

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
CITIZENS REDISTRICTING COMMISSION (CRC)

In the matter of:

CRC BUSINESS MEETING

MONDAY, DECEMBER 14, 2020

9:30 a.m.

Transcription by:

eScribers, LLC



APPEARANCESCOMMISSIONERS

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

STAFF

Dan Claypool, Executive Director
Alvaro Hernandez, Executive Director
Fredy Ceja, Communications Director
Kary Marshall, Chief Counsel
Marian Johnston, CRC Legal Counsel
Wanda Sheffield, Office Technician

TECHNICAL CONTRACTORS

Kristian Manoff, AV Technical Director/Comment Moderator
Jesse Solarzono, Videography Assistant Crew Chief

Also PresentPUBLIC COMMENT

Lori Shellenberger, California Common Cause
Jacqueline Coto, NALEO Educational Fund
Sarah Bedy
Rosalind Gold, NALEO Educational Fund
Margo Morales
Michael Wagaman

INDEX

| | <u>PAGE</u> |
|---|-------------|
| Call to Order and Roll Call | 4 |
| Public Comment | 7 |
| General Announcements | 12 |
| Chair Report | 16 |
| Executive Director's report | 17 |
| Chief Counsel's Report | 22 |
| Subcommittee Updates | 23 |
| Communications Director's report | 24 |
| Subcommittee Updates (Continued) | 39 |
| Line Drawers RFP2 | 86 |
| Public Comment | 128 |
| Line Drawers RFP2 (Continued) | 146 |
| Administrative Policy Review and Adoption | 163 |
| Outreach and Engagement Plan | 180 |
| Adjournment | 226 |

P R O C E E D I N G S

December 14, 2020

9:30 a.m.

CHAIR LE MONS: Good morning and welcome to the meeting of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. I'm Commissioner Le Mons. I will be the Chair for the next series of meetings.

Allow me to introduce my Vice Chair, Commissioner Taylor. If you could raise your hand there? Great. Good morning.

Good morning to fellow Commissioners. At this time, I'd like to call the meeting to order and go to our executive director for roll call.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Thank you, Chair.

Roll call: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Commissioner Taylor.

VICE CHAIR TAYLOR: Present.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Here.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Commissioner Vasquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Here.



1 MR. CLAYPOOL: Commissioner Yee.

2 COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

3 MR. CLAYPOOL: Commissioner Ahmad.

4 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

5 MR. CLAYPOOL: Commissioner Akutagawa.

6 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

7 MR. CLAYPOOL: Commissioner Andersen.

8 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here.

9 MR. CLAYPOOL: Commissioner Fernandez.

10 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Here.

11 MR. CLAYPOOL: Commissioner Fornaciari.

12 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

13 MR. CLAYPOOL: Commissioner Kennedy.

14 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

15 MR. CLAYPOOL: Chair Le Mons.

16 CHAIR LE MONS: Here.

17 MR. CLAYPOOL: We are all present.

18 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

19 So I want to go through the agenda really quickly
20 and give the public, as well as the fellow Commissioners
21 a sense of how the meeting will run today and over the
22 next couple days. Then we'll go to our opening general
23 public comment.

24 So we've done our roll call. After I go through our
25 agenda, we'll open with our public comment. Then, we'll

1 have general announcements from Commissioners and
2 updates. And then, we have a new category called "Chair
3 Report". I'll give a brief report. And then, there will
4 be the executive director's report, chief counsel report,
5 and then the communications director's report.

6 My anticipation is that this will take us right up
7 to our first 11 a.m. break. And then, we'll have a
8 fifteen-minute break and come back and begin our
9 subcommittee updates. And that should run us right up
10 into the lunch hour, based upon the feedback that I've
11 received from Commissioners so far.

12 We should be able to conclude our subcommittee
13 reports by the lunch hour, at which point, we'll take our
14 break for lunch at 12:45 and return at 1:45. At which
15 point, we'll open the floor for public comment and our
16 post-lunch general comment. And then, we'll move into
17 our agenda item number 9. That should put us right
18 around 2 p.m.

19 And after we complete that agenda item, we'll move
20 into the next one, which will be agenda item number 10.
21 And I anticipate we should be hitting right around the
22 2:45, 3 o'clock mark. At that time, again, we'll go to
23 public comment if there's action that is to be taken on
24 agenda item number 10, which we anticipate.

25 And then we will move into agenda number 11 right

1 around 3:30, anticipating needing about ninety minutes
2 for that agenda item. I'll do a time check around 4:30
3 to see how everybody's feeling. Because we can always
4 move the remainder of that discussion, dependent on where
5 we are at that point, to tomorrow morning.

6 Number 12, we won't be doing. I'm getting some
7 feedback from someone's microphone. Number 12, we won't
8 be doing, as indicated on the agenda. That has been
9 tabled. And then, if closed session is necessary --
10 there's been no indication that there will need to be any
11 closed session, and then we would talk about our
12 reports -- excuse me -- discussion of future meetings and
13 agendas, take closing public comment, and be done.

14 So I am anticipating this this will be a two-day
15 meeting and not a three-day meeting. So that's what
16 we're looking at right now. Of course, we're flexible
17 and we'll make adjustments as necessary.

18 So with that, I'd like to ask Jesse to open the
19 floor for public comment. Please, if you could read the
20 instructions.

21 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: In order to maximize
22 transparency and public participation in our process, the
23 Commissioners will be talking public comment by phone.
24 To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the
25 livestream feed. The telephone number is 877-853-5247.

1 When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided
2 on the livestream feed. It is 93989466294 for this
3 week's meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID,
4 simply press pound. Once you have dialed in, you'll be
5 placed in a queue from which a moderator will begin
6 unmuting callers to submit their comment.

7 You will also hear an automated message to press
8 star 9. Please do this to raise your hand indicating you
9 wish to comment. When it is your turn to speak, the
10 moderator will unmute you and you'll hear an automated
11 message that says, "the host would like you to talk", and
12 press star 6 to speak. Please make sure to mute your
13 computer or livestream audio to prevent any feedback or
14 distortion during your call.

15 Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when
16 it is your turn to speak. And again, please turn down
17 the livestream volume. These instructions are also
18 located on the website. The Commission is taking general
19 public comment at this time.

20 CHAIR LE MONS: So as we all know, there's about a
21 minute or two delay, I believe -- not a minute or two.
22 There's a little bit of a delay between the live cast and
23 the actual. So we'll give a few minutes to see if we
24 have any public comments.

25 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Good morning, caller.



1 Could you please state and spell your name for the
2 record, please?

3 MS. SHELLENBERGER: Yes, this is Lori, L-O-R-I,
4 Shellenberger, S-H-E-L-L-E-N-B-E-R-G-E-R. I'm a
5 redistricting consultant for Common Cause. And good
6 morning. I hope everyone enjoyed the time off from their
7 Commission meetings. And nice to see everyone's faces
8 again this morning. I just had a quick question about
9 agenda item number 9.

10 In the RFP, it sounded like you would be taking that
11 up today. But I did not see a revised RFP posted or the
12 supplemental materials pages, I think 23 to 63, or maybe
13 73 were not -- I wasn't able to find them on the website,
14 if they were in fact posted. So I just --

15 CHAIR LE MONS: So --

16 MS. SHELLENBERGER: -- I just had a question about
17 when those would be available to the public.

18 CHAIR LE MONS: So Ms. Shellenberger, there won't be
19 any action taken on that. There will be discussion on
20 that agenda item today, but there won't be any action.
21 When there is some revised documentation available, that
22 will be posted. But there will not be an action taken on
23 that matter today.

24 MS. SHELLENBERGER: Okay. Thank you so much for
25 that clarification. I appreciate it.

1 CHAIR LE MONS: You're welcome.

2 Do we have any other callers, Jesse?

3 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: There's one more caller
4 in the queue, Chair.

5 CHAIR LE MONS: Please invite them forward.

6 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Good morning, caller.

7 Could you please state and spell your name for the
8 record, please?

9 MS. COTO: Hi. Good morning.

10 CHAIR LE MONS: Good morning.

11 MS. COTO: My name is Jacqueline Coto,
12 J-A-C-Q-U-E-L-I-N-E. Last name, C-O-T-O. Good morning,
13 everyone. Commissioners, hope you had a good weekend. I
14 am calling from the NALEO Educational Fund. I'm the
15 state director of civic engagement policy.

16 It wasn't clear to me on the agenda if the topic of
17 the regions was going to be taking place today. So I
18 wanted to make a comment on that. And my comment
19 basically is, I wanted to uplift for you to consider that
20 as we move forward in looking at the regions, that for
21 the outreach purposes, to take into consideration that
22 all the regions are not the same.

23 And it's important to take into account the
24 population, the difficult -- difficultly in reaching some
25 people in some areas, and calibrate the resources that

1 are needed and the number of hearings that should not be
2 the same for every region, but instead, reflect what's
3 needed in the community and the population in each
4 region.

5 So I just wanted to uplift that real quickly. And
6 for today, I wish you guys have a great hearing and for
7 the week. I'm looking forward to connecting with you
8 later. Thank you so much.

9 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that Ms. Coto.
10 Actually, there will be a discussion of our regions for
11 outreach during item -- agenda item number 11, where we
12 will be discussing the overall outreach and engagement
13 plan. Again, that's anticipated to start around 3:30
14 this afternoon. So if you'd like to come back in, if
15 you're not staying for the whole day at that time, we
16 welcome you. Thank you so much for your comment.

17 MS. COTO: Thank you so much.

18 CHAIR LE MONS: You're welcome.

19 MS. COTO: Thank you.

20 CHAIR LE MONS: Jesse, do we have anymore callers in
21 the queue?

22 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Chair, there are
23 currently no callers in the queue.

