, that you
 5 guys reply since you were named -- as to your
 6 willingness to do this.
- 7 Commissioner Sadhwani, you have the floor.

2.0

2.3

- COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. Yeah, I heard that shout out, Commissioner Sinay. I'm happy to be supportive. I want to be really honest. I'm trying to be really cautious about taking on more of anything at this point in time, because I just feel like I have too much on my plate.
- But I agree. I mean, I felt like there were missed opportunities. And at the same time, I go back and forth on our relevance, to be perfectly frank. At this point in time, our main role is over. I think that we can continue to have a communications role and remind people about the importance of independent redistricting.
- I think we can, through a modest communications plan, be supportive of efforts elsewhere, of course, as well. But I'm happy to play a supportive role. I wouldn't want to take that on in its entirety because like I said, I just have -- I have a lot on my plate, unfortunately, at this point between work and kids.

1 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you. Commissioner Fernandez? Then I'm going to pick out Commissioner Vazquez. 3 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. 4 Thank you, Chair. 5 mean, (audio interference). I think I'm also agree with what Commissioner Sadhwani said. I'm not sure in terms 6 7 of how much effort we should be putting towards this, at least in the next few years, maybe once census is up, 8 9 then maybe a little bit more relevance then. 10 Also, if we're going to move forward with this. Ι 11 mean, it wouldn't just be social media, I'm assuming. 12 don't know if we're thinking of press releases that we 13 send it out to the media as well. And if that's the 14 case, then I would make sure that we receive the 15 information from Martine in terms of that whole 16 distribution that Fredy had whenever we had press 17 releases of that, that we maintain those contacts and I'm 18 not volunteering. CHAIR TAYLOR: Commissioner Vazquez and Commissioner 19 2.0 Le Mons? 21 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I also, like 22 Commissioner Sadhwani, feel like I've got a lot on my on 23 my plate, things that I put on hold while we were doing 24 the actual business of redistricting. So I'm happy -- I 25 am on social media, so I'm happy to amplify messages and

support -- play a supporting role on social media. But I don't think I have the capacity to sort of develop strategy or messages either proactively or in response to things that are happening out in the world.

CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you.

2.0

2.3

Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you, Chair. I think that -- first of all, I want to say I hold the position that Commissioner Sadhwani put forward. But it raises something bigger for me. I think that maybe we need to agendize the future of the Commission over the next eight years and what our priorities are going to be.

I think that this has come up around what we're going to need in terms of potential legal representation, communication, and there's probably other categories as well. So I think that this deserves some concentrated time. And to look at it more broadly as what does the next eight years look like and what is the expectations moving forward?

I feel like the bulk of our work has been completed as well, but not that these things aren't important, but it's a little bit different than what I think our scope was initially. Thank you.

24 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons.

Any other comments or questions? I think I'm in the

same stance as Commissioner Le Mons. I think we need to
have an agendized -- I believe we need to have an
agendized topic in time for discussion. Going forward, I
think it lays more into our strategic plans for the next
eight years as opposed to simply a Communications
Committee. So I would like to add this to agenda for our
next February meeting, and we can further expand upon

Commissioner Kennedy?

2.3

this topic.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. And I agree that we need to have a discussion of this from a strategic perspective, and we can get the ball rolling in February, but there are things that are coming up, I think, sooner than people are realizing. I mean, the requirement that candidates for the 2030 Commission have voted in X number of -- X number of elections prior to their application.

It seems like that -- those three elections I think would be 2024, 2026, and 2028. So really for individuals who might be interested in applying for the Commission, we need to be out there almost now talking about what the requirements are and talking about what service on the Commission is in order to have the best possible pool of applicants for the 2030 Commission. So yes, let's have this strategic discussion. But let's not fool ourselves

1 into thinking that we can let this slide until 2028. Thank you. 3 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you. I think I'm in agreement 4 with your statement, Commissioner Kennedy. 5 Commissioner Fornaciari? COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I think what Commissioner 6 7 Le Mons brought up -- a lot of that is related to the work that Commissioner Sinay and I are going to be doing 8 9 on the committee we're on, Continuity Transition 10 Committee. So I think and -- now that the -- I'm sorry. 11 I've been really sick. Now that the draft of the --12 CHAIR TAYLOR: Lessons Learned? 13 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Lessons learned is out, 14 Commissioner Sinay and I are going to get together and 15 formulate an outline of the work that we think the 16 Commission needs to do over the next several years. 17 so maybe that outline can serve as a basis for this 18 discussion. Thank you. 19 CHAIR TAYLOR: Absolutely. So some of those topics 2.0 are embedded in the continuity community and they're 21 going to sort of flesh their self out over the upcoming 22 meetings. And we should be able to have a directive and 2.3 be -- and see whether or not this is a need or how the 24 need can be filled. Any other questions or comments? 25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do you know where this

1 printer came from? 2 MS. LEON: Yes. It was in the very back of my room. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is that the one --3 4 CHAIR TAYLOR: So hearing none, or seeing none, 5 Kristian, can you open us up for public comment with agenda item 2? 6 7 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Sure thing. In order to maximize transparency and public 9 participation in our process, the Commissioners will be 10 taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the 11 telephone number provided on the livestream feed. 12 877-853-5247. 13 When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided 14 on the live stream. It is 87120131061 for this meeting. 15 When prompted to enter a participant ID simply press 16 pound. Once you've dialed in, you'll be placed in a 17 To indicate you wish to comment, please press 18 star 9. This will raise your hand for the moderator. 19 When it's your turn to speak, you'll hear a message 20 that says the host would like you to talk press star 6 to 21 speak. If you'd like to give your name, please state and 22 spell it for the record. You're not required to provide 23 your name to give public comment. 24 Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream

audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your

call. Once you're waiting in the queue, be alert for when it is your turn to speak. And again, please turn down the livestream volume. And there are no callers at this time, Chair.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

15

- CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you. We'll give it a few minutes. And just to remind us of the flow, once we clear public comment, we're going to go to subcommittee reports. And we're going to begin with Finance and Administration.
- So Kristian let me know when we are -- we've met our livestream -- the feed and we'll go forward. Thank you.
- PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Those instructions are complete on the livestream and there is no one in the queue, Chair.
 - CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you. With that, we'll turn it over to the Finance and Administration Subcommittee.
- 17 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you. I'll go
 18 ahead and start. Sorry, Neal, just jump in. I know
 19 you're not feeling well. I appreciate you being here.
 20 So a couple of things we want to talk about. The first
 21 being -- we just want to emphasize if there's
- subcommittee work that we get it done by the end of June because we do have funding this year.
- And I'm going to ask Alvaro if he can share the
 budget document, the BCP document that we posted. Again,

1 this was shared at last meeting too. And then we had a full discussions on it in terms of us needing to appeal their denial of our BCP. And the reason we want to bring 3 it up again for discussion, but just quick discussion, 4 5 not a lengthy -- hopefully not a lengthy, but of course, we want to make sure we get everybody's feedback is 6 7 hopefully Alvaro is able to -- is Alvaro there? Corina, can you share the document? So you know 9 which I'm talking about? Oh, thank you, Alvaro. And if 10 you can just scroll down to the what was not approved, 11 that's be great. Okay. Right there. Thank you. 12 So what we're going to do is Corina and Alvaro are 13 going to -- and Terri and Commissioner Fornaciari and 14 I -- well, they're going to set up a meeting with Finance 15 and we'll be involved, Commissioner Fornaciari and I 16 we'll be involved in that conversation. 17 And during that conversation, we want to provide 18 additional information in terms of why we requested the 19 funding that we requested in the first one, the office 20 space, we've already gone through that in terms of we 21 actually need a physical location and we have a staff 22 person. Regardless, we still need office space. 2.3 And Office 365 we need that as well. That's our 24 communication tool, our -- and the cell phones we --25 Anthony talked about that earlier some may choose to turn

in their cell phones, some may not. I personally won't because I don't want -- I don't want to have my cell phone maybe eventually discoverable so. That's why we need that funding.

2.0

2.3

Retired annuitants, so retired annuitants were looking at legal accounting and IT support. And what I'm sharing this with you is if any of the Commissioners or staff can come up with additional justification or activities -- and that's part of it is our activities for the next, I'm going to say seven years, seven to seven and a half years, not eight anymore. We're in 2023 and we still don't know if potentially the next Commission will be seated earlier than us.

But anyway, so we need to explain to Finance, they believe we're done. We need to explain that we're not done and what activities we project we're going to do.

As Commissioner Fornaciari explained earlier, him and Commissioner Sinay will be looking at the -- what's the name of your subcommittee -- Continuity Subcommittee.

And then also Commissioner Akutagawa and I put
together the initial -- what are we going to do in ten
years spreadsheet? So we can also forward that to
Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner Sinay in case
they've lost it. So we've already identified certain
activities that we plan to do every fiscal year. And

that's what -- that's how this BCP came forward for the next fiscal year. And part of that was the legal support.

The IT, as we listen to Corina, we're -- we still have some work to do in that area and we will need the IT support for that. And accounting, we will still have invoices and reconciling our expenditures, which actually is very challenging with fiscal.

And again, this is to provide support to Corina. It mean, it's great what she's doing. She's coming up and she's got to be -- she's got to do it all. And so it's to provide support because she's probably going to need it. And State Storage, that's pretty self-explanatory. Postage and office supplies, it's explanatory.

The meeting services, if we don't -- up top they approve the Commissioners with the assumption of four meetings -- I think there's four meetings a year, but they didn't approve the services that we would need to hold those meetings in terms of the videography, the ASL, and transcription services which we are required to provide.

So that's a -- I won't say it's a simple explanation, but it's -- if we don't get -- if we don't have the videography, ASL, and transcriptions, then we really can't have meetings and unless one of us knows ASL

translation, which I don't, and if somebody can do a videography for us and again, transcriptions.

2.0

2.3

And then probably the one that we would like to get as much feedback from would be the subcommittee work other than the chair and vice chair, which we will still have subcommittee work, finance and admin would go all the way until the new commission is seated as we track the expenditures and ensure we have sufficient funding.

But there's also additional subcommittee work and we've also talked about we're reaching out to The State Auditor's Office. Eventually, we'll coordinate with the Census Office. So if there's something else in that area for subcommittee, we're still working on some of the potential legislative changes.

But if you can think of anything else in terms of subcommittee work, it'd be great to get your feedback on that. And then the OEE, operating expenses and equipment, that's just the general supplies and agreements that we will go forward for services.