24 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you so much, Jesse.

25 So with that, I'd like to move to general

1 announcements from Commissioners and updates and that
2 includes staff as well. So if we have general
3 announcements that are interest to Commission, now would
4 be the time.

5 Commissioner Sinay?

6 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Good morning, everyone. As
7 everyone said, it is kind of nice to see friendly faces
8 again and be in a group, versus our usual isolation
9 bubbles. So good morning.

10 One just overall comment regarding the agenda, when
11 we create agendas or any items, and I haven't always
12 either, but we have been asked if we could use Arial at
13 14-point font so it's easier for folks to read. So if we
14 can adopt that, at least for the agendas, if not,
15 remembering it for other data -- other documents we
16 create.

17 And I just wanted to say that I did -- let's see --
18 just in an effort to start -- well, I was contacted by --
19 I'm part of the League of Women Voters of North San Diego
20 County. And one of our members introduced me to a
21 local -- a commissioner for the local San Diego County
22 redistricting efforts.

23 And so I just wanted to put that out there, that
24 that introduction was made. And then, that local person
25 had introduced me to the staff for the county

1 redistricting. They're interested in connecting with our
2 staff. So when that all happens, I'll make sure our
3 staff connects, because they do really want to think
4 through how do we do some that conversations or education
5 from local, county, and state level. So I wanted to put
6 that out there.

7 And in my effort, just see what interest there was
8 in 101 sessions, or if people really thought that there
9 was, you know, redistricting -- people are busy, I did
10 put just in my little outreach -- I did some outreach on
11 my personal Facebook page and got a lot of response from
12 people saying, yes, we would like a fifteen-minute
13 presentation on redistricting in January or February,
14 whenever. There was a lot of interest.

15 So I was invited tonight to just be introduced to
16 the South Bay forum and their -- South Bay San Diego
17 County. And it's just going to be a hello, wave, type
18 thing but just to start building that trust. But I just
19 wanted to share that there is interest in meeting the
20 Commissioners, seeing their faces, and just getting a
21 little overview of what redistricting looks like, and
22 what's coming up, and how people can engage.

23 So that was good news. And that was all. I think
24 Angela has some -- an update on people that we met.
25 Thanks.

1 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

2 Commissioner Vasquez, did you want to add something?

3 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Oh, I was going to save that
4 for our committee reports.

5 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Thank you.

6 Commissioner Sinay, did you share that information
7 with Director Ceja so that --

8 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.

9 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay, fantastic.

10 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: He's cc'd every time that
11 someone says yes. I've asked the people to send me an
12 email directly to my CRC, you know, my email here.

13 CHAIR LE MONS: Awesome.

14 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: And then when I respond, I
15 put Commissioner Ceja -- Director Ceja. And I also
16 started a spreadsheet that we can share, if that's
17 helpful for people to put in the different people that
18 they're contacting so that we all know.

19 So of them are, you know, some of them are my HOPE
20 sisters -- or people from Hispanas Organized for
21 Political Equality. They aren't necessarily in San
22 Diego. And my response always is, staff will work to
23 find the best Commissioner for you that meets your needs.
24 So there's no expectation that it's me who will be
25 speaking.

1 CHAIR LE MONS: Awesome, thank you for that.

2 Any other announcements or general comments,
3 Commissioners?

4 Okay. With that, I'll move to the Chair report.
5 It'll be pretty short this week. I first just wanted to
6 really commend all the Commissioners for the time between
7 our last meeting and this meeting. For those of you
8 who've chaired already, you know what an organizing feat
9 it is in that between time to prepare for the upcoming
10 meeting.

11 So just really just wanted to acknowledge and say
12 thank you to my fellow Commissioners who were very
13 responsive to clarity questions, et cetera, regarding
14 their agenda items, and time needed, et cetera. I do
15 want to invite those Commissioners who were unable to be
16 responsive to please be sure to check your emails and
17 voicemails so that if a message is left for you, you can
18 respond within the time given.

19 It's really important as we move these agendas
20 forward and things change. And there are a lot of
21 Commissioners. There's quite a bit of staff. So we're
22 trying to coordinate about twenty-plus people to get to
23 this place. So all in all, it was a really wonderful
24 experience.

25 And also, something was raised by a Commissioner,

1 whether or not we needed some training on maybe using
2 Google Docs or some of the other tools that we were
3 using. So I was going to, during my report here, put
4 that out there and just ask that question.

5 And if you do feel like some training is necessary,
6 just shoot an email to staff, to Raul, and let him know
7 that. And then, we can start to look at putting together
8 the appropriate trainings. We do -- I do want everyone
9 to feel like the tools that are being used are easy to
10 use, accessible.

11 Or if we want other tools, we can make those
12 changes. But we do need to have the feedback in order to
13 know what's going to work best in the service of
14 communication and coordination amongst many people who
15 are, like, all over the state and not with each other.
16 So thank you so much for that.

17 Anyone have any questions or concerns?

18 Okay. With that, I'd like to move to the executive
19 director's report.

20 MR. CLAYPOOL: Good morning.

21 CHAIR LE MONS: Good morning.

22 MR. CLAYPOOL: So the first item on my report is to
23 say that we have two new employees starting today. We
24 have Ms. Kaplan, who you voted -- took a vote on in the
25 last meeting sets. And she is actually watching the

1 meeting as we speak. And we have our new Deputy
2 Executive Director Alvaro Hernandez. And I'm going to
3 start by asking him to introduce himself.

4 MR. HERNANDEZ: Good morning, Commissioners. It's
5 my first day. So I'm excited to see you all in person,
6 sort of. This is a long time coming. I've been very
7 excited to watch some of the meetings that were going on.
8 Unfortunately, I wasn't all that involved at that time.
9 But I'm looking forward to being very involved. I see
10 that you've done a tremendous amount of work.

11 And I'm going to playing catch up here. So I'm
12 looking forward to working with all of you. And as I
13 mentioned before, I'll be working on my thirty-, sixty-,
14 ninety-day plan and incorporating a lot of what you've
15 already done into that plan that I have. And I'll be
16 reaching out to all of you when the opportunity presents
17 itself. So thank you, and I'm looking forward to working
18 with all of you.

19 CHAIR LE MONS: Welcome, Deputy Exec. Director
20 Hernandez. I can't tell you, you've been -- well, you've
21 been watching. You know you've been the topic of many
22 discussions. We're go glad to have you finally here.

23 I'll turn it back over to Director Claypool.

24 MR. CLAYPOOL: Thank you.

25 So in the next agenda, it's for all future -- for

1 the current Chair and all future chairs, we'll need to
2 add a new agenda item for report out by our Deputy
3 Executive Director. It should go right after my report
4 out.

5 And just as a note -- an item to note, we posted
6 three -- we received responses for three of our posted
7 positions -- administrative positions. We have
8 approximately seven people who responded to our budget
9 officer position; approximately ten people who have
10 responded to our accounting clerk position, that will
11 help our fiscal, basically, our state management for
12 accounting for our funds. And we have two individuals
13 who responded for our senior legal analyst position.

14 So we will be forwarding the senior legal analyst
15 position recommendation to our finance and administration
16 subcommittee for their review. And we would like to do
17 that as soon as possible for that review so that we can
18 settle that position.

19 As we move forward, we will still be looking at our
20 communications manager, assistant procurement analyst,
21 procurement analyst, and budget analyst positions. But
22 we have no posting and no responses at this point. We'll
23 be doing that next week -- or actually, this week and
24 going into next week.

25 And we'll also be doing the interviews for the two

1 positions where we have received responses, hopefully at
2 the end of this week, so that we can make a decision on
3 those positions by the next meeting. All of that by the
4 way, everything we're talking about, we'll run through
5 the finance and administration committee -- subcommittee
6 ahead of Commission.

7 The budget, in agreement with the finance and
8 administrative subcommittee and the recommendation by
9 Commissioner Turner, I will do the actual budget each
10 month at the start of the month to tell you what's, you
11 know, what our expenditures have been.

12 I can tell you that we did in the last week,
13 encumber approximately 350,000 dollars in per diem, staff
14 salaries, and most importantly, our interim budget with
15 our videographer, that will insure forty additional
16 meetings until we complete our final contract for
17 videography. And that will come in the start of the --
18 the first of year.

19 And that final contract will run through June 30th,
20 2022. It's important to note that some of those forty
21 meetings that I just discussed have already been used.
22 So we need to get the RFP in for the final contract
23 during January, and then advertise it to probably through
24 late January, early February, and then complete that
25 contract.

1 And then finally, I think all of you saw an article
2 that we received about our Commission's spending. I
3 would like to remind this Commission that, that article
4 was based on a proposed draft document. That amount --
5 the amount that shows as an overage will be coming down
6 because we're already making decisions that will reduce
7 the amount that I had anticipated being over.

8 And we also have a Public Records Act request, but
9 that will be addressed by our chief counsel during her
10 report. Then we have the Department of Finance. And as
11 I told you in the last meeting, I will be preparing the
12 release letters for operational funds and outreach funds.

13 Just a reminder, on January 1st, I'll be sending
14 them a letter requesting that they release the 1.3
15 million dollars for operational expenses, which will give
16 us access no later than January 30th. And on January
17 7th, we'll send out the letter for outreach for the
18 2,065,000. And we'll have access no later than February
19 6th.

20 We have enough money so that if we needed the
21 outreach funds ahead of that, we could use money from an
22 operational fund so it won't affect -- the timing of
23 receiving that money won't affect anything that you may
24 wish to do, should we do it more quickly than I am
25 anticipating.

1 And then, RFPs and contracts. The subcommittees
2 will discuss their respect of RFPs, interagency
3 agreements, and RFIs during this meeting. The current
4 plan that we can all hold to is to have all of our RFPs
5 out of the Office of Legal Services by December 23rd,
6 with the possible exception -- or to the Office of Legal
7 Services by December 23rd, with the exception of the
8 final videography contract.

9 And then, we will have other minor contracts
10 throughout the course of our operations. But our primary
11 contracts will be finally done and we should be in place
12 no later than, no later than, March -- mid-March,
13 hopefully sooner if we get expedited services.

14 And then finally, I've asked staff to begin to think
15 about an overall public meeting plans. And we're going
16 to just talk about it on Thursday. I realize that this
17 is part of the approach plan for the RFP for the line
18 drawer.

19 But we need to start thinking about everything after
20 census and making sure that we're prepared to go out and
21 line up the different places that you may need to put
22 remote hearing sites for the public, depending on the
23 plan that's agreed on with the line drawer. And that is
24 the end of my report.

25 Does anyone have any questions?

1 Chair, I turn back to you.

2 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Thank you very much for that,
3 Executive Director Claypool.

4 I'd like to now move to the chief counsel's report.
5 Chief Counsel Marshall?

6 Is Ms. Marshall present?

7 MS. MARSHALL: Good morning, everyone. I forgot to
8 push on the microphone. This will be brief. We received
9 a Public Records Act request last week on the 10th from
10 Open California for the draft estimated budget that the
11 committee requested to review two open meetings ago. We
12 have ten days to respond. And if needed, I can do -- I
13 can extend that response time, fourteen days. So I'm
14 currently in the process of reviewing it and gathering up
15 what type of response that we're going to have.

16 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Ms. Marshall.

17 Does any Commissioners have questions for Ms.
18 Marshall?

19 Okay. Thank you, Ms. Marshall.

20 I'd like to move now to Director Ceja for a
21 communications director's report.

22 You're on mute or we can't hear you.

23 Okay. While Mr. Ceja gets his microphone, technical
24 situation straightened out, we'll move forward.

25 So I'm going move right to our subcommittee updates.

1 Let's start with subcommittee A, which is action on
2 census subcommittee.

3 Commissioners Sadhwani and Toledo?

4 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: We have nothing in
5 particular to update, unless Marian has any additional
6 update on the Supreme Court case.

7 MS. JOHNSTON: No, nothing new. We're waiting.

8 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Thank you so much.

9 Well, the hiring of the deputy executive director, I
10 guess that's the committee that we're officially
11 sunseting; am I correct?

12 Okay. So we will move on.

13 Finance and administration. Commissioners Fernandez
14 and Fornaciari?

15 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Go ahead.

16 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. I couldn't find you
17 on the screen. So let's see. We have our -- we have a
18 couple of proposed policies that we'll talk about later.
19 I'll just give you all an update. I volunteered -- I
20 mentioned that I volunteered to look at these agenda
21 management tools. We were unable to schedule a demo last
22 week.

23 But I have it -- schedule a demo for a company
24 called Granicus with Director Claypool, and Director
25 Ceja, and Commissioner Fernandez, and myself on Thursday.

1 Director Ceja also gave me the name another tool called
2 BoardBook, and I've been exchanging emails with those
3 folks. So hopefully, we can come to some conclusion
4 about this tool in the very near future and get one tool
5 or other on board and help us out.

6 Did you have anything to add -- okay.

7 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you much.

8 Any questions for the subcommittee?

9 Director Claypool?

10 MR. CLAYPOOL: Commissioner Fornaciari, could you
11 add Deputy Executive Director Hernandez to that list for
12 that? He needs to know how that's going to work as well.

13 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes, absolutely.

14 MR. CLAYPOOL: Thank you.

15 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Let's check in with Director
16 Ceja.

17 MR. CEJA: Okay. I think I'm good. Can you hear me
18 now?

19 CHAIR LE MONS: Yes, we can.

20 MR. CEJA: Okay, perfect. I had to restart my
21 system. But good morning, everyone. Thank you.
22 Welcome, Alvaro. I was going to say that, I had my plate
23 of responsibilities and from that, I'm going to pluck
24 outreach and hand it right over to you. So
25 congratulations.

1 I did want to mention a few things for today's
2 report. Our media monitoring contract is actually moving
3 forward.

4 Thank, Raul, for moving that.

5 So soon, we'll be able to have that monitoring
6 service that tells us when we're in the news, like that
7 California Globe article that came out recently, and
8 allow us to respond. As far as the website's concerned,
9 I do have full control of NationBuilder now. So I have
10 been working on building our website. And I wanted to
11 give you a brief introduction as to what it's going to
12 look like. So I'm going to share my screen. Let's see.

13 So this is currently what I'm building here. It's a
14 website that's going to be a lot more interactive, a lot
15 more --

16 CHAIR LE MONS: Director -- oh, there we go. Okay,
17 now we can see it.

18 MR. CEJA: Okay, perfect.

19 So it's going a website that's more interactive.
20 It's easier to find information. And so what I've built
21 so far is the first few pages. This is not going to be
22 the main picture here but I just put it on there to have
23 it as a boilerplate. But what I do want to have is a
24 picture that indicates that we're moving transitioning
25 from the census to the work of line drawing. I think

1 that message is going to be key in letting people who we
2 are and what we do.

3 And I also plan to work with the census office to
4 get on their website and on their social media sites so
5 that they start publicizing our work too and we don't
6 lose their audience so it's an easy transition. What
7 this website will give you first is just an introduction
8 of the Commissioners. And if you click on it, it will
9 take you directly to the Commissioners and staff.

10 Again, this is just boilerplate. I've just
11 transferred all the information over. So all your bios
12 are there, but I do want headshots. So for those of you
13 that have already sent me headshots, thank you so much.
14 For those of you that have not, it's fairly easy to do.
15 And if you have already submitted your headshot to the
16 Commission, I'll track it down.

17 The next slide will actually take you the COI tool,
18 once we have it uploaded, so that people can click on it
19 and start drawing their own communities of interest maps.
20 And then that information will get emailed to us.

21 And then lastly, help us get the word. So if you
22 look at the outreach toolkit here, this tab will have
23 social media information for organizations to share.
24 It'll have an actual toolkit of pictures that they can
25 share, messaging for Facebook, Twitter, and also our

1 frequently asked questions, our collateral materials for
2 individuals to use at their desire, and able to tweak it
3 so it can make sense to their constituencies.

4 I have included in here a place for us to go onto
5 our live Commission meeting. So whenever we have a
6 meeting like today, people will just be able to click on
7 there and go live to our meeting; a cleaner version of
8 our upcoming meetings; and then, of course, the community
9 of interest tool for people to, like I said, draw their
10 own lines.

11 But this is pretty much the template that I've taken
12 on from NationBuilder. So I'll be, like I said, working
13 on this, and making sure that it is updated, and that it
14 makes sense for folks. But you already see the
15 difference. I mean, this from the website that we have
16 today, very different. So we hope to bring it to this
17 new century and make sure that all the information that
18 we have on there make sense for people that are using it.

19 I did also send out the new branding and new logo
20 ideas. I wanted to share this because this is the final
21 two images that we voted on. So if you did participate
22 in voting in the last four series of logos, A and D, were
23 the winners. So now I'm going to do a second round of
24 voting and it's going to be between the one you see at
25 the top.

1 We did move the pen up to divide "We Draw the Lines"
2 and "California". And we did give it a little more space
3 so that it's not so crowded. And then at the bottom one,
4 the D, we switched out the California State for a line
5 option, instead of the scribble. So I'll be sending
6 those out to Commissioners so you can vote on that. And
7 then finally, by the end of this week, we'll have a final
8 logo and we can start using it on the website and all
9 collateral materials as they come up.

10 As far as social media is concerned, once we
11 finalize that logo, I'll be able to go live with Facebook
12 and Twitter. I'll swap out the logo and I'll start using
13 it regularly. I held off because I didn't want to start
14 using it under the old logo and then reintroduce a new
15 logo. It's just going to be confusing. And we're very
16 close to finalizing the logo. So I thought it like -- we
17 can wait a few more days to go live on those.

18 And then, Commissioner Sinay, going back to your
19 idea of having folks start to schedule those one-on-ones
20 with organizations to do redistricting 101, another idea
21 in addition to that, what we could do is create a video
22 that's the actual training. And then, we can shoot that
23 out, post it on our website. People can go to our
24 website and just view it whenever we're having meetings.
25 And just show our training video. That'll be fifteen

1 minutes. And that way, it will reach our broader
2 audience. And again, that will be in addition to folks
3 actually Zooming into meetings across the state.

4 But we'll have something substantial for
5 organizations that for whatever reason, cannot get us on
6 their agenda, they'll have something to show at their
7 meeting if they're holding electronic Zoom meetings like
8 I'm sure everyone does. And then the last piece is the
9 media training. So (audio interference) did indicate
10 that they're interested in having media trainings. So
11 we'll start scheduling those.

12 And then another issue was brought up, social media
13 training. One of the Commissioners felt they're not as
14 tech savvy on social media so wanted more information on
15 how to use Twitter, how to use Facebook, how to follow
16 our pages, and how to reshare our information. So I'll
17 make sure I integrate that into the media training. But
18 I'll start scheduling those for the upcoming week.

19 And that's it for me. I'll continue chipping away
20 at the website, transferring information. And all the
21 2010 archived info will go under one tab as 2010, and
22 will have a list of documents and past information on
23 there.

24 CHAIR LE MONS: Great. Any questions?

25 Commissioner Sadhwani?

1 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Just a comment. This all
2 sounds amazing. I'm so excited about the website and all
3 of the things that you're planning. I mean, I just
4 wanted to offer, if we are moving forward with some sort
5 of informational video, I have a lot of materials and
6 slides on redistricting, reapportionment, gerrymandering.
7 I teach on this. I've written about it. So if you need
8 any content and you can make it, you know, look
9 beautiful, and change the wording to, you know, into more
10 plain language, but I'm happy to share that if it's
11 helpful.