Neal, did you have anything that you wanted to ask?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes. This really ties

into especially the last part of what -- I mean, all of

whatever -- into the assignment that Chair Akutagawa gave

to Commissioner Turner and myself to kind of look at how

to just file this.

I mean, that was my takeaway of the assignment. And so Anthony wrote up a short explanation of the Bagley-Keene -- of the meeting requirements to justify us having -- what is required to have the meetings. And so we have a justification for that.

2.0

2.3

And then I took a shot at drafting up what -- all the subcommittee work is going to be ongoing. And then, so I have a list of like seven or eight subcommittee work that we think to go on further. And then what I did is I took this table here and I correlated the work in this table to the work on those subcommittees to justify why we needed all this work.

And I got that document. I just didn't have my act together to get it all to you all to take a look. So I don't know how you want to go forward with that. I'm sorry I didn't get it posted today, but maybe we can set it out later and then just get some feedback on it for next meeting.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, I think that's a good idea.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Guys, I am. I'm going to check out.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I know you are. Thank you.

I think that's a great idea, is maybe through Anthony we
can send this and get everyone feedback and we will have

- the information ready when we meet with Department of Finance. I think that's probably our recommendation right now.
- 4 Chair Taylor?

5

6

7

8

9

10

2.0

21

22

23

- CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you. I think that's -- I think that's a proper course of action. So ideally to combat the denial is that we want to set up a meeting with the Department of Finance to address our budget shortfalls or what we perceive as the budget shortfalls, correct? And so we want to --
- 11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.
- 12 CHAIR TAYLOR: -- set out this information for the
 13 Commissioners for review for us to discuss at the
 14 February meeting. That's the hopes, correct?
- 15 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. And hopefully we'll

 16 meet -- hopefully we'll be able to set up a meeting prior

 17 to that with Finance so that we have more information.
- But if not, then yes, definitely. We'll discuss again at the February meeting.
 - CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you very much. Thank you,

 Neal. I know you're feeling under the weather. Any

 questions for the Budget and Finance Committee? I like

 that when there's no questions. That means that was a

 job well done. Going once. Going twice. All right.
- 25 You guys are off the hook.

We're going to move on to the Website Subcommittee report. And I, along with Commissioner Anderson, are diligently ticking away at the I guess the little gremlins that are in the way. I'm going to give it to Commissioner Andersen to start us along this path. COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you, Chair Yes. Just a quick update. I'll get into -- we Taylor. didn't really get comments on issues or -- that's a mistake, something that's looking at the switching over from the dot org website to the dot ca dot gov website. If you do have any issues, comments, please send them to the -- actually, send to the office. I believe Corina is actually taking these things in now. That's actually going well. And in terms of our -- the hubbub in that is actually, as Corina mentioned, the database issue. specifically the videos. There has been a hiccup in what we really need, and particularly in view of what is it really going to cost us to maintain our database. The issue, of course, with 2010 is the website crashed, lost things and we cannot let that happened again. And we couldn't -- we essentially have to start all over. Again, trying to make sure the 2030 it doesn't happen to them. And we have a website that we can use at

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

dot ca dot gov. But it's limited in terms of size of

what we can store there. And including like our videos.

There's an issue there, so -- but no problem we have another group. But the communication back and forth between them has -- there is some -- several hiccups have come up. And that's where I might have Commissioner Taylor and/or Corina get a little bit more into.

The need for -- we actually do need to get an R.A on to get an expert in database. What's really out there?

A quick and efficient way to do and deal with our issue of not just the actual database itself, but the videos.

And there, again, back and forth between WordPress, which is the language used at The State level for where we're going to keep everything and the databases we're potentially working with. So that's quickly it.

Basically it's like we need to hire a consultant for a short bit to figure out what exactly our options are in terms of the best plan.

Particularly thinking of how much is this really going to cost us year to year. Because there are particular ways -- without getting into the details of it, it actually could cost quite a bit when people want to use the website and use the database.

One thing I would like us to consider right now.

So that's two things from the Commissioners and the public in general that are listening is, one, look at the

1 websites. See if anything does not cross over, please Two, how do you believe moving forward -let us know. 3 this is kind of like our second strategy moving forward, our database in terms of our -- the actual Airtable --4 5 what was there now? How do you believe people will use that in the future? 6 7 Because that is, of course -- what are we keeping and how will it be retrieved? If it's just -- there are 8 9 different ways and methods to use this depending on how 10 it's going to be used. And so think about how you used 11 Would you use in the future? 12 Would any of the other groups who are -- we'll be 13 asking our partners in redistricting their opinions about 14 this, because it does -- how we save things and what is 15 available on our website or through other means, we can 16 tell you how to get things. 17 Depends on how people want to use it. We have legal 18 requirements to what we need to keep, and that's we're 19 planning on doing. But how we use it makes a huge 20 difference in terms of how much it might cost us a year. 21 And as you know, that's exactly what we're delving into 22 right now. So that's my quick summary. 2.3 Commissioner Taylor? 24 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you. I'm going to let Corina 25

jump in right here. She might be able to add some more

- 1 information to this, our need for the -- for R.A. as
- 2 | some of the what's been problematic between data
- 3 | management and Snowflake. For the most part the website,
- 4 | the transformation from the old to the new is okay.
- 5 There's no issues with that.
- 6 It's the embedding of the video and how we access
- 7 the video, whether or not Snowflake is able to do that.
- 8 | Snowflake is able to secure the data and manage the data.
- 9 But we're having problems with the video.
- 10 Corina?
- 11 MS. LEON: Yes. What we've run into from our team
- 12 | is that the way Snowflake, their security, which is very
- 13 good, is were not able to do any static links and that
- 14 was the whole thing about the whole purpose of Snowflake
- 15 | is we were going to be able to store our videos and our
- 16 COI data and they'd be secure. And that's the way my
- 17 | team would be able to link them.
- And if we should run out of room and WordPress,
- 19 | which probably won't happen, but they can't -- they're
- 20 | not able to store videos. So we'll be able to continue
- 21 to store our videos in Snowflake. But that didn't work
- 22 out. And at this point it's just for our needs. It's
- 23 very limited.
- 24 So we are looking to see if maybe we can find a --
- 25 | we want to look for a more secure and adaptable database

- 1 | that could be useful and more adaptable to our needs.
- 2 Because right now we're finding it very limited. As of
- 3 | now, it can store our COI table. And it's one table,
- 4 | it's not a huge database.
- 5 And we're thinking that -- we believe that there's
- 6 another option out there that would be more adaptable to
- 7 our needs as secure and as maintainable as Snowflake. So
- 8 that's what we want to look into.
- 9 CHAIR TAYLOR: So we're still looking into options
- 10 | while providing Snowflake the opportunity to come up with
- 11 | a solution --
- 12 MS. LEON: Correct.
- 13 CHAIR TAYLOR: Does that sound correct?
- 14 MS. LEON: Correct. And we do believe that it's
- 15 happened. But we, as you know, I've been -- I want to
- 16 make sure that we're not the first person to do that. We
- 17 don't want to be that test ground for that. We want
- 18 | something that's dependable.
- 19 And so I believe that's where -- it wouldn't take a
- 20 lot. I mean, we do still have our contract with AWS.
- 21 | And I do believe that there are services there that they
- 22 can provide for the security and the maintenance. And we
- 23 can look into that and how much maintenance that would be
- 24 because --
- 25 CHAIR TAYLOR: So we're way all of those options



1 against the costs --2 MS. LEON: Yeah. CHAIR TAYLOR: -- before we switch totally over to 3 the ca dot gov website, correct? 4 5 MS. LEON: Correct. And right now, actually, Martine's going ahead with that because we're going to 6 7 be -- he has the option of the YouTube for the video records right now. So he's going to be reaching out for 8 that to be tested and see how we -- how that works out 10 for us, because it's a -- it's a very viable, very -- I 11 mean, there's a lot of things we can do with that that 12 might be fun in the future with YouTube. 13 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you. So we still have -- we 14 still have upcoming meetings with Snowflake's --15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yes. 16 CHAIR TAYLOR: -- Snowflake as to possible options 17 and solutions. So we are asked again, is that you 18 continue to look at the website, see if there's anything 19 missing, that nothing got lost in in translation, and 20 provide us with that feedback. And we'll report back 21 when we hear from our subsequent meetings with Snowflake, 22 correct? 2.3 MS. LEON: Correct. And I just want to make sure 24 all our files are -- we have backup and backup so they're 25 very secure. And we we're not in danger of losing any

1 files. And right now that -- we have that in place. have it with The Statewide Database. We have it on an 3 external hard drive and we have it in -- well, we'll be 4 having them with well we don't want to depend on YouTube 5 That's just for us to be able to display them. But we have at least three areas where we have backups of 6 7 our files. 8 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you. Commissioner Fernandez, question? 10 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Not really a question. quess a reminder, this is great. And just so that we 11 12 have a solution before the end of the fiscal year, 13 because we do have the funding this year, if we have to 14 deal with another vendor or whatever the case may be. So 15 I don't want to rush anyone, but I'm just reminding 16 everyone that hopefully we get -- we find a solution 17 before the -- before June. 18 CHAIR TAYLOR: Absolutely. It is imperative. 19 you. 2.0 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Can I just say, that's why 21 we want to hire the R.A. right now to basically move on 22 this now. 2.3 CHAIR TAYLOR: Commissioner Sinay? 24 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Is it helpful for all of you to

talk with the group that helped us create the database,

1 the pro bono group? I'm forgetting their name. I mean, is the -- Trena -- sorry, Commissioner Turner, you 3 probably could speak to that, but it seems like they were 4 good troubleshooters when we started this adventure. 5 MS. LEON: Sure. I'm sorry. That would be good. Yeah. I think the website -- I think Martine has that 6 7 taken care of with Commissioner Andersen. I think that's -- but obviously it would -- it's always nice. 8 9 would love to have their contact information for 10 questions. That would be great. 11 CHAIR TAYLOR: Director Hernandez? 12 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, I just wanted to mention that 13 we did reach out to USDR initially before we -- as we 14 were looking at different options and though they had 15 great ideas, they didn't actually do what we were -- some 16 of what we were asking for. 17 So we can reach out to them again if necessary. 18 we did reach out to them to discuss this, and they did 19 provide some information that allowed us to move forward 20 with our options. 21 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you. 22 Any other questions from commissioners? 2.3 seeing -- Commissioner Yee, go ahead. 24 COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, chair.