12 MR. CEJA: Definitely, thank you.

13 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Ahmed?

14 COMMISSIONER AHMED: Thank you so much, Fredy. That
15 was amazing. I really like the vibe of it, the picture.
16 Yeah, I understand you're going to change it. It looks
17 so California, right, beautiful sunset, and beautiful
18 beaches.

19 Just two quick questions. I know it has come up
20 before. Are there any intentions of branching out into
21 Instagram, LinkedIn, and Facebook? And then also, what
22 do you project the time line for launch to look like?

23 MR. CEJA: So yes on the multiple channels. I know
24 we've had this conversation before. And we want to be
25 mindful of the audiences that use certain social media

1 sites, right? So not everybody's on Facebook. Not
2 everyone's on Twitter. Younger generations are on
3 Instagram and Snapchat.

4 Because of our capacity, we will be bringing on a
5 communications manager. Hopefully, they'll be able to
6 bring online multiple channels. So definitely Facebook,
7 definitely Twitter. We can do Instagram. That's not as
8 labor intensive. Snapchat? I'm not sure. We'll gauge
9 it based on who we bring on and how comfortable they feel
10 with that platform.

11 But we definitely do want to have as many platforms
12 as possible, like I said, to reach the multiple and
13 different audiences. And then, maybe there's other
14 things like -- Commissioner Kennedy sent me Nextdoor as
15 an option to do outreach as well. So aside from doing
16 social media management, we also need to tap into some of
17 those already existing structures that are out there,
18 where people get their news, right?

19 Nextdoor is a very grassroots platform that people
20 use to monitor what's going on in their communities. So
21 we'll definitely tap into that. And that's it, yes.

22 CHAIR LE MONS: Any other questions, Commissioners?
23 Commissioner Akutagawa?

24 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

25 Mr. Ceja, I mean, I can't just say enough. Like

1 along with everybody else, the website looks fantastic.
2 And I do love that picture. So if you decided to keep
3 it, it probably wouldn't be, you know, seen as a bad
4 thing, at least for me.

5 Quick question on a couple things. I guess, I'll
6 just kind of pile on some of what's been said. If you
7 create social media kits, instead of having, you know,
8 the staff having to do everything, could it be crated in
9 such a way that we (audio interference) use the most?

10 And I'm not sure if you're hearing me because my
11 internet seems to be really bad today.

12 MR. CEJA: Yeah. I lost the question. What was the
13 question?

14 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was just asking, if you
15 create, like, a social media kit on various things that
16 you want to get, you know, news out, is it something that
17 we could just -- each of us then take and post to our
18 preferred, you know, platforms, you know, whether it's
19 LinkedIn, or even like Nextdoor.

20 Or like, I know we have a Ring. So my husband is on
21 it. And he says that they have kind of like a Nextdoor
22 type feature. So you know, again, hyperlocal but it
23 might be actually the best way to get to the people that
24 might have an interest in this kind of stuff, so.

25 MR. CEJA: Yeah. So if you were following the

1 census process, they were shooting out information and
2 putting up content on weekly basis. When I was working
3 at the Senate office, we would actually get those
4 toolkits from the census communications department every
5 week. So every week, there was new content; make sure
6 your family counts, you count, very culturally diverse
7 messaging that made sense to different people.

8 And that's what I plan to do. And hopefully, once
9 the communications manager come on, we'll be able to
10 create a content calendar so we're going to know what
11 we'll be pitching and putting out every week. And we'll
12 share that with you. And yeah, the point is to have a
13 toolkit that's very general; this is what redistricting
14 is, this is what we're trying to do, it's the second --
15 or the next step after the census, and this is how you
16 can be part of it.

17 And the point is to get that information out to the
18 nonprofits and our partners and make sure that they can
19 alter it so that it makes sense to their audiences. So
20 that when they're sending it out, like the census
21 information, you were able to adapt it and change a few
22 things but the core message was always still there.

23 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?

24 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. It looks great.
25 The one piece that I want to make sure is that everybody

1 sees themselves. And it may not be that everybody sees
2 exactly, but it may be they're -- they see the coast. So
3 they see themselves that way. Or they see someone, you
4 know, that's brown so they see them -- yeah, whatever it
5 may be, but just always, constantly, trying to think
6 through that piece.

7 I want to make sure that our -- to get on our
8 mailing list or to get on, you know -- is very quick and
9 easy that, they don't have to dig for it, because right
10 now you have to dig for it. So just an invitation.
11 Because everything I feel like we're doing from now until
12 mid-March is about an invitation to play with -- not to
13 play, but to be engaged later.

14 And so anything we create has to be with kind of
15 that action piece of, stay in loop, we want you in our,
16 you know, whatever it might be and that goes with the
17 video as well. I mean, hopefully the training video will
18 be a kind of a fun video that explains it simply. I'm
19 sure it is.

20 But again, that they see themselves, that they get
21 an invitation to be part of this, and how they can be
22 involved. Because I think a lot of people -- for me, I
23 did this whole exercise for myself on my why. And for
24 me, my why on all this is that, at the end of this,
25 obviously we get good maps. But it's also to increase

1 that trust with government and that relationship with
2 government. And so that was helpful for me to realize
3 where I was coming from. But thank you. It looks great.

4 MR. CEJA: Thank you. So I did take a lot of
5 interest or -- a lot of the look from the webpage from
6 Shape California's Future, which is the website that was
7 used to recruit you as Commissioners. Yeah, looking at
8 the different geographic areas of California, the
9 diversity, and including that in there. That's what I'm
10 going for.

11 And as far as a mailing list, that feature will be
12 captured through NationBuilding. NationBuilder was set up
13 to grow the database. So as people visit our website,
14 their information is captured automatically. As people
15 visit our Twitter handle or Facebook station, their
16 information actually gets funneled right into our system.
17 So they become active members of our database, whether
18 they click on the information or not. So they'll be
19 receiving all our eblast and information moving forward.

20 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you so much.

21 Any other questions or comments from Commissioners?

22 Commissioner Andersen?

23 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Again, I won't go on too
24 much, but thank you, thank you. And so I just got a
25 couple of quick questions. What I believe is

1 Commissioner Ahmad said, do you have a -- just an
2 estimate for launch time frame?

3 MR. CEJA: Oh, yes. I did miss that question. I'm
4 sorry. So we were hoping for a January launch date. But
5 I think we'll be able to do it much sooner, maybe in the
6 next two weeks. So what I need is content, right; so
7 Commissioner bios of -- not bios, I'm sorry -- headshots
8 so that I can build everything out and it's ready to go;
9 the logo, which we're going to do at the end of this
10 week; and all the transfer of information that I'll be
11 doing over this week and the next.

12 So I think at the end of next week, it'll be ready
13 to go, which will give us two weeks to build up the
14 audience. So when we do a formal launch in January,
15 we'll already have followers on social media and things
16 of that nature.

17 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay, thank you. Then just
18 a couple of specifics. As you mentioned the COI tool,
19 just in terms of where things might be, where the public
20 might be looking for things, where are public comments?
21 And also, where are you planning on -- you know,
22 ultimately we have to post maps. And where will those be
23 going?

24 MR. CEJA: So we can add maps anywhere we'd like.
25 We can actually add a tab that says, these are the pre-

1 maps, or the draft maps, and then final maps. As far as
2 the COI tool is concerned, we will have that at the
3 bottom of the page. But then when the sliders -- soon as
4 you go on the website, the second slider is, draw your
5 own map. So that'll connect you to the COI tool.

6 I did talk to the COI tool individuals last week and
7 they're still building their splash page for the COI tool
8 website. But part of their idea was also to have it live
9 in our webpage so that as people start looking for that
10 tool, it's integrated into our webpage, but also, it's a
11 splash page somewhere else on their website.

12 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Have you considered
13 the part of what they will send -- ultimately send to us,
14 are the PDFs? Have you considered, in terms of spacing
15 on our website to insure show those, or was that part of
16 your discussion with the COI people -- COI tool people?

17 MR. CEJA: The PPS?

18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Pardon? The PDF of the
19 actual COI -- public draws on the COI tool. You know, as
20 question of, do we need to show that on our -- as a
21 public comment? And if so, have you been considering
22 that?

23 MR. CEJA: Yeah. We have not discussed that. But
24 we can discuss that with the Commission. I wouldn't see
25 any problem hosting that on our website as public

1 comment, obviously, so people know what other people are
2 thinking as far as boundaries or what a community looks
3 like.

4 And then the other thing that we did talk about was
5 having an actual map of California. I think that this is
6 something that Commissioner Sinay had brought up. And as
7 people fill out a map or draw their own map, it shows a
8 spot or a pin in the map so you know who in California is
9 filling out their COI maps.

10 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you very much.

11 MR. CEJA: They told me they would be able to do
12 that.

13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Great. And then that would
14 live on our website?

15 MR. CEJA: Yeah.

16 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.

17 CHAIR LE MONS: Any other questions or comments from
18 Commissioners?

19 Thank you so much, Director Ceja. You've been the
20 highlight of the morning. Well, next to -- next, of
21 course, to Director Hernandez joining us.

22 MR. CEJA: Thank you.

23 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: We can't hear you --

24 COMMISSIONER SINAY: You're on mute.

25 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you much, Commissioner Sinay.

1 With that, we'll return to our subcommittee reports.
2 We left off at our Gantt chart subcommittee, with
3 Commissioners Kennedy and Taylor.

4 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: We did submit an updated
5 Gantt chart for posting. So that is available on the
6 website. I don't know if anyone has any comments on it.
7 The changes were not enormous.