separate matter, but relating to the website. At the

1 last meeting I mentioned, maybe it would be worth developing some kind of index to meeting handouts since 3 they're not searchable. I mean, you can't find them 4 unless you kind of know they're there and know the 5 general date when the meeting was, which is really cumbersome. So I actually went ahead and chatted with 6 7 Martine a bit about how that might look. And we're thinking maybe just a downloadable spreadsheet, 8 9 searchable. And this would not be all -- every last 10 handout, but just the ones that seem like it would be of 11 ongoing or future interest. So I'm motivated to work on 12 that between -- before June. 13 MS. LEON: Right. 14 COMMISSIONER YEE: So if that seems like a good 15 idea, I'll go ahead and plan on developing it. 16 MS. LEON: That'd be great. 17 CHAIR TAYLOR: Yeah. Commissioner Yee, I think that 18 would be fantastic. If we can compel you to work on 19 that, that would be wonderful. You can coordinate with 20 Martine and we can funnel that through the Website 21 Subcommittee and see -- and make that a -- make that a 22 reality. So I think a searchable database is wonderful. 2.3 COMMISSIONER YEE: Great. I will plan on that. The 24 whole issue of permanent links comes into play here, of 25 course. So that may be --

```
1
         COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And actually that is the
           That's come up with our -- that's kind of the
 3
    major hiccup is how do we do that? How secure? And
 4
    there are pros and cons both ways. So those are the
 5
    issues we're actually working on.
         CHAIR TAYLOR: Any other questions?
 6
 7
         Corina, can you speak to the need for the R.A. and
    the vote for that hire?
 8
 9
         MS. LEON: Sure. Yes, I think -- well, the person I
10
    think -- he worked for D.O.T. Department of Technology.
11
    He's a software specialist 3. He's a SME in database.
12
    So he's very knowledgeable with The State uses, what's
13
    out there. And he's always my go to person that I talk
14
    to whenever I have questions. He's very reliable.
15
         I think also, is it okay if I mention, Commissioner
16
    Kennedy, that you also may have somebody that could help
17
    in this regard?
18
         So yeah, I think, a team of people that work
19
    together and flesh out the options that we can present to
20
    you. That would be great. And yeah, he's worked in
21
    databases for -- I mean, I knew him when he was a
22
    student, so -- and he's retired now. So he's a long time
2.3
    with databases, all kinds of databases.
24
         CHAIR TAYLOR:
                        Thank you.
25
         And Chief Counsel Pane, for the hire, we wouldn't
```

1	require a special vote or just a majority vote?
2	ATTNY PANE: The hiring decisions need to be a
3	special vote under the Commission statute. Because that
4	is a personnel matter that can be done in closed session
5	as well.
6	CHAIR TAYLOR: Copy. So that's one of the issues we
7	can take up in closed session after our lunch break.
8	Any other issues for the Website Subcommittee?
9	Questions? Comments? All right. Seeing no hands,
10	saying nothing raised, that will conclude the Website
11	Subcommittee's report.
12	And where we are right now on the agenda, I think
13	we'll I'll leave you with a break a few minutes early.
14	And we will we will return at 11:15. 11:15, we will
15	return from our break with the Lessons Learned
16	Subcommittee. 11:15.
17	MS. LEON: Okay. Thank you.
18	(Whereupon, a recess was held)
19	CHAIR TAYLOR: Welcome back to the January 11th,
20	2023 meeting of the California Citizens Redistricting
21	Commission. As it notes, we now have ASL interpreters in
22	place for the duration of our meeting.
23	We have just we have just (audio interference)
24	Website Subcommittee's update. And we now are going to
25	move on to the Lessons Learned. And this is agenda item

number 3, the Lessons Learned Subcommittee report. Go ahead.

2.3

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. And I will hand over to Commissioner Yee in a moment. Just at this point, a reminder to colleagues that at the December meeting, we agreed on a January 20th deadline for Commissioners to share their comments, recommendations, suggestions that it's everything on the draft Lessons Learned report.

My preference would be that those go to either

Anthony or Corina, who could then forward them to the subcommittee. I think the option was also given to share them with either me or Commissioner Yee. So that is a reminder to colleagues, depending on the Chair's disposition.

We may be able to get into a discussion of any points that folks would like to raise now, since we have this 11:15 to 12:45 block reserved for the rest of subcommittee updates, which is Lessons Learned and Legislative. But I'll leave that to the Chair to decide and at this point, turn it over to Commissioner Yee for anything.

COMMISSIONER YEE: No. That's all good. So yeah, we have already received some feedback, but I would love to get big or small, any of your comments or edits or

1 feedback or corrections certainly to the draft report. But now very open to larger questions and maybe a process or timeline or issues we can discuss now? 3 4 CHAIR TAYLOR: Yeah. Commissioners Yee and Kennedy, 5 we have the room for discussion. If you want to, marshal 6 us through, absolutely. Go ahead. 7 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Any hands? Commissioner 8 Sinay? 9 CHAIR TAYLOR: Commissioner Sinay? 10 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I wasn't going to jump in, since no one did, I figured I'd start and others -- this 11 12 document is amazing. My first question is, is it even a 13 Lessons Learned document or is it more a -- what we did? 14 I feel like this needs a better title than Lessons 15 Learned because it captures so much and it's not set up 16 in a way -- it's set up in a way -- it's a great -- I 17 don't even want to say snapshot because 100 -- and once 18 you put all the appendixes, it'll probably be about 300 19 pages. 2.0 I don't think Lessons Learned snapshot anything like 21 that. But it's a good document of everything we've 22 done -- we did. So thank you for taking up that effort. 23 The two big pieces that jumped out to me and I'm being 24 honest, I've only read maybe a third of it, if that.

But the two things that jumped out is, one, we need

clarity of who the audience is because -- so we need clarity of who the audiences and also what voice are we using? Because sometimes the docket will say -- and I'm going to say we because I see this as our document and it will highlight names of people or names of subcommittees and other times that says we the Commission did this when it was -- so I think we just need consistency on that as well as on who our audience is and how this was put together.

I think that the intro needs to be a little bit more clear so that people have a full idea as they're reading this is where are these recommendations, did we all agree, was this consensus or what type of methodology kind of used.

The other one -- and Commissioner Yee and I went back and forth on this, I would really want to encourage us to take out the philanthropic dollars from the budget from 2010 and 2020. The philanthropic dollars were separate moneys, and in the past they were kind of put together as a way to advocate for the 2020 to get more money for outreach and engagement. And it did work.

But I think it's missed out. It's not done correctly by putting it that way. I would compare apples with apples and oranges with oranges and create two-line items and one say how much money came from The State or

the redistricting -- to the redistricting Commission, and then how much money went out to community groups from philanthropy.

2.0

But I wouldn't mix the apples and oranges. I understand that they did in 2010, but I wouldn't want to continue that at -- moving forward because that's not the true pieces -- the way that the money -- it should be what sources and who has power or control over that money.

CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Yeah. You know, just a reminder that this document is the result of the discussions that we had primarily back in March of last year over the course of I believe it was six days for one week and two another week.

And what we asked at that point was for colleagues to focus on what were strengths of the process? What were the weaknesses? What were the innovations in comparison to the 2010 process? And what were their recommendations?

And from the notes that I compiled, that

Commissioner Yee compiled and some others, as well as all

of the input from the public at that point in time that

resulted in a spreadsheet of -- I can't remember, I think

was close to 13 or 1,400 points. Obviously, some were

repeats, but that just helped us understand where to put

more emphasis and where perhaps to put less emphasis.

2.3

The audience for this, I've always said that I would like to hand over a document like this to the 2030 Commission. That doesn't mean that it's a confidential document, that it's for their eyes only it's for everyone's eyes.

I think legislators probably need to understand more

of what we went through in this process. Not that they don't have -- some of them don't have an appreciation.

But this was truly a monumental task under extremely difficult conditions and timeframes. And we need to be clear what can be done to make the lives of future

Commissioners better as we go through this.

I certainly agree that having some more on the process in the introduction would be useful, and I'll certainly work on that. And I guess, Commissioner Yee will work on any reframing of the budgets.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. Thank you, Commissioner
Sinay. So yeah, for sure it's grown into much more than
just recommendations. And partly that's because
Commissioner Kennedy and I, our minds, this is the last
big report we probably will put out.

So we thought to ourselves let's throw everything in the kitchen sink because you just never know what might be useful. And the primary audience in my mind, was like 1 | Commissioner Kennedy, is actually the 2030 Commission.

2 | Just as we all probably read with great interest, the

3 League of Women Voters report when people draw the lines,

4 | which actually -- I didn't realize, actually do not come

5 | out -- I didn't even notice it had not come out till

6 actually some years later, 2016 or something.

useful.

So the 2030 Commission will surely take a great interest in what we leave behind, including this report. So yeah, very open to titling it and framing it somewhat differently to capture its true nature and the fact that it's something -- a lot of recommendations but also just a lot of reference materials that we think will find

So I think the philanthropic money is interesting for me to learn more about that as I research the matter. So as you're probably aware in 2010 there was saving money and then there was the Irvine grant, which gets widely reported in 2010 coverage that Irvine Foundation provided 3.4, 3.6, \$3.5 million, most of went -- all of which went out to private organizations.

And then you see Berkeley as well. And a lot of that went out to Outreach during the application phase as well as the mapping phase. And outreach is a Constitutional requirement for the CRC. And since they barely had time to get things together and did what they

did, they did their job and they commissioned the work

that that money funded in -- and was deemed as our

helping to fill the constitution requirements outreach by

the CRC. And so that is the rationale.

2.3

Then also, of course, advocating as Commissioner

Sinay mentioned -- advocating for the budget for us. So

that money has been included originally in reporting for

2010. That's always distinguished. It's not all just

lumped together because it is very different money. 2010

had no control over that money. And so it's a

different -- it is a different time.

But I think in draft report we have been careful to always distinguish it, the bottom line that I have in one or two charts does include that money. And it actually was very interesting to me that if you adjusted for inflation, it actually -- the money we spent through the final maps and the money they spent through the final maps is very comparable if you include that outreach -- private outreach money.

Now it's still a little goofy because there were grants in our cycle too, to outreach groups, private groups, and we are not counting those. So that's a little -- I don't know if we can get some numbers on that, we can certainly include those in the report.

So that's not quite comparable in that way. But the

fact is we spend a lot more -- we spend a lot of money on internal outreach. And you'll recall we did not do grants because we found out we couldn't do that. And so we hired all these staff. Our staff was much bigger than 2010, twenty-seven or so compared to eight. And a lot of that was outreach.

So it seems to me that since that's the case and

since it's been routinely reported as such thus far that it was good to keep -- to continue including those monies clearly identified -- the private money, the Irvine grant, and in our budget reporting. And so that is my thinking.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thanks, Commissioner Yee.