8 Commissioner Fornaciari?

9 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I just have a
10 question. Last week, I spent some time reviewing the
11 schedule, just trying to understand where we are and what
12 it looks like. And one of the things that Director
13 Claypool mentioned earlier was beginning to actively plan
14 our public input meeting strategy. And I'm just
15 wondering who is responsible for that -- developing that
16 public input plan, strategy? Do we have a subcommittee
17 that's doing that or what's -- how are we getting that
18 done?

19 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay?

20 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Part of the outreach piece on
21 the agenda, we will be going cross committees, because
22 there's a lot need input needed from different
23 committees. And so we will look at the different -- all
24 the different inputs, including that piece. And then, we
25 can see where that will lie. But just answering a lot of

1 those questions and what it will look like and -- because
2 we're all feeling a little, like, antsy, anxious,
3 whatever, A word you want to use about it.

4 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Thanks.

5 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy, were you done?

6 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Director Ceja had his hand
7 up.

8 CHAIR LE MONS: Oh, I'm sorry.

9 Director Ceja?

10 MR. CEJA: Yeah. So I just wanted to mention that I
11 think I was tasked working with Commissioner Sinay and
12 Vasquez on putting together a draft of what that would
13 look like, Commissioner Fornaciari. But now that we have
14 the deputy executive director -- I wanted to make sure I
15 got his title right -- he will be taking the lead on
16 drafting that outreach plan. But we're on it. We're
17 going to meeting soon so that we're all getting ahead of
18 that plan.

19 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I just -- it wasn't
20 clear to me that, you know, how far the outreach plan
21 extended, whether outreach was just, like, education and
22 informing or if it included the public meetings, and then
23 the map drawing meetings, and if that was all part of the
24 plan too. But it sounds like it is. So thank you all.

25 MR. CEJA: I think at the end, it'll be a

1 multipronged approach; so redistricting 101, pre-map
2 meetings, and then going back and presenting the actual
3 maps. But it'll all be in that plan.

4 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy?

5 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Commissioner Taylor, do you
6 have anything that you want to add at this point?

7 VICE CHAIR TAYLOR: No. I think that covers it.

8 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: We're good. Thank you.

9 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

10 Now we'll go to our line drawers' subcommittee.

11 Commissioners Andersen and Sadhwani?

12 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, thank you. As you
13 mentioned earlier, there is item 9 on the agenda, which
14 we'll be addressing after lunch. And at that point, we
15 have a couple of issues that did come up on the RFP and
16 the delineation between the data manager and the line
17 drawer. And these are items that we have discussed in
18 subcommittees but we need the full Commission to discuss
19 and make decisions on. So -- which is why the RFP is not
20 being presented until it is a complete document. So at
21 this point, we don't really have much to say, except we
22 really look forward to discussing in more detail item 9,
23 which I believe is after lunch.

24 Is that -- Commissioner Sadhwani?

25 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I think that's all

1 right. We've had a lot of great conversations over the
2 last week with multiple subcommittees, as well as, you
3 now, we've had a number of very informative conversations
4 with the line drawer from 2010, Karin MacDonald, as well
5 as -- I'm going to botch the name -- USCR.

6 So it's been very helpful just to gather all of this
7 information. And so we're certainly still on that
8 process. I think that our time line for moving this
9 forward is to have a working draft by the end of this
10 week. After our conversations here, hopefully have
11 something that we can post, I think we said Saturday for
12 everyone to view, that we can finalize at our meeting on
13 December 22nd and move forward.

14 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

15 Does anyone have questions for the subcommittee?

16 Commissioner Andersen, is there something else you
17 wanted to add?

18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No, not at this time.

19 I'll --

20 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay.

21 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.

22 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Thank you so much.

23 We'll move on to the VRA compliance subcommittee.

24 Commissioners Sadhwani and Yee?

25 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, thank you. Shall I start?

1 So good news on the RFIs for the VRA counsel and outside
2 counsel. I believe those are completed. Maybe, Director
3 Claypool, could you clarify next steps from here? This
4 is our first time doing this. What comes next?

5 CHAIR LE MONS: Go on, Director Claypool, please?

6 MR. CLAYPOOL: So from here, we're going to have the
7 Commission look at it and approve the two RFIs. They're
8 well written. And then, we're going to move them to the
9 Office of Legal Services. We're hoping for an expedited
10 review. However, we are pushed right up against the
11 holidays.

12 But we have alerted our contact over there in the
13 Office of Legal Services about the fact that they're
14 going to move forward. And that person has cleared a
15 spot for us, as I understand it, to start reviewing them.
16 If we get them back in the first week in January, then we
17 can go out with them and start fielding responses after
18 we've had the advertisement period.

19 I'm trying to remember whether we had thought about
20 having a thirty-day advertisement period on that. I'm
21 not sure -- or less. But we'll get our responses. We'll
22 set up our review of the process. Shouldn't take longer
23 than a week. At some point, we're going to have to
24 consider that enlarged committee -- legal committee so we
25 can have public review, particularly of the outside

1 litigation. Although, both and contracts are very
2 important to the VRA as well.

3 But we can do that in January. There's no rush. We
4 need to consider who wishes to be on that subcommittee
5 and then start setting up that process. But we can
6 have -- in my mind, we can have both of these done by
7 mid-February to the third week in February, including the
8 interviews, if we plan it correctly.

9 COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you. I believe the
10 Commission had already approved the content for the RFIs.
11 So I mean, of course can look at the final draft, but it
12 doesn't -- we haven't changed anything that wasn't
13 already approved. So do we need to that or can we just
14 move forward?

15 MR. CLAYPOOL: I apologize. I had forgotten that it
16 had been approved. So no, we can move them to the Office
17 of Legal Services. We just needed the Commission to have
18 the opportunity to see what had been created, that's all.

19 COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. So do we just post drafts
20 then, or do we not, without --

21 MR. CLAYPOOL: I was under the impression they were
22 posted.

23 CHAIR LE MONS: I have a question. I believe we
24 have this agenized for the 22nd? Do we not, or am I
25 thinking of something else?

1 COMMISSIONER YEE: No. That's for the RPV, the
2 Racial Polarized Voting discussion, yeah.

3 CHAIR LE MONS: Ah, correct. Okay.

4 COMMISSIONER YEE: Let me look.

5 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani?

6 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No. I just going to say, if
7 we all feel good about the RFIs, we can go on to talk
8 about the RPV analysis. We've had a lot of conversations
9 about that as well. But if there's any additional
10 conversations on RFIs, then let's finish it -- hold on.

11 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioners Fernandez --

12 COMMISSIONER YEE: And Kennedy, I think.

13 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just had a really quick
14 question on the litigation counsel one. On section 7,
15 the fee arrangements in there, it says that it shall be
16 in place until August 15, 2022. I wasn't sure if it was
17 supposed to be 2022 or 2021, because you've mentioned
18 2021 in section 4.

19 COMMISSIONER YEE: I believe that's correct, because
20 there's telling how long litigation will continue after
21 the maps have been filed. So that's the same time period
22 that the 2010 used -- 2010 Commission used.

23 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. So should then
24 section 4, Terms and Conditions, state 2022 also? I just
25 noticed that they were two different dates -- or years.

1 COMMISSIONER YEE: I will take a look at that.

2 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. We'll take a closer
3 look.

4 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah.

5 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you for pointing that
6 out.

7 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, thank you for your
8 time. I know a lot of work went into that. And it's
9 really a well written (indiscernible).

10 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy?

11 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes, thank you. These are
12 reading better. I do still have some items to bring to
13 your attention. On the one for litigation counsel, under
14 Section III, "Statement of qualifications must be
15 received by 5 p.m. on January 14th". But under key
16 action dates, it says, "Submissions due January 29th".
17 So we don't want to send something out with competing
18 submission dates.

19 COMMISSIONER YEE: Wow, yes. Thank you. Oh, gosh.

20 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I'm also wondering, under B,
21 "Evaluation Process", since these are going to be
22 virtual, do we need to say, "in Sacramento" or is that
23 just something leftover from the 2010 Commission?

24 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That is probably left over.
25 I think we attempted to remove all of those, but thank

1 you for highlighting that. Can you repeat where you saw
2 that? Which piece you saw that in again?

3 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: The litigation count -- well,
4 actually, it's in both of them under "Evaluation
5 Process". And then on the fourth bullet under
6 "Evaluation Process", it seems to me that it would be
7 useful to specifically mention that they must be
8 available to meet with the Commission virtually.

9 COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay.

10 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: There was also an issue that
11 we discussed at the last meeting, which was making some
12 sort of statement about hyperlinks, and that we wanted
13 what we wanted in the response itself, but hyperlinks
14 could be considered as supplemental information as long
15 as all of the basic information was in the response
16 itself.

17 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I do recall that
18 conversation, and we can certainly add that at this point
19 because it's important.

20 CHAIR LE MONS: Is that it for you, Commissioner
21 Kennedy?

22 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: No. Sorry.

23 CHAIR LE MONS: No worries.

24 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Under section -- I guess it's
25 Section VI, although there is no -- in the Litigation

1 Counsel, at least, there doesn't seem to be a Section VI.
2 It goes from Section V to Section VII. But under, b,
3 "Other Conflicts", I'm wondering if we need to make some
4 mention of work for political parties under "Other
5 Conflicts". We talked about work for candidates, but not
6 for parties. I'm just wondering if that would be
7 something that we would want to include there.

8 On the one for VRA Counsel, seems like we also had a
9 discussion about whether California experience was
10 required or just desirable. And when we say, all
11 applicants must be in good standing with the State Bar of
12 California, are we unnecessarily limiting our pool on
13 that? We had said that VRA was something more national
14 in scope, and that we wanted to make that pool, or at
15 least have the opportunity for having more applicants in
16 that pool that might not necessarily have the same level
17 of California experience.