Commissioner Turner?

2.0

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy and Commissioner Yee.

I just wanted to say, look -- going through the report, this report is so much -- I guess is far more superior than anything I would have imagined or thought about in detail in reading it through.

I felt like looking at it -- and I have not read all of it still and so I'm glad that we still have till the 20th. But every time I pick it up to look at it, I feel like I'm learning things and I kind of went through the process. I'm like, oh my gosh, yeah, that's good.

That's really good. And then I try a different approach because I want it to be additive.

2.3

I wanted to kind of flip through some notes and stuff that I had to say, let me see if that's in -- it's in there. I think it's very thorough and comprehensive, and I'm not certain what I can add to it at all. So I just wanted to say thank you. I am looking at it. I'm not not looking at it to not add to it.

But I think you all have done a phenomenal job in the report. And whether it's Lessons Learned or just a look back and review or whatever we call it, I think it's neither here nor there. And the content and the output of the quality of this work, I think will speak for it. I think it will be highly valued. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Turner. Any other colleagues?

COMMISSIONER YEE: The question about voice, we tried to be careful about things that were just suggestions during the Lessons Learned process that one or two, Commissioners mentioned versus things that we had in fact agreed, perhaps even formally agreed on and so forth.

We tried to keep that fairly -- be precise about that in the report. But if there are places where we missed the mark, certainly please call our attention to

1 that. And in terms of timeline, it kind of just depends on the volume of comments you guys provide. So you get 3 those to us by January 20th, we may or may not have time to incorporate all those before the February meeting. 4 5 But I think Commissioner Kennedy and I certainly would hope to have it by the March meeting. We just --6 7 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thanks. There's lots more to do on the COMMISSIONER YEE: 9 report. 10 COMMISSIOENR KENNEDY: Yeah. Well, I'm particularly 11 on the appendices, which as Commissioner Yee mentioned 12 earlier, a lot of valuable reference material and putting 13 this all together in one place as much as possible for 14 the 2030 Commission with the intent of, again, making 15 their lives easier so that they don't have to go chasing 16 around everywhere. And yeah, if that merits a change in 17 title for it, that's certainly something that we're open 18 to. 19 Commissioner Sinay? 20 COMMISSIOENR SINAY: This is just a point that's 21 going to bug me and I'll live with it. But I really do 22 think that the money, philanthropic dollars, need to be 23 separated just so that people can see the budget grew in 24 a in a realistic manner -- what reality was.

Again, not mixing apples and oranges on where the

funding sources went and where it went to. And yes, in 2020, the Philanthropy of California folks took on the effort to raise money for redistricting. They also took over the census — funding from philanthropy for redistricting. So they created a pool fund.

2.3

And that one report, that's just focused on that grantmaking. It was \$2.5 million. Irvine started that fund by paying for the staffing and stuff, but was not going to put in as much as they did in 2010 because some of their priorities have shifted as a grant maker.

If we're going to include the Irvine dollars, again,
I would say it should be a different line item. And I
know you're saying you're being clear, but it's not being
clear for folks who don't understand that difference. So
I think what money came from The State is one line, what
money came externally to external actors is second.

So yes, there was an additional \$2.5 million that was allocated to organizations to be engaged in redistrict -- in our redistricting efforts. So that's just in The State of California. There was a lot of money nationally. And a lot of it went to Michigan and other places that were doing it for the first time.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Well, yeah. Thank you,

Commissioner Sinay. I appreciate your concern to be

precise here and to be helpful. And I learned a lot

1 working on this. Things I actually didn't know how that money worked. So just understand your concern fully. 3 mean, we do always identify the money's as separate. They're always separate line items. We do strike a total 4 5 at the bottom, as has been routinely done. So is even striking a total -- do you find that 6 7 inappropriate as long as it's clear that they're separate 8 lines items that went into that total? Or is as long as it keeps the line items clearly identified as separate, 10 is it okay to strike that total as has been done in the 11 legal report and in other places? 12 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Good question. I'm thinking. 13 COMMISSIONER YEE: You don't have to -- we don't 14 have to land this necessarily right now, but --15 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner 16 Akutagawa? 17 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I'll just weigh in 18 on this and I'll just share my thoughts on this. 19 think that it's good to get a grand total so that we know 20 the scope of the full cost. 21 I do agree with Commissioner Sinay that there should 22 be a separate call out to show what portion of that grand 23 total was essentially funded by private foundations or 24 other outside -- I'll just say nonstate of California

entities, in this case the legislature, so that there is

1 a full cost understanding of what it takes to actually undertake this effort, but to also understand what part was taken on by -- not by The State, but I -- foundations 3 4 and particular -- I quess it's really just a private 5 philanthropy. That's the word I'm thinking of, 6 philanthropy. 7 So then this way then I think for future efforts, 8 there will not be any modeling of who and what costs are 9 going to be. So it's not under-funded, but it's also 10 realistic in terms of what really -- how much it takes to 11 do all of this and the importance of the I'll just say to 12 the community-based organizations as well to -- and the 13 kind of funding that they needed to be able to do given 14 some of our restrictions. 15 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right. Very good. Thank you 16 so much. 17 Commissioner Andersen? 18 I'm just also going to put COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: 19 in a little cents on this one. I do like -- we do need a 20 total, though, because that is what was spent at that 21 particular time. I do like the way -- I did think it was 22 kind of separate. But I understand let's be crystal 2.3 clear about this was State money, this was private money.

And the reason why I think it really is totally

important is because -- to emphasize -- this was not

24

State money and CRC did not control it. Therefore, the CRC, we need a certain amount or the 2030 will -- to make sure that everybody is being contacted because. It's not what -- it's private money they can do whoever they want.

And the vision is to make sure everybody's contact. So there is money that is needed to be directed with the CRC that even if then they have -- you try to set up who can give it to that sort of thing. But Commissioner Yee was saying, there is a Constitutional requirement to outreach.

And outreach, we try to reach everybody as possible. And so I like the idea that by putting the total there, you can't kind of go like, oh, well see all this dollars spent and they did the job in 2010, therefore, why do we need to have that much money for 2030, that you need to have the big picture, and you also need to have the breakdown? But emphasis on that certain amount of funding needs to be with the CRC to ensure complete outreach.

COMMISSIONER YEE: If I could share my screen briefly, I can show you exactly what we're talking about. So here's the draft report. And we're talking about these last two rows -- so funding state for foundation for 2010, state for 2020, the two boxes with numbers 2010 in the center and another 2020 on the right. So you can

1 see when you break it out, but we do strike a total as 2 well. COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa? 3 4 COMMISSIOENR AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I think this is 5 maybe where Commissioner Sinay was going. I think there should be two separate funding lines. One, that's -- so 6 7 that there's an apples-to-apples comparison. So one funding line would be just The State and then 9 another funding line would show, in this case, 10 philanthropy for both 2010 and 2020. And then the grand 11 total underneath, however you want to do that so that 12 then those clear distinctions are made. And also, there 13 could be a more clear comparison between 2010 and 2020. 14 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. We could certainly break 15 that out, create another row or two. If we include the 16 2020 philanthropy grants. That gets a little tricky 17 because we're not -- we did not deem -- we did our own 18 outreach this time, right? 19 We didn't deem the private outreach as fulfilling, 20 helping facilitate Constitutional requirement. So that's 21 where it gets a little stickier, I think. 22 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, I mean --2.3 COMMISSIONER YEE: We could certainly put that in the discussion. 24 25 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah, yeah, yeah. And if

colleagues are able to come forward with some suggested language we' be quite happy to get that from you.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So for me, it's not so much about The State mandate because I feel like even internally we've debated that State mandate of doing outreach and what does that mean and how much do we do and what kind?

To me, it's about the full understanding, both by
The State as well as the philanthropic community of what
is needed to have successfully created fair and
representative maps. And that 2.5 million this year was
allocated for that purpose. I mean, their whole purpose
was to make sure to get the voice of those who are not
necessarily heard.

It is important to include it in this report because we included the 3.3 million. I think it's only fair to show that the allocation -- we will -- it's hard to figure out the full number because foundations gave on their own, not through Philanthropy of California and all that.

But the outside world is -- nonprofits are really struggling to get funders to understand how important this is, how important fair and representative maps, how it's connected to the census, and then how it's connected

to allocation of funding and why civic engagement is so important.

2.0

2.3

So it's a tool we're giving back out to the community so that when people read this full map, they read the whole budget, this report, they see the full picture. Because those people who called in and did all that, that wasn't from our allocation of money. Some of it was, but a lot of it was a lot of nonprofits that funded with that 2.5 million who really worked hard to get those calls in.

And by not including that amount and not separating it out because they worked really hard last time with that 3.3 million, I think it's a bit -- the reason I'm advocating for this is for groups -- for those who want to make a point in 2030 that philanthropy should be engaged and how important it is and what a difference it makes.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Yes, we're certainly committed to making this as realistic and as helpful a picture as possible. And your suggestions are pointing us in the direction that we need to go with this. So we will -- we'll be making some changes.

Commissioner Akutagawa?



COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I think I'm going to say something similar. So yes, I think that there should be a second line item. Call it funding. Again, one line will be State, the other -- second funding line will be philanthropy.

I don't think we should get hung up as to what the funds were used for -- making a distinction between our outreach mandate and what philanthropy spent their money on to help these CBOs do what they needed to do. I think it's just understanding that in 2020, 2.5 million was used, a big part of it likely for outreach.

But I think it would -- also to Commissioner Sinay's point, it was also engagement of support of organizations to do the outreach. I think we don't need to get into those details. And I think that details -- I haven't gotten fully through the whole entire document. So that details could be added in there if it's not already there.

I think just for the sake of a at a glance, I think we should just know how much The State gave or spent, how much philanthropy spent. What's the total? So then that way then we have a quick at a glance, bottom line understanding. And then as people want to dive into the details, they could look into the rest of the report for that.