18 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That is correct.

19 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Under --

20 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: We can certainly make -- you
21 know, adjust that language.

22 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay.

23 MS. MARSHALL: This --

24 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: (Indiscernible).

25 MS. MARSHALL: This is Chief Counsel Marshall.

1 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Under --

2 MS. MARSHALL: Just a quick comment in regards to --

3 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes.

4 MS. MARSHALL: -- good standing in the State of
5 California. If you're going to practice in the State of
6 California, you need to be licensed with the State of
7 California. The only exception is the issue regarding
8 federal attorneys.

9 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So then just for
10 clarification, that requires then that someone is -- we
11 couldn't have someone -- I think my understanding from
12 2010 is that there were applicants from outside of
13 California. I do not know whether or not they were bar
14 certified in California or not. But the idea that had
15 been -- that we had learned about was that they would
16 have been perfectly suitable to advise on Voting Rights
17 Act because VRA is a federal law. So just for
18 clarification, are we saying that this -- we ultimately
19 need someone who is bar certified within California?

20 CHAIR LE MONS: Ms. Marshall.

21 MS. MARSHALL: I'm just trying to get clarification
22 in regards to the purpose of this particular counsel
23 because I know there's one in regards to litigation, and
24 you had a other one that's in regards to the Voters
25 Rights Act. Let me go and consider that and get back to

1 you. But I just know in general, if you're going to
2 practice here in the State of California, you have to be
3 licensed in the State of California. So I'll get back to
4 you after lunch.

5 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. I think that's fair,
6 and that would certainly be helpful.

7 Certainly, one of the conversations we've had for
8 quite some time is that we would want to be able to look
9 broadly for someone with VRA -- an attorney with VRA
10 experience, and that that experience doesn't necessarily
11 have to be based in California. The experience could be
12 elsewhere. But I certainly see your point, so getting
13 that clarity would be helpful. And most certainly having
14 this cause for the litigation piece would be important.
15 We want someone that would not only serve in California,
16 but with significant experience in California.

17 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right. So the last point
18 under "Conflicts of Interest", at the very bottom of the
19 page, it says "identified in 4 below", but I'm wondering
20 if that's above rather than below because I don't see any
21 more 4's below that.

22 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Was that in VRA or
23 litigation or both?

24 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: In VRA.

25 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. I'll take a look.

1 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

2 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.

3 CHAIR LE MONS: You're welcome.

4 Commissioner -- excuse me -- Director Claypool.

5 MR. CLAYPOOL: First, Commissioner Kennedy, could
6 you also forward those -- all of your comments to us so
7 that we can make sure that we incorporate them?

8 On the meeting in Sacramento, technically, this
9 building is your meeting site, so I don't know that we
10 necessarily need to eliminate the language regarding in
11 Sacramento. That's why I thought we had left it in
12 the -- in it because 721 is your headquarters -- 721
13 Capitol Mall.

14 And then on the hyperlinks, I believe the
15 conversation last time said that, yes, you could -- that
16 a proposer could put in hyperlinks, but anything that we
17 asked for had to be addressed in hard copy, and the
18 hyperlinks would just be something that was addition.
19 We're not asking -- I think that what happened with the
20 one contract that had the hyperlinks was it exceeded the
21 number of pages that we were allowing for the -- or that
22 that organization was allowing for the contract. I don't
23 know that we're necessarily asking for a specific number
24 of pages, so I think that it just needs to be
25 addressed -- the body needs to be addressed in their

1 response to hyperlinks or extra. That's my
2 understanding.

3 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioners Yee or Sadhwani, is
4 that your understanding?

5 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, that was mine.

6 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Are we ready to move forward?

7 COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy,
8 for your attention to detail. Warms my heart.

9 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen, I'll be right
10 with you.

11 I'd just like to invite Commissioners that -- and
12 thank you for that, Commissioner Kennedy -- the
13 subcommittees working behind the scenes to get these
14 things done and ready for the meeting. So if you review
15 a document, and you have this level of feedback, please
16 communicate that to the subcommittee so they have an
17 opportunity to see, particularly if it affects the
18 process, if it requires a different kind of action for
19 the Commissioners, et cetera, so that they can be
20 prepared, and always send it to staff also so that way
21 they can incorporate those things.

22 So for example, if these particular edits that were
23 just discussed mainly affects how we move forward, we be
24 prepared to know that when we come and what the next
25 steps will be. So just in the spirit of efficiency,

1 please feel free to send your feedback to these documents
2 that are posted directly to the subcommittee that's
3 working on them.

4 Commissioner Andersen.

5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Just a couple of
6 quick -- the VRA counsel does indeed have a page limit,
7 so -- and not to exceed page limits, so I think that's
8 why, you know, does that include hyperlinks? Does it
9 not? I think that's for that -- under Section VI (sic),
10 the very first intro paragraph has "Responses should not
11 exceed 15 pages".

12 But and then this is -- Ms. Marshall is going to
13 give us exact detail. But as far as it's a professional
14 licensing issue, your experience can be elsewhere, but to
15 practice in state, you must be licensed in that state.
16 That's true in medical; that's true in engineering;
17 that's true in law. So that's just a general -- unless
18 you're doing a federal case, as I think she's going to
19 tell us. So that -- I believe our wording -- well, it'll
20 be parsed exactly, but that's -- just in terms of
21 general, for all our RFPs, there is a licensure issue.
22 And this doesn't mean all your experience has to be here,
23 but you must also be able to legally practice here, even
24 if you're consulting. So it's just a general for future
25 work.

1 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that, Commissioner
2 Andersen.

3 Commissioner Sadhwani, did that conclude your VRA
4 subcommittee report?

5 COMMISSIONER YEE: No. We also have RPV work, which
6 I think --

7 CHAIR LE MONS: Please proceed.

8 COMMISSIONER YEE: Go ahead, Sara.

9 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. So as we have
10 mentioned previously, it is our intention to move forward
11 as soon as possible with RPV analysis. We have discussed
12 previously in a memo that we had prepared several weeks
13 ago, and presented to the Commission, the idea of doing
14 a, quote/unquote, "stage one analysis", that would be a
15 public document of racially polarized voting in
16 California. We've had a number of conversations about
17 such a document, what that would entail, what that would
18 look like, and what that would cost.

19 At this point in time, we -- given the price
20 estimate that we have received, we would actually perhaps
21 like to adjust our suggestion on this piece. We felt
22 like the cost that came back was quite high, and that
23 this is a document that would be supplemental. We would
24 still most certainly need RPV analysis at the time when
25 we are drawing lines. We've received a number of --

1 we've talked to a number of experts on this piece, and
2 the best advice I think that we have been given is that
3 as we are creating districts, we would conduct the
4 analysis to understand if it's such a new district would
5 have racially polarized voting in it, if there are
6 communities that would qualify as polarized voting
7 communities.

8 So at this point in time, we are still assessing all
9 of those options. We are thinking about and trying to
10 explore the idea rather than a racially polarized voting
11 analysis, which would be quite costly for the Commission
12 at this stage, but potentially more of a demographic
13 report using the data from the American Community Survey
14 to identify demographic shifts over the last ten years.
15 We've heard about demographic shifts from a number of our
16 presenters who have come, and we feel like this might be
17 an option that could cost us less, but still give us the
18 kind of information to help guide our outreach process,
19 which was ultimately our goal with the RPV analysis. So
20 that's where we are at.

21 We continue to have conversations. We are -- we've
22 sent emails just at the end of last week to the Public
23 Policy Institute of California to see if such a document
24 already exists or if they could create one for us. So we
25 are actively looking for that, and we hope to be able to

1 have something to bring back to you all on the 22nd.

2 Mr. Yee, did you have anything more that you wanted
3 to add to that?

4 COMMISSIONER YEE: No, that was all.

5 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.

6 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani and
7 Yee.

8 Does any Commissioners have any questions or
9 comments for Commissioner Sadhwani and Yee?

10 Commissioner Sinay, and then Commissioner Andersen.

11 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just read an article from
12 CalMatters from -- about Votebeat and how they have been
13 coming up with their numbers, and it looked like they had
14 done something similar to what you are hoping takes
15 place. They did use census tracts and looked at changes
16 in demographics. I sent the article to staff asking them
17 to share it with all Commissioners, but they did seem
18 like they already have some of that information. And my
19 initial thought was, hey, it would be great for them to
20 talk to us because they've looked at this. So I'll send
21 it directly to the two of you since -- so hopefully it's
22 helpful.

23 COMMISSIONER YEE: Excellent. Thank you.

24 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yep, that would be great.

25 And then Commissioner -- oh, sorry. Chair Le Mons, if I

1 may.

2 Commissioner Sinay, if you intend to reach out to
3 them, can you let us know? And if not, then certainly we
4 could as well.

5 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Oh, yeah, I wasn't intending to
6 reach out to him.

7 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay.

8 COMMISSIONER SINAY: It was just -- my gut was, hey,
9 these guys might be good, but I leave you all as the
10 experts to know who is.

11 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. Sounds good. Thank
12 you.

13 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen.

14 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you for really looking
15 into this and realizing there were a couple of different
16 options and different ways to do this. One thing about
17 the racially polarized voting. Were you considering at
18 all just doing a small sort of, like, a little training
19 or like, a little workshop just to show the full
20 Commission how this would apply in addition to getting
21 the full information? Or is that another option in
22 your -- in the multi-things you've been considering?

23 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, it is absolutely an
24 option. We are still -- we didn't give this update, but
25 we are still working on a number of trainings, hopefully

1 in January and February for the Commission on VRA and as
2 well as on RPV analysis. Certainly, had we had a
3 contract at this stage, we would have wrapped training
4 into that contract. My sense, though, is that the cost
5 of that is still quite high for us at this stage. So I
6 think we can still do that training, but perhaps once we
7 actually contract for the more localized analysis, which
8 we will ultimately do, we will still need to do it. I
9 think from the Commission's perspective, we'll still need
10 to figure out if we want to have that analysis kept as
11 attorney work product, which means it would not be
12 released to the public, or if we want to make that
13 public. My sense is we shouldn't answer that question,
14 though, until we have VRA Counsel identified.

15 CHAIR LE MONS: Any additional questions, comments?

16 Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani and Yee.

17 COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

18 CHAIR LE MONS: I'd like to move on to outreach and
19 engagement.

20 Commissioner Sinay and Vazquez.

21 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Thank you. So the outreach
22 subcommittee met with a couple of representatives from
23 our local -- our -- Los Angeles' SEIU Local 99 and SEIU
24 California. So we met with Jen Baca and Lindsay Hopkins
25 in order to talk with them to see -- to gauge their

1 interest and availability, and having someone from SEIU,
2 either a local representative or someone from their
3 headquarters, to present on a panel that we are putting
4 together around additional ways to view communities of
5 interest. So again, part of our -- part of this
6 committee's efforts have been to give a 360 view to the
7 Commission, as well as to our viewers and the public
8 about the many ways in which communities can affiliate.

9 And so this particular panel we are thinking about,
10 you know, economic, professal -- professional or industry
11 affiliations, so we're hoping to also invite someone from
12 a small business association, like a chamber or an -- and
13 an agricultural representative. So we're putting
14 together a three-person panel, and so this meeting with
15 the SEIU folks was step one of putting together that
16 panel. We're thinking sometime in January -- one of our
17 meetings in January is when this panel would take place.

18 And then lastly, we're hoping to facilitate a
19 conversation across the many subcommittees that have an
20 interest or a particular -- are working on a particular
21 thread that impacts the outreach -- the overall outreach
22 and engagement plan. And so we want to make sure that we
23 have all considerations surfaced from each of those
24 committees, as well as any answer -- any outstanding
25 questions from these various subcommittees, in order to

1 give Director Hernandez the information he needs to
2 develop a plan. And I think that the timing of that
3 conversation is TBD at the moment, unless Commissioner
4 Sinay, you have --

5 CHAIR LE MONS: I actually can speak --

6 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: -- the dates and times
7 confirmed. Okay. Yes.

8 CHAIR LE MONS: I can speak to that if you'd like.
9 Want me to do that now or wait till you guys conclude?

10 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes, please. That was the
11 end of my report, so.

12 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Great.

13 So the conversation that Commissioner Vasquez is
14 talking about will be a part of item 11 during this
15 meeting. So there'll be about three prongs to that
16 discussion. And you guys, when we get to agenda item 11,
17 you could lay out what is expected to be covered. We're
18 going to talk about proposed outreach regional maps,
19 we're going to talk about engagement strategy plans,
20 we're going to talk about the cross section of various
21 subcommittees that influence outreach. And the good news
22 is that because we have tabled item 12, we'll have the
23 luxury of a nice chunk of time to really address those
24 issues, so item 11 will be very robust.

25 Commissioner Sinay.

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to add one last
2 thing is when the Delores Huerta Foundation spoke to us,
3 they had talked about they had created a COI survey -- a
4 community of interest survey. And one of the questions
5 that was kind of outstanding from all of us was, what did
6 they do with that survey? Because it looked like it was
7 a two or three pages that people wrote down their
8 thoughts. And I followed up with them, and they said
9 that there wasn't enough time to take those surveys and
10 actually turn them into maps, but they did submit all the
11 surveys that they had received from the community. The
12 community submitted it to the redistricting -- local
13 redistricting effort that took place. And the tool kit
14 that they had shared that I think was being created by UC
15 Santa Cruz will include the surveys that they had shared
16 with the community. So I just wanted to close that loop.

17 CHAIR LE MONS: I have a question about that,
18 Commissioner Sinay. Did they say or have you -- do you
19 have a chance to reach out to the local entity that
20 received the content of those surveys and see how they
21 translated that information to maybe get some cues as to
22 how we might use similar processes? I know we're
23 exploring all of those things.

24 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think that's a great
25 question. I hadn't even thought about that since I was

1 only thinking about the input piece, but I can get a
2 contact person. And I don't know if you all want me to
3 follow-up with that or if there's another subcommittee
4 who would like to understand that piece who's better
5 aware of the questions asked.

6 CHAIR LE MONS: I think it would be -- I think it
7 would fit with you guys in the outreach subcommittee.
8 Certainly, it can come up in 11, and we can explore
9 whether or not that's the right path to go, but let's
10 talk about that in item 11.

11 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. I'll reach out, for the
12 time being, to the Delores Huerta Foundation to see who
13 the contact is.

14 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

15 Does anyone -- any Commissioners have any questions
16 for the outreach and engagement subcommittee? Okay.
17 Language access committee, Commissioners Akutagawa and
18 Fernandez.

19 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, initially, based on
20 our last meeting, we were going to come forward with our
21 recommendations, but as Commissioner Akutagawa and I got
22 into it, all of the documentation that we've received and
23 getting as much information as we can, we realized it was
24 a lot bigger and more information than we could put
25 together for this meeting, so we're putting it off until

1 the full Commission meeting in January.

2 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. I'd invite you to share, as
3 appropriate, during item 11 as well because there is
4 intersection with that subcommittee also. So hopefully,
5 that can help inform some of our outreach strategies.
6 Thank you.

7 Data management subcommittee. Commissioners Ahmad
8 and Turner.

9 You're on mute, Commissioner Turner.

10 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, chair. I saw that;
11 I was just trying to get to it.

12 Hello, everyone. Is it okay? Do you want me to
13 start out? Okay. So Commissioners, thank you. Yes,
14 data management, woo-hoo. All right. Get myself stoked.
15 This has been quite the journey. So as you all will
16 recall, at our last meeting, we presented an RFP that we
17 were super stoked and excited about, and there were some
18 questions, but we did get things kind of narrowed down
19 with just -- and you gave us all clearance and authority
20 to move forward with the RFP that was presented. And we
21 moved forward getting information and determined that we
22 need to come back to you because we're not going to move
23 in that direction at all.

24 So with lots of subcommittee meetings and counsel
25 from individuals, there is a different process that we do

1 want to present to you today. So we're excited about all
2 of the data that we're going to get -- 30, 40,000 pieces
3 of information. A lot of it will come structured, and
4 for that, we have an amazing COI tool that we are still
5 gathering some information around, so I'll start with
6 that.

7 For the COI tool subcommittee, there are some bits
8 of information that we want to confirm that will tie into
9 our recommendations today. First of all, we want to have
10 our legal staff just finally and definitively let us know
11 what absolutely must be posted on our website for public
12 review. We know that the public will not have access to
13 information once it's inputted -- input into the COI tool
14 outside of their own, but at what point does that
15 information need to be made public? Or will it need to
16 be made public? That's number one, as far as what other
17 people have. So just whenever we can get feedback from
18 legal staff. We don't need to know that right now, but
19 that is a question we have.

20 We've decided to take all of the information, and
21 our recommendation is that it's going to be split into
22 two separate systems. We will have one system that will
23 be our COI tool that will have all of the GIS
24 information, shapefiles, information that can be mapped
25 out will be entered in through the COI tool. And our

1 recommendation is that we actually use a tool that is
2 already available called Airtable to receive and store
3 and later be able to retrieve all of the non-GIS-type
4 information that we will receive.

5 And so in using Airtool (sic), we will need to also
6 have a data management person, someone that will manage a
7 team of individuals. So we'll have one person that will
8 be able to manage and oversee this whole data process,
9 and then we'll be looking for a team of people that will
10 actually do the input from our meetings. They can hear
11 it through the recordings, that we'll be able to take
12 nonmapped information, someone that just says, I want my
13 community to stay together, someone that may describe
14 something that can't necessarily fit into a COI tool,
15 we'll have that information categorized in Airtable.

16 Airtable is something that exists that is really
17 robust that we've received information on all along.
18 However, up until our last meeting, we was thinking that
19 we needed one singular tool to hold everything, and of
20 course, Airtable isn't sufficient for that. But now that
21 we're talking about splitting the information out,
22 Airtable sounds to us, our data management team, as just
23 the tool that we'll need.

24 So the recommendation that we have is that if we
25 move forward with contracting or hiring a data management

1 person to oversee this and begin staffing a team -- and
2 the team that we'd actually like to use is just a team of
3 students, which was done in 2010. They contracted with
4 students to be able to do input for data management. And
5 when the students input, we cap them, I think Dan set up
6 10,000 dollars or whatever the dollar amount is, and it's
7 kind of a rotating team that will be able to come in, and
8 they'll be utilizing the Airtool (sic).

9 The Airtool (sic) is amazing, and some of you may or
10 may not be familiar with it, but you're able to do
11 queries, you're able to pull information if you needed to
12 be reminded about something that happened in Redding,
13 what someone had a testimony that they had about a
14 different area. And so it would be kind of an overlay
15 with the COI tool. We'll have our line drawers using
16 predominantly the, of course, the COI tool that they'll
17 be able to draw maps, et cetera, with, and you'd have our
18 data management person and/or us as Commissioners,
19 because we have access to Airtool (sic) as well, that
20 we'll be able to say, and how were we informed by that?
21 What's the verbiage or words or support was the sentiment
22 or feeling that went along with those lines?

23 So I'll pause there and see if Isra wants to add --
24 Commissioner Ahmad wants to add anything, or if -- indeed
25 Dan was in a lot of the meetings, if he wanted to add in

1 as well, before we take questions.