1	COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. I've definitely at
2	CHAIR TAYLOR: That's right.
3	COMMISSIONER YEE: a row, just break out the
4	funding and definitely add the 2020 money, private money,
5	2.5 million somewhere to make it clear that that was a
6	vital part of this work as well.
7	COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right. And we can go into
8	more detail of explaining all of that in the body.
9	COMMISSIONER YEE: Right.
10	COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: As you point out, this is a
11	summary table. We want the summary table to be as
12	accurate as possible. But to give people the full
13	understanding, we'll use the body of the report to make
14	sure that that they have that full understanding. Thank
15	you for bringing up that point.
16	Commissioner Fernandez?
17	COMMISSIONER YEE: I'll stop, Chair.
18	COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner
19	Kennedy. Just briefly, I have not read the documents, so
20	I apologize for that. And just on this topic, I kind of
21	caution us to put external funding because there might be
22	other external funding that we're not aware of that
23	actually went into this effort.
24	And I would hate to underestimate the true funding
25	by all other agencies or organizations, whatever the case

1 may be. I kind of -- it's difficult to for me to feel comfortable trying to attach a number for external. 3 internal, of course, we know what it was. So that's just 4 my only caution. 5 COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner 6 7 Fernandez. We can mention that the big provision for including it here is that it's been routinely reported 8 9 this way up to now. If you read the League of Women 10 Voters report and other reports on the 2010 Commission 11 that they routinely report this money and include it in 12 the 2010 findings. 13 So it would really seem strange that the money just 14 disappeared and the numbers were different than have been 15 reported to date. So as long as we're clear, I think 16 we're okay. 17 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right. 18 Commissioner Sinay? 19 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Fernandez, I 20 absolutely hear you. And that's why I said we won't know 21 the complete number. But if we use the number that's 22 been put out in the philanthropic report, just the way 2.3 that it was, it was used in 2010.

Women's Voters Report. So there is a whole philanthropic

It was the number that was included in the League of

24

25

1 report that talks about redistrict, the investments and redistricting. I think it's important to give credit to that work that was done. If we all of a sudden don't 3 4 start talking about it and what Commissioner Yee said is 5 true is, this is significant funding for this process. I mean, get \$2.3 million collected and organized is 6 7 a lot. But it's not going to capture everything because individual donors gave, others gave outside of 8 9 Philanthropy California. But that's why I say let's 10 stick to the number from the Philanthropy California 11 report, because then we have one source. And we can say, 12 plus others that weren't reported or we don't know about. 13 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Very good. Anyone else? 14 Okay. Well, then that is it for Lessons Learned at this 15 point. 16 Chair, I will turn it back over to you. 17 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you. Thank you very much. 18 think that's a great opening salvo to our Lessons Learned 19 conversation. I know that we'll have more to say once 20 everybody completes their homework assignment, which is 21 due on 1/20. So continue to read through and provide 22 your feedback. 2.3 With that, we're going to alter our schedule a 24 little bit. We're going to go to closed session right 25 now when we should return by 12:15 and continue with the

subcommittee reports with the Legislative updates. But for the moment, we're going to move to a closed session and personal matters.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

2.3

CHAIR TAYLOR: Welcome back to the January 11th,

2023 meeting of the California Citizens Redistricting

Commission. The Commission is just returning from closed session where the only action taken was a vote to hire an R.A. as IT support.

With that, we're going to return to subcommittee reports. We just concluded the Lessons Learned. This is agenda item number 3. We just concluded Lessons Learned. And we will now go to the Legislative Subcommittee. And it's all yours.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair.

Alvaro, could you share the spreadsheet? And so we're just going to go through the colorful spreadsheet that we continue to update in between every session or meeting based on any decisions made. There we go. Thank you, Alvaro. And just as a reminder, the first item A, that was already been enacted, signed by the governor. So yay.

And in the next session, in the next four to five items are -- we have already moved forward in terms of we're working with our legislative partners to develop



1 some of the language as well as find a sponsor for that. And then when we move to the next page, Alvaro, the blue sections are -- we've already discussed those, one of 3 4 them going to work with The State Auditor, which is 5 defined fully functional and instructed by the 6 legislature to receive that one. It was assigned to The 7 Government Affairs Subcommittee to address. And then the next items that are kind of in that salmon color all the 8 way until page 4, those are items that we've discussed 10 and we've decided to leave and let the Commission decide 11 how they want to address them. So next page, Alvaro, 12 please. And then now we are on 3-A. So 3-A is 13 clarifying taking public comment during regular non-14 mapping business meetings does not constitute receiving 15 input on redistricting matters. 16 And so Commissioner Akutagawa and I -- we met on 17 this because based on our last meeting we were supposed 18 to draft language to provide additional clarification. 19 And what we came up with instead was to develop a policy 2.0 for the Commission and then future Commissions can use it 21 as well. And so that language was posted. 22 And it's basically is what it's about. I don't 2.3 know -- Alvaro, I don't know if we need to bring it up. 24 What do you think Commissioner Akutagawa? Should we get

If they have any comments, they can email

25

feedback?

Anthony and then Anthony can forward it to us. Does that sound good? Is that okay, Chair Taylor? It's a half page public input testimony policy.

2.0

2.3

Instead of changing a government code section or adding to a Government section, we felt that a policy would also solve or address some of the concerns that we have in terms of differentiating between a fourteen-day agenda notice versus a ten-day.

And just as a reminder, now that we've already drawn the maps here on out until the next Commission is seated, we are only bound by the ten-day -- by the Bagley-Keene. So I think that's what we're going to do, Chair, if that's okay with you.

CHAIR TAYLOR: Yeah, that's fine.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. And so the next one, Alvaro. An earlier start date for Commission nurse. So on this one -- okay. So on this one, what our decision was, we're going to move forward. We're going to look at the impact to The State Auditor.

We've already reached out to The State Auditor and a new State Auditor was appointed. So we've reached out, but we don't anticipate being able to meet with the new State Auditor until February, maybe March. But we will talk.

We also plan to meet with their chief counsel prior

to that, since she was involved in this past redistricting process and the outreach, kind of get her feedback, and then we can report back to the Commission. So that's the status on that one.

2.3

So the next one, Alvaro. This one is expand the mandate to support local redistricting efforts. And what the decision was was to reset the statewide database, which the -- Commissioner Akutagawa, our Chief Counsel Pane, Karin, Jaime, and myself met -- was that yesterday? Was that yesterday, Linda?

Okay. So we met yesterday and we did forward the concerns that some of the community organizations had in terms of building a database -- a statewide database, that they could also access and use as their -- be able to download the information.

And so it is something that they thought of, they'd been looking up, but they do have -- right now there are concerns in terms of being able to provide adequate support to all of the localities in terms of the cities and the counties and also whether or not they have -- would have the infrastructure to support it and the security measures.

But again, what we said is we're going to continue to periodically monitor what the progress is. And we both agree that the next seven years we don't know what that technology's going to look like. That is kind of how we're moving forward.

2.3

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I'll just say that if we look at this in a in a really holistic way, there's what the statewide database needs to do from a technology point of view. And then there is what the cities, counties, the localities, would need to do to receive and use the data.

We don't want to assume that just because we build it, they will come. I think we need to look at it in a holistic way, and that is something that our partners at the statewide database have been looking at. What we agreed to do is at this point right now, it's best to just monitor the situation. As Commissioner Fernandez said, technology may be different.

And we also want to be just mindful of, you know, what the capabilities are going to be for the cities and counties and other entities that would need to be using this. So for right now, our takeaway was that there's not an urgent need to address it like right now this year or the next couple of years.

But we can continue to just stay in touch and see where the technology goes so that as we look at it in a holistic way, we want to make it so that it's possible to

be used both by the cities and counties, but also, making it so that the statewide database, what is created is usable by the cities and counties. So that was our takeaway.

2.3

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thanks. Two points, one is I think this is one piece. It may be that we decided that that's how we were going to define expand mandate to support local redistricting efforts.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay?

On this piece, though, about sharing data between state and local redistricting efforts, does it make sense, since it's not going to be a legislative thing, to move it on to the Transition Continuity Committee?

Because that is one of the technology and data is one of the categories — buckets that we're starting to look at for the future.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: That would be up to the charity to decide.

CHAIR TAYLOR: I think it seats well. It sits well right here. I know there's always going to be things that might go back and forth, but I think right now it sits well right here in the continued discussion. So I'm fine with it remaining. If we see that it needs to transition somewhere else, we can move it. But I think it's fine here.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. And so that -that's fine. That's pretty much it for the items that
we've discussed so far. And so the next four items are
items that we have discussed but not decided what we're
going to do or if we're going to move them forward or if
we're going to leave it.

2.3

And one of them is allow no party preference to be considered a party for purposes of considering

Commissioner membership categories. And this basically came up because the language now reads there's five

Commissioners for the largest party, five for the second largest party, and then four for the rest.

And no party preference in terms of the percentage registered as no party preferences is -- it is almost equal or surpass Republicans in California. And but right now, no party preference isn't considered a party. So they would always that group would always be grouped with the others.

And so the purpose of it -- of bringing it forward,

I believe I don't want to speak for someone else, but it

was to be fair in terms of the representation on the

commission would be reflective of California in terms of

how the voters are registered.

And so with that, I'll just open it up if you want to provide feedback to it. And so we've got Commissioner

1 Sinay. Was your hand still up or is it up for this one? For this one? Yeah. Okay. Thank you. COMMISSIONER SINAY: The notes, I don't think are 3 4 reflecting where we left this conversation. And my 5 memory is that this conversation kind of -- I've asked to remove bullet number 2, but that the idea is that we 6 7 wanted to talk about this along with the changing of -to fifteen members and doing five, five, and five. 8 So we wouldn't get into the whole debate of is no 10 party preference a party or not because we don't want to 11 take away from the other parties that are not the Big R, 12 Big D. But it may be two different conversations.

But I think a lot of where we keep falling on this conversation is that if we changed it to fifteen and went five, five, and five, we would reflect better The State of California.

Okay. And I was just

looking really quick to see. Okay. And I believe, Anthony, if you're there, the changing to five, five, five, that would be a Constitutional change, correct? ATTNY PANE: I think that's -- I think that's very likely. Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ:

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24 ATTNY PANE: Just to put this in a little bit in 25 context, I mean, I know we've certainly discussed this a

1 few different times, but essentially defining or otherwise contextualizing no party preference is a way, not the only way, of course, it is a way to -- what it 3 4 does is it leaves the Constitutional provisions untouched 5 and would simply be adjusting the statute. And so this way, again, it's not the only way to do 6 7 this, but is a way of changing the statute, which doesn't require any Constitutional changes. And of course, 8 9 there's a different process for changing the Constitution. 10 11 COMMISSIONER FERNADNEZ: Okay. 12 Commissioner Kennedy? 13 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. I'm just 14 following up on Commissioner Sinay. Recent data doesn't 15 show that NPP is the second largest political grouping in 16 California. 17 What's the second largest is if we take NPP with all 18 of the smaller parties that -- I had pulled up that 19 number off the secretary of state's website. And so it's 20 the entire other grouping that is now larger than the 21 Republican registration in The State. So we need to we 22 do need to be careful on this. 2.3 As to whether we can allow no party preference to be 24 considered a party for the purpose of considering

Commissioner membership categories, I think we also need

25

to take a look and make sure that there's nothing in the election code that defines a political party in a way that's going to be inconsistent with that.

So it's not just the Constitutional language and The Government Code language. We have to -- we have to take a look at what's in the election code and make sure that we're not coming up with something that's inconsistent with what's in the election code, because that could get us into some problems. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

Anthony, would you mind, it's not right now, obviously, but looking into that in terms of if there is a conflict with the elections code?

ATTNY PANE: Sure. Happy to.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

17 Commissioner Yee?

18 COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Yeah. So even the statutory change, Anthony, that you mentioned, even that would still take a legislative vote to approve, is that correct or incorrect? Because if it is correct, it seems like a pretty zero chance of happening, right? I mean, it may just theoretically, certainly the argument it would be more fair, but if it takes a partisan vote of the legislature to approve a

statutory change like this, it just seems like a nonstarter realistically speaking. So Anthony --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I want to see Anthony, but go ahead. Yeah, I know what he said in the past was in order for a statutory change, there's two avenues. One is to go through the legislature with a two thirds vote, but it still has to be voted on by the California voters.

And then the other route is have a lot of money to put it on -- get the signatures and put it on the ballot. So yes, it would be a heavy lift for any statutory changes.

Anthony, is that close kind of?

ATTNY PANE: Kinda of close. Just for the statutory changes, we do need two thirds because this would be changing the Commission statutes. As you may recall, any time we're touching the 8250s, which is the statutory scheme, that there are special hurdles to go through.

And so the largest two thirds of both houses of the legislature would need to approve such a change. And of course, I don't -- I'm not weighing in as the likelihood of the change being implemented, just whether it is a way to do it. And so I don't render any legal opinion on how likely it is, but this would be a change to the commission statute.

And so yes, both houses of the legislature by two



1 thirds would need to approve it as well as there's other conditions that would need to be satisfied. Commission 3 would need to approve the exact language, need to be in 4 print for a certain amount of time. We would also have 5 to explain why this furthers the purpose of the of the act. 6 7 But to your point about vote counting, Commissioner 8 Yee, it would need two thirds in both the Assembly and 9 the Senate.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: But Anthony, doesn't it also have to go to the voters of California, because it's a Constitutional change?

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

24

25

ATTNY PANE: If we're just changing the statute, it doesn't change the Constitutional language. So there's not a vote of the people that's required. If we've change the language of the Constitution, then it does require that.

So the question is whether we're changing wording of the Constitution. I think if all we're doing is further clarifying and specifying an existing statutory framework, then it's changing the statute. And so we wouldn't need a vote of the people for that.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

Okay. So we'll go on to the next one. C-11 is Commissioner Compensation Salary as Exempt. And the

1 reasoning behind this was to incentivize prospective 2 candidates. So do we have any comments on this one? 3 Commissioner Sinay? COMMISSIONER SINAY: I quess this is a general 4 5 comment. We haven't had the -- I think the bigger comment were -- kind of where Commissioner Yee was coming 6 7 from of how big of a lift do we want to take. And that 8 might help answer some of these smaller questions. 9 Do we as a Commission want to take on Constitutional 10 changes knowing that it's going to involve X, Y, Z? 11 we, as -- just having that bigger philosophical change 12 conversation and then go into the weeds? Because I feel 13 like we keep saying, oh, there's going to be a big lift, 14 but we don't finish that conversation of are we willing 15 to do the big left or not? 16 And I think some Commissioners have been very clear 17 that they're not -- that they don't want to -- and others 18 just -- I just think that might help answer some of these 19 questions and get some of these things off of your to do 2.0 list if we had that bigger conversation. 21 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. 22 Commissioner Akutagawa? 2.3 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I was just going to 24 say, I believe we did make a decision that we did not 25 want to go down the road -- the route of any

1	Constitutional changes. And that could reflect why this
2	doesn't have that five, five, five change. I think we
3	I mean, we've had many a discussion about this document.
4	And I thought pretty early on we were all pretty clear
5	that we did not want to undertake Constitutional changes.
6	And so we pretty much moved anything that required
7	Constitutional change off of the kind of the list for
8	consideration. That was my recollection, though.
9	COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay?
10	COMMISSIONER SINAY: That makes absolutely sense if
11	we did have it. I'm sorry if I can't remember. But
12	again, maybe we had talked about this kind of being a
13	summary of some of the conversations we had. So maybe
14	it's at the very bottom saying we've agreed on this date
15	not to do the route of constitution.
16	And these, that we've talked about, fell under that
17	just so that we all don't go back like I did to the five,
18	five, five, if we've all decided because I know
19	another commissioner brought up the five, five as
20	an answer to me.
21	COMMISSIONER FERNADNEZ: Commissioner Kennedy?
22	COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. Yeah, I mean, I
23	think there was apparently discussion of this by the 2010
24	Commission. There are things that they expressed some
25	level of support for. But again, did not feel that it

was worthwhile to take it forward.

2.0

I think, we should at least look at building out that list of Constitutional changes. I think there are, as well drafted as the language was, there are some issues that I feel in the long run or very long run need to be addressed at the Constitutional level.

And so I think the best approach might be to take some more time, whether it's this decade or the next decade to really build out the catalog of things in the Constitutional language that are problematic or gaps in the Constitutional language that are problematic and go at it once to make the needed changes and additions.

If this is not the time, fine, but let's at least make the effort to document our thinking, share it with future commissions, and hopefully build -- I don't know, build a snowball if that's if that's an apt metaphor for this. But I do think there are changes and additions needed. Maybe this isn't the time. But let's keep this rolling. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you for that,

Commissioner Kennedy. I totally agree. And I propose

that the time be -- let's put this in the strategy, which

is brought up because it is a -- I agree there are things

1 which are worth doing the lift over. This particular time, I'm not so sure. But yes, it needs to be -- what 3 would those be? When might be the best time to approach that? And the strategy meeting would be exactly a good 4 5 time to put that in. What form it ends up with, we'll 6 see. But I propose that. Thank you. 7 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Commissioner Vazquez? 9 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes, he would. I also want 10 to add that in particular Constitutional amendments, those are going to need not just money but a very broad 11 12 set of supporters, a coalition of support really. And it 13 feels like those will be very, very long-term policy 14 development discussion interested folks. 15 And in my best guess, I feel like that around some 16 of these changes will in reality have to come from 17 community partners rather than be really driven 18 strategically or otherwise by the Commission. 19 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner 20 Vazquez. 21 Commissioner Kennedy? 22 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: And I actually have one to 23 add to the mix. And I'm happy to wait until we get to 24 the very bottom of page 7, if you'd like. But I'd also

be happy to put it on the table now. It's up to you.

25

1 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: How about if we get through 2 the end? Just put it on your to do list. How's that? 3 Okay. So C-11, we haven't really -- so we just had 4 the conversation regarding the Constitutional changes. 5 And so we'll go to C-11, which is salary as exempt if we have any discussion on that. I guess my personal opinion 6 7 is I thought it was fine the way it was in terms of -- by day in terms of, I guess, a daily rate. 8 9 And I think that's good in terms of those that do 10 have the extra time, can maybe sit on more subcommittees 11 and do more up front and work during the entire term 12 versus those that maybe don't have as much time wouldn't 13 be charging as much. 14 I guess I'm just trying to look at the fairness of 15 it all and incentivizing not only trying to attract 16 additional people to apply, but then also amongst the 17 commissioners themselves too is there is an incentive --18 or not incentive if you do more or do less. So that's 19 kind of how I look at it. 2.0 So Commissioner Kennedy? 21 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. Yeah. 22 the original idea here is that if there is interest in 23 ensuring greater diversity among Commissioners, 24 particularly as far as socioeconomic situation of 25 prospective Commissioners, I have to say that anyone who

is struggling to make ends meet or looking for a way to make ends meet is never going to take this on because there is simply too much uncertainty as to the time requirement and the income stream from it.

I mean, I'm -- I was looking last night at my income from commission work, which from 2021 to 2022, fell from something just over 50,000 to something more along the lines of 10 or 15,000. Someone who is looking for a way to make ends meet, is not going to be able to deal with that much variability in their income.

And we know that at least for a portion of the time that we have been at this, it is a full time or more than full time job. But I continue to believe that if we want to attract a more socioeconomically diverse candidate pool, there have to be at least some minimum guarantees of what their income is going to be from this. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay?

2.0

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I hear what Commissioner

Kennedy is saying, and I've tried to think this through
in different ways. But I think the solution is really
being more upfront when you're recruiting individuals for
them to know how much time it takes because in the end,
having it set up the way it is, if we were to say, okay,

on average, get paid for the ten years, it'll be a number that's very small in that one year, that it is a full-time job versus the way it's set up now.

As Commissioner Fernandez said, it compensates you for the amount of time you're able to give. To me, the solution is really to say upfront okay from this month, from this month, it'll probably be a full time plus job because in some ways what we made that first year -- the full-time -- when you look at how much you made it is higher than the average salary in California even though it is low. To me it all goes back to how honest we are in the beginning.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Vazquez?

2.3

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. This is an issue that's really important to me and also is personally relevant. I really don't think that being upfront with the time commitment is an adequate solution. It is certainly part of the solution.

But I knew going in how -- that it would ebb and flow, but that it would also be a very big, time commitment. In hearing the presentations that I went to from the previous Commissioners, they were very upfront about how much of a time commitment it was. The reality

is that, salaried position offers a much more stable stream of income and allows folks to plan -- allows folks to plan their -- how to spend their labor, how to spend their time.

2.0

I mean, I'll be honest, I was working 60, 70 hours a week that whole year up to approving the maps, which is bananas for anybody, but especially for someone who has a disabling fatigue and chronic illness. And if I could have been guaranteed a salary even for a year, I would have been much more economically able to even ask for a leave of absence, a full leave of absence from my full-time employer.

I did not feel comfortable asking for a leave of absence from my employer because it was a daily stipend that felt too precarious financially. And I also think there isn't actually as much choice and flexibility during that year lead up in terms of like how much you can work versus -- how much you can put in versus how much you can really step back.

And so I think to honor that reality, I think we could structure a proposal that has a full-time salary for at least the year lead up to map approval and then transition Commissioners to a daily stipend post -- so after some time period post map approval. That feels like to me a third way. And again, I do really think

1 economically this -- the work required -- the time 2 investment required of this position does demand a full-3 time position. And I think it will -- it also communicates -- it 4 5 communicates to potential applicants that they will need to sort of make a choice between what they're spending 40 6 7 hours a week on here versus at some other place of 8 employment. And I think that's a much more helpful 9 framing when you're making a decision about where to 10 spend your time. Thank you. 11 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. 12 comments on Commissioner compensation? 13 Commissioner Sinay? 14 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Is it possible to do an and 15 solution like for the year of redistricting its salary 16 and then and it becomes stipend per day after that year? 17 I'm just trying to get to a solution because I hear --18 and I quess that's where I'm stuck is I feel like if 19 there was an and it would be better than if it was an or. 2.0 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. 21 Commissioner Kennedy? 22 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah, I think definitely 2.3 because I mean, the issue, and Commissioner Vazquez set 24 it out very clearly, I think, if someone has a job with a

known income stream, then whether or not they're going to

25

proceed with applying to the Commission could depend on
what kind of income stream the Commission could offer as
an alternative for that period of time up through the
approval of the maps and possibly a short time after
that.

Once that's through, it's not a question of a

regular forty hour a week job or the Commission. It's a

regular forty hour a week job or the Commission. It's a lot of these months over the last year, I've put down one day on my timesheet per month. And that seems like something that most people would be able to juggle with a full-time job.

But to me, again, it comes down to, if you want to claim most or all of my working hours during a certain period of time, I need to have an idea upfront how much that's going to pay. Is that going to be enough for me to make ends meet or is it not? And asking people to go into this blindly with no assurances of what their income is going to be over the course of that year? Just to me doesn't seem realistic or fair.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay?

2.0

COMMISSIONER SINAY: That's my life as an independent contractor. But I hear what you're saying, and I think it is my -- the other piece that I had heard from some Commissioners and from the -- from the

community, we -- if we do -- it's the benefits side of it, the health benefits side. And I don't think we're willing to do employee with a health benefits side, but I don't want us to be naive and think that just by offering a salary, we make it equitable.

The health -- someone taking a leave or leaving unemployment to work here without benefits is there -- not to work here -- to serve, that is hard. But I'm great with an and solution.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

2.3

Commissioner Akutagawa: What Commissioner Sinay just said was on my mind as well, too. I think we're -- it's not as simple as just -- I don't know. I don't want to call it a salary, but a known amount or compensation. I do wonder right now it's under a government code.

The discussion we're having, I think we're going to start to delve into many other areas that may I don't want to say unintended consequences, but I think we need to be aware of all of the ripple effects of such a decision. And then where does that also fall into from a -- whether it's a policy change, a legislative change, Constitutional change, whatever.

Those are all things that I think we can discuss what we'd like to see, but not necessarily -- without knowing what the implications are, I think this may be a

- topic that requires further study before -- and some recommendations before we could actually make some decisions.
 - Because I think what Commissioner Sinay just said about health care and then it gets into the question of does then instead of being a Commission, do we become an employer? I guess those are questions that now are coming up for me that I think we should at least explore first.
- 10 | COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.
- 11 Commissioner Kennedy?

4

5

6

7

8

9

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

2.3

24

- 12 CHAIR TAYLOR: Commissioner Fernandez, if I can cut
 13 in for a second?
- 14 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Yes.
 - CHAIR TAYLOR: It seems that there's still a little bit of discussion to be had during this subcommittee report. That being the case, I'd prefer to get us back on to the regular schedule as posted for our listening audience, however large it may or may not be.
 - So we can sort of conclude where we are and come back after a lunch period in the next five minutes. I'd want to break for lunch at 1:05, and then we could return at 1:45 and conclude the subcommittee reports if that's acceptable to the Commission.
- 25 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: That's fine. Or we can



1 also -- Chair Taylor, we can also continue this 2 discussion at the next meeting --CHAIR TAYLOR: Yes. 3 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- because -- if you want. 4 5 It's an open item. I don't want to stifle any of those juices flowing. If you want to still come back after 6 7 lunch and discuss this report further, I'm okay with that. Or we can plow through but I would want to 8 9 conclude this in the next ten minutes or so. 10 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Let me just hear 11 from Commission Kennedy, Commissioner Vazquez. 12 like I said, I think the other two items. And that's 13 kind of what we've been doing in the prior meetings, 14 we've just kind of go to a certain stage and then we just 15 leave the rest for the next meeting. So I'm okay with 16 that -- just leaving it. 17 And I do think that there is additional research 18 that needs to be done with this specific one, because I'd 19 actually like to task Terri and Corina to look at this in 20 terms of position authority, salary versus switching to 21 stipend and whether or not benefits could be -- the 22 commissioners could receive benefits. 2.3 So there is more research I'd like to do before we 24 actually -- so we're not going to conclude the discussion 25 today because we still -- I think we're going to have

1 some homework on our site. So it's not going to be the end of discussion today. But we'll listen to Commissioner Kennedy, Commissioner Vazquez, and then that 3 4 that will be the end of our committee report. 5 CHAIR TAYLOR: Very well. Thank you. COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: If I can also at least have 6 7 the opportunity to lay on the table the additional item which shouldn't take long. 8 9 CHAIR TAYLOR: Absolutely, Commissioner Kennedy. 10 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. So on this discussion, 11 I don't think we're necessarily going to reach a perfect 12 solution. My goal in this discussion is to advance the 13 likelihood of having a more diverse applicant pool. 14 And I believe that the diversity of the applicant 15 pool is going to be enhanced by ensuring people that --16 whether it's through being able to keep their regular 17 position and do Commission work, which is mostly going to 18 be the case after the maps are done or receiving a 19 minimum --a quaranteed minimum income for their 20 Commission work, which would enable them to make a decision whether to take a leave or whatever, I think 21 22 that's going to get us closer to having a more diverse 23 applicant pool. 24 And finally, on the issue of more research to be 25 done, very definitely the Michigan Commission is

salaried. The Michigan State Constitution, as a result of the initiative that set up their commission, says that commissioners should be paid at least twenty-five percent of the governor's salary.

I've been following it enough to know that there has been some controversy around the Commissioner's salaries and who has the authority to increase or decrease their salary within those Constitutional guidelines. So yeah, let's research not only here in California, but let's take a close look and perhaps listen further to the Michigan Commission on this issue. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

And Commissioner Vazquez?

2.0

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, thank you. One final point to add to Commissioner Kennedy's really solid point about increasing the diversity pool. The reality is that during our business meetings we're directly competing with the vast majority of working hours for most people, even service workers -- Target is open from 8 to 7.

When I offered to have our many of our community input meetings in the evening to accommodate more folks, there wasn't a lot of initial uptake because no one really wants to work in the evening unless you have to. So I do feel like we -- because much of the work when it is work intensive is directly competing with other

working hours in many industries, including service industries that we will lose many diverse candidates if we don't offer them stable employment.

They may not be able to keep their current position even if it -- even if it is part time or flex work, you can't you can't do two things at once, or at least most people can't. So I think just the practicality of it being a mostly 9 to 5 gig for at least a year makes it really challenging to do other -- to do other paid work.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. And then just the one thing you wanted to add, Commissioner Kennedy, potentially add to the list.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes. Thank you. So I was looking recently at the provisions for amending The State Constitution. And so Article 18 of the Constitution in Section 2, talks about the legislature by roll call vote may submit a question of whether to call a convention to revise the Constitution.

So just like the U.S. Constitution, California

Constitution can be amended through a State

Constitutional Convention. Section 2 then goes on to

say, "Delegates to a Constitutional convention shall be

voters elected from districts as nearly equal in

population as may be practicable."

So there's a provision requiring the division of The



- 1 | State into some number of equally populated districts.
- 2 But I've not yet found any provision that says who is
- 3 responsible for undertaking that division of The State
- 4 | into equally populated districts.
- 5 Now, there was a vote on possible Constitutional
- 6 | Convention back in 1930, and the suggestion was that
- 7 | there be 120 delegates, one from each Senate District and
- 8 one from each Assembly District. My reading of the
- 9 current language in Article 18 is that that probably
- 10 | wouldn't fly as dividing The State into districts as
- 11 | nearly equal in population, as practical.
- 12 So my thinking on this is at some point -- and my
- 13 | philosophy is always, it's better to have a provision
- 14 telling you which way to go on something than, for
- 15 example, finding yourself with a tie vote and having no
- 16 way to resolve the tie. If California were to have this
- 17 | call for a Constitutional Convention with no one
- 18 responsible for dividing The State into districts, what
- 19 | would we do?
- 20 So to me, the most logical step would be to add
- 21 dividing The State into equally populated districts for
- 22 | the purpose of holding a State Constitutional Convention
- 23 to the duties of the California Citizens Redistricting
- 24 Commission. Thank you.
- 25 | COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. I'm not sure

1 what to do with that one. So I'm just going to punt it over to, Chair. And we're done with our subcommittee 3 report. 4 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you. I know there's plenty of 5 discussion left to be had, so I quess we'll get a clear, concise addendum to our list as we continue to have this 6 7 conversation. Any further questions or comments for our 8 Legislative Subcommittee? 9 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No. I just had a quick --10 on our subcommittees, I was thinking that we could --11 Commissioner Akutagawa and I were thinking that we could 12 sunset the Long-Term Planning Subcommittee, which is I 13 because it sounds like the Continuity Subcommittee is 14 kind of taking that on. 15 CHAIR TAYLOR: Is there a question? 16 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ No, I'm just recommending 17 that we sunset the Long-Term Planning Subcommittee. 18 CHAIR TAYLOR: That's so --19 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. 20 CHAIR TAYLOR: -- the Long-Term Subcommittee (audio 21 interference) so same thing, same issues. So we want 22 to -- any objection to sunsetting the Long-Term Planning 2.3 Subcommittee? Anything to discuss further? All right. Then that's on hiatus. 24

All right. With that, Kristian, can you open up the

1	phone lines for public comment as it relates to agenda
2	item 3, the subcommittee reports, please?
3	COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Chair, Commissioner Kennedy
4	has a comment.
5	CHAIR TAYLOR: Oh, go ahead, Commissioner Kennedy.
6	COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Just a quick question for the
7	subcommittee the Legislative Subcommittee. We had a
8	spot bill last year with a sponsor identified. Do we
9	currently have a spot bill and a potential sponsor?
10	COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No, not yet. They were
11	just recently seated, so they don't know who's in which
12	committee. So we're working on that. Thank you.
13	CHAIR TAYLOR: All right. Any other Commissioner's
14	questions or comments? All hands, nothing is missing.
15	Going once. Going twice. And this subcommittee is sold.
16	All right. Kristian, can you open it up for
17	comment, please?
18	PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Sure thing.
19	The Commission will now take general public comment.
20	To give comment, please call 877-853-5247 and enter
21	meeting I.D number 87120131061 for this meeting. Once
22	you've dialed in, please press star 9 to enter the
23	comment queue. The full call-in instructions are read at
24	the beginning of the meeting and are provided on the live
25	stream landing page. And there's no one in the queue at

- 1 this time, Chair.
- 2 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you. And we'll pause until the
- 3 stream and the live feed are met -- caught up.
- 4 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And those instructions
- 5 are complete, Chair. And there is no one in the queue.
- 6 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thanks you. I appreciate that. So
- 7 our next (audio interference) have in front of me.
- 8 | Corina, can you tell me what our meeting dates are for
- 9 February, March, April and May.
- 10 MS. LEON: Yes. Let me see what we have. I'm in
- 11 | the -- for February, it's on February 10th. It's a
- 12 Friday. For March, oh, nothing for March. Why isn't
- 13 there something for March? Hold on. Let me just check
- 14 | my calendar. March -- I just sent them to --
- 15 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: March is the 10th. Okay.
- 16 | COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.
- 17 MS. LEON: And that's also a Friday. Believe. And
- 18 | let's see, this is -- Yeah. And --
- 19 CHAIR TAYLOR: Alvaro, I see you have your hand up.
- 20 MS. LEON: I'm sorry.
- 21 CHAIR TAYLOR: That's okay.
- MR. HERNANDEZ: Yeah, Chair. I just wanted to ask
- 23 | if I can share my screen. I have the dates from our --
- 24 CHAIR TAYLOR: That would be wonderful. I didn't
- 25 | mean to catch Corina off guard. Go ahead.



1 MS. LEON: That's okay. Yeah, I do. I do have them here. So March is March 10th. April is April 7th. is May 5th. And June is June 2nd. 3 4 CHAIR TAYLOR: February, 2/10? I thought it was 5 2/17 for some reason. MS. LEON: February 10th. I'm sorry. Yes, it's the 6 7 10th. CHAIR TAYLOR: Okay. 2/10. And all these are 9 Fridays? 10 MS. LEON: Yes. And I believe Commissioner Kennedy 11 asked us to change April, I believe. 12 CHAIR TAYLOR: Change that to -- what day is being 13 proposed? 14 MS. LEON: I believe he mentioned the 23rd, but I don't think that works for -- I don't think that works 15 16 for everybody. Is there another date? 17 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I did not mention the 23rd. 18 I thought I had mentioned the 14th. 19 MS. LEON: Okay. 2.0 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I know that that's not 21 workable for one colleague. Other dates to look at are 22 the 13th and the 17th. 2.3 MS. LEON: The 17th.

before the 14th or the business day after the 14th.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: So the day before -- the day

24

```
1
        MS. LEON: Okay. April.
         CHAIR TAYLOR: April 17th was one of those
    suggestions? I heard correctly, correct? And that's a
 3
 4
   Monday?
 5
         COMMISSIONER KENNEDY:
                               That's a Monday. I would be
    I would be -- I would be okay with spoiling all those
 6
 7
    Fridays with a Monday. Any -- Commissioner Andersen?
         COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I understand why we
 8
 9
    switched from Wednesdays, but why did we pick Fridays? I
10
   mean, because right now we're still remote, but we're
11
    from Sacramento. That's not exactly the best.
                                                    I thought
12
   we were trying to avoid Friday/Monday -- or Monday, but
13
   not all of them Friday.
14
        CHAIR TAYLOR: It was -- no, there's no.
15
         COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Well, on this
16
   April --
17
         CHAIR TAYLOR: There's no geometric view.
18
         COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. On the April, I would
19
    go on the 13th with 17. That's fine.
                                          I'd also like to
20
    talk about moving the March to either the 13th or 14th
21
    from the 10th. I can't. I will be traveling. Gone.
22
         CHAIR TAYLOR: And we do -- we have to do -- we try
23
    to accommodate the best -- we might we might miss a
24
   meeting or two. We realize that. But we try to
25
    accommodate our schedules as best as possible. So you
```

1 have a -- Commission Andersen, what was your -- what days 2 did you propose? 3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'm sorry, on the April I 4 could do either the 13th or 17th, whichever. But for the 5 March, I would propose either moving it from the 10th of March to say the following week, either the 13th or 6 7 preferably the 14th a Tuesday. Do Tuesdays work for 8 people? 9 CHAIR TAYLOR: I think most of us that are still 10 like working like the -- well, we are still working on 11 one form or another, but that front or the end of the 12 week is a lot easier to squeeze in than that middle. 13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, okay. Well, the Monday 14 because originally we had it down is March 15th. We made 15 this -- we put out some dates originally and then we've 16 now changed them again. So I've kind of -- I moved 17 things from that week and now. So that's why I'd like to 18 move it if we could, the Monday the 13th would still work 19 instead of the 10th. 2.0 CHAIR TAYLOR: 13th? Okav. 21 All right. Commissioner Fernandez? 22 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. I'm wondering 23 if maybe we just forward the dates we can't make it to

Alvaro and Corina and then they come up with alternative

date only because it's going to be hard to -- and like

24

1 you said, sometimes you can make it, sometimes you can't. And hopefully if they have information from all the commissioners, they can, at least see what date they will 3 4 have the most commissioners available. 5 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you. Commissioner Akutagawa? 6 7 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I was -- actually, you mentioned it already, Chair Taylor. Either the 8 9 beginning or the end of the weeks are easier when it's a 10 Wednesday, and especially as we transition to in-person 11 meetings again after the Bagley-Keene exemption expires. 12 The middle of the week is just really hard. It just 13 blows a couple days, if not three days, depending on the 14 timing. So that's why I had asked for the end of the 15 week when I asked Corina to look at dates for the future 16 meetings. 17 Selfishly, I agree with Commissioner CHAIR TAYLOR: 18 Akutagawa. 19 Commissioner Yee? 2.0 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. Can someone remind us when 21 the Bagley-Keene exemptions do expire? Thanks. 22 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: June 30th. 2.3 ATTNY PANE: Yeah. 24 CHAIR TAYLOR: June 30th. So we are set for

That's correct?

25

February the 10th.

1 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And then are we doing March 2 13th and April 17th? 3 CHAIR TAYLOR: Hang on, Commissioner Hang on. So we're set for February 10th just 4 Andersen. 5 so that we can we can put that in writing. What I then see from what we asked, I would suggest an alternating 6 7 Mondays and Fridays. So we have 2/10 then 3/13, that's a Monday. Then, we can go back to a Friday, the following month's 10 meeting, then go back to a Monday. That's my 11 suggestions. That way, sort of get people at the front 12 or the end. And it suits a few people's availability. 13 So we'll meet on a Monday or Friday every other month. 14 MS. LEON: Yeah. Okay. CHAIR TAYLOR: Starting with the Friday in February. 15 16 If that poses a problem to any commissioner, please send 17 it in and we can work accordingly from there. 18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, I'm sorry. Hang on a 19 sec. So then we moved April -- so then that moves May 20 has now become the 8th instead of the fifth? To switch 21 it to -- if we go --22 CHAIR TAYLOR: Yeah. Whatever that, how that 23 rotation falls. Friday, Monday --24 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Got it. 25 CHAIR TAYLOR: Friday, Monday, alternating months.

1 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you. 2 CHAIR TAYLOR: You got it. 3 Commissioner Akutagawa? 4 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So for 5 clarification, we had discussed April 14th. Are you saying that it would move to -- is it the Monday, the 6 7 10th or Monday the 17th? CHAIR TAYLOR: It'll be the 17th. 8 9 COMMISSIONER ANSWERSEN: Wait. 10 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Or I'm sorry. I don't 11 know. I think now we're making it more confusing. 12 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Our regular Friday. 13 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Friday. Yeah. Okay. 14 Okay. So all right. So not 7th. It will be the 14th. 15 Is that what we're talking about? 16 MS. LEON: Yes. That would be the Friday. 17 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. 18 MS. LEON: And then May is Monday, May 8th. 19 June is a Friday. So that'll stay as June 2nd. 2.0 CHAIR TAYLOR: And again, if there's a problem with 21 your availability or it seems to be cumbersome to send it 22 in and we can discuss that at future meetings. 2.3 MS. LEON: And I'll resend out the list. 24 CHAIR TAYLOR: Commissioner Kennedy? 25 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I guess I was understanding

- 1 | that if we weren't going to -- that if April was going to
- 2 stay on a Friday, that it would stay on the Friday that
- 3 | it's already scheduled for. I believe I can do it then.
- 4 If I can't, then, Commissioner Le Mons as Vice Chair,
- 5 | will chair that one.
- 6 CHAIR TAYLOR: All right. We can touch bases.
- 7 Again, it's a -- yeah. Trying to fix it. The next two,
- 8 | February and March are set, though. And we'll try to get
- 9 the April. Anything else on our meeting dates?
- 10 All right. Kristian, if you can call for general
- 11 public comment, please.
- 12 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Sure thing.
- 13 The Commission will now take general public comment.
- 14 | To give comment, please call 877-853-5247 and enter
- 15 | meeting ID number 87120131061 for this meeting. Once
- 16 you've dialed in, please press star 9 to enter the
- 17 | comment queue. The full call-in instructions are read at
- 18 | the beginning of the meeting and are provided on the live
- 19 stream landing page and there is no one in the queue at
- 20 this time, Chair.
- 21 CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you. And let me know when the
- 22 | feed and the livestream have caught up.
- 23 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Those instructions are
- 24 | complete and there's no one in the Chair -- I mean, no
- 25 one in the queue, Chair.

1	CHAIR TAYLOR: Thank you. There is no one in the
2	chair? Were you trying to is that Freudian slip
3	there, sir?
4	PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I'm in a chair, Chair.
5	CHAIR TAYLOR: Okay. All right. All right.
6	Commissioners, again, thank you for your attentiveness,
7	your thoughtfulness.
8	Alvaro, we wish you the best as you move on from
9	your role. California, thank you for listening and
LO	hearing no objections we'll call this January 11th, 2023
L1	meeting to an end. This meeting is adjourned.
L2	(Whereupon, the CRC Business Meeting
L3	adjourned.)
L 4	
L 5	
L 6	
L 7	
L 8	
L 9	
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 24th day of January, 2023.

AMANDA SELF, CER-1554

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 24, 2023 DATE