2 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you so much, Commissioner
3 Turner.

4 Before you jump in, Commissioner Ahmad, what I'd
5 like to do is, we're on our 11 o'clock hour. I'd like us
6 to take a fifteen-minute break. Commissioner Turner just
7 said a lot of exciting stuff that you guys have been
8 doing. So over the break, fellow Commissioners can think
9 about any questions they have. We'll hear from you and
10 Director Claypool.

11 So at this time, we'll take our fifteen-minute break
12 and come back at 11:15.

13 (Whereupon, a recess was held)

14 MR. MANOFF: You're live, Chair.

15 COMMISSIONER TURNER: You're on mute, Chair.

16 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

17 Welcome back, everyone, from break.

18 Commissioner Ahmad, I believe we're going to pick up
19 with you on the data management subcommittee report.

20 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Right before she
21 does, I need to correct. I was saying "Airtool", someone
22 called to my attention. I wanted to make sure everyone
23 knows we're talking about "Airtable". Okay. Thanks.

24 Go ahead.

25 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

1 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Go ahead, Commissioner.

2 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you. And that's a
3 perfect segue into the small addition that I wanted to
4 contribute to Commissioner Turner's well-thorough report
5 out, and that is that we recognize that Airtable may not
6 be the chosen tool by the data manager themselves. As we
7 know, many people have their preferred tools. So
8 Airtable was an example of the type of tool that can
9 handle all of the different inputs that we are
10 considering for our work.

11 And Derek Poppert, who wrote that Medium article, he
12 had actually sent over very recently, actually -- last
13 week, he had sent over a list of additional tools that
14 could be used for consideration. So we do have other
15 tools that are on our radar, but I believe the -- once we
16 have a conversation in more detail about what that data
17 management role will look like, that tool come to light
18 on its own.

19 Dan, do you have anything else to add? I know you
20 were in many of our calls and kind of supporting us
21 through this process.

22 MR. CLAYPOOL: No, that -- you have both reported
23 out everything I heard. The one -- actually, the only
24 thing I would say about this is, going back to that
25 article about our proposed budget, this is going to be a

1 significant reduction in what I had anticipated this to
2 cost. So it's not only, I think, a better route for what
3 we want to do, but it's also going to help us in our
4 bottom line.

5 CHAIR LE MONS: I have a question to the
6 subcommittee. Do you have everything you need to move
7 forward as far as the data -- what was the position? You
8 called it a data management person. Is everything clear
9 for you to move forward in securing that person?

10 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: We're going to look for --
11 we're going to talk with both USDR and also our USDR --
12 oh, and also the Statewide Database to see if they have a
13 recommendation on a management person to oversee, and
14 then we'll move forward from there.

15 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. And Director Claypool, is
16 that a role that we have already approved in the former
17 prior discussions around staffing?

18 MR. CLAYPOOL: No, it isn't. However, it is a role
19 that we had in the prior Commission -- 2010 Commission,
20 so it should be a place where we have an established
21 position that we can fill rather than having to try to
22 create another position similar to what we did with the
23 deputy executive director.

24 However, that -- in saying that, there will be a
25 parameter of pay that we can make in that position. So

1 it's going to be a matter of finding the right person and
2 determining whether or not we can match them into that
3 pay grade, or -- and this is another possibility that we
4 had discussed -- if they're affiliated with the
5 university or in State of California, we could go out
6 with an interagency agreement similar to what we had
7 talked about with the RPV analysis -- analyst, and then
8 pick them up that way.

9 So we have options with this one. We just want to
10 make sure that we get a person who has those skill --
11 that skill set with whatever management tool we use, and
12 can also manage the group that we're going to have to
13 hire in behind them in this kind of a student set that
14 we're talking about to do the actual input.

15 CHAIR LE MONS: So my final question would be, does
16 the subcommittee and a new executive, Director Claypool,
17 have an ETA on when someone might be brought forward and
18 presented to us for approval? Yes, Commissioner -- or I
19 mean, Director Claypool.

20 MR. CLAYPOOL: I would say that we could -- that our
21 time line should be around the end of January. We need
22 to spend this next -- the rest of the time we have in
23 December to finalize what we want to do and confer with
24 both the Statewide Database and the digital response
25 team. And then when we have identified someone, then

1 it's a matter of just figuring out how we can bring them
2 aboard and come back to this Commission with the
3 recommendation. But I would hope at the end of January,
4 this position could be filled, because as we've
5 discussed, we need to have a way to start capturing this
6 data before we start bringing on lots of data. So that's
7 an internal time line, but we'll have more on December
8 22nd.

9 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Do other Commissioners have
10 questions for the subcommittee?

11 Commissioner Fornaciari.

12 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, first off, I just
13 want to say really well done. Very, very complex and
14 challenging topic area, and I mean, you guys handled it
15 well, and I think, got to a great place.

16 I just want to offer that Commissioner Taylor and I
17 and the security subcommittee would offer up some help,
18 some consultation in the job requirements when you guys
19 are ready.

20 MR. CLAYPOOL: Um-hum.

21 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

22 Other questions?

23 Thank you so much, Commissioner Turner and Ahmad.

24 Moving on to community of interest tool.

25 Commissioners Akutagawa and Kennedy.

1 We can't hear you, Commissioner Kennedy. There we
2 go.

3 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Is Commissioner Akutagawa
4 back?

5 CHAIR LE MONS: I'm not sure. Would you like me to
6 come back?

7 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay.

8 CHAIR LE MONS: Yes?

9 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes, please.

10 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Thank you.

11 Cybersecurity subcommittee. Commissioners
12 Fornaciari and Taylor, please.

13 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I don't think we have
14 anything significant to report at this point.

15 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Thank you very much.

16 Any questions?

17 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Did you have anything,
18 Derric? Okay.

19 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Troubleshooting Committee.
20 Commissioners Andersen and myself.

21 Commissioner Andersen, I'd like to actually propose
22 that we sunset the Troubleshooting Committee considering
23 that we now have our leadership staff in place. And I
24 think that through the subcommittees that currently
25 exist, and staff, that the things that we were working on

1 seem to be things that have been resolved, and we really
2 haven't had a substantive report in several meetings now.
3 So if you have no objections to that, I'd like to -- or
4 other Commissioners don't have any objections to that --
5 I'd like to sunset the Troubleshooting Committee today.

6 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I would say just -- we have
7 a couple of items that we were charged with which haven't
8 quite finished up, but -- you know, like, i.e., are we
9 going to get the computers? That sort of thing. But
10 that can certainly just be general information, so I have
11 no objection.

12 CHAIR LE MONS: Does any of the other Commissioners
13 have any objections to subset -- sunsetting the
14 Troubleshooting Committee today? Okay. So with that,
15 we're sunsetting the Troubleshooting Committee today. So
16 those outstanding items will make sure get addressed vis-
17 a-vis staff moving forward.

18 And I think the primary item that Commissioner
19 Andersen lifted up is the biggest one, and that is when
20 the computers will be distributed. So more to come on
21 that. We'll expect to hear from our director of
22 administration, Raul, on that process as he's shepherding
23 it.

24 Lessons Learned Committee. Commissioners Ahmad and
25 Kennedy.

1 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Commissioner Ahmad, would you
2 like to start?

3 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Sure.

4 Thank you, chair.

5 The -- I was going to say the lessons learned
6 subcommittee has put forth a draft noncomprehensive
7 document. It is posted online under Agenda 8M Lessons
8 Learned. And this document highlights some of the big
9 bucket areas of consideration for our discussions at the
10 end of -- I guess, post-August 2021.

11 So we did meet with -- I'm going to forget her
12 name -- Stephanie (ph.) at the CSA to discuss some of the
13 considerations that we have put forth and get her
14 perspective on just the input process of Commission
15 recruitment and the business functioning of that process
16 and what worked and what didn't work and what
17 considerations that we should be taking note of for our
18 further discussions down the line.

19 So if folks have additional items to add to this
20 list, please do send those our way. We are very excited
21 to bring these items for discussion at a later point so
22 that we can improve the process for the future
23 Commissions.

24 Is there anything else that you would like to add,
25 Commissioner Kennedy?

1 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah, just the idea that this
2 is the start of a matrix that would also -- in addition
3 to the topics and subtopics that we've presented would
4 also divide input into strengths, weaknesses,
5 innovations, and recommendations similar to a SWOT
6 analysis that many of you may be familiar with.
7 Strengths and weaknesses are fairly self-evident.
8 Innovations is anything that we've done differently from
9 the 2010 Commission. And then recommendations would be
10 anything that we believe the 2030 Commission should do
11 differently from how we're doing it.

12 So as Commissioner Ahmad said, this is mainly very
13 forward-looking, something that we'll get to after we
14 have -- after we submit the final maps to the Secretary
15 of State's Office. But we want all of you to be thinking
16 in these terms as we go forward, and we hope that this
17 framework will provide a useful tool for you to keep
18 track of your thoughts as we move towards that date when
19 we can finally sit down and talk seriously about lessons
20 learned. So thank you.

21 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioners Kennedy and
22 Ahmad. And thank you for posting that. I got a chance
23 to review it and looks awesome. And I think this is a
24 really good thing that we're doing in terms of really
25 trying to clear a path to make things easier for the next

1 Commissioners -- I mean, excuse me, Commission -- a
2 decade from now. So awesome work.

3 Any questions for the Lessons Learned Subcommittee?

4 Commissioner Turner.

5 COMMISSIONER TURNER: So the one thing I was
6 thinking about -- and I don't know -- and thank you also
7 to the lessons learned subcommittee. I really love
8 looking at this list as a place to capture our thoughts.

9 I was thinking about the feedback received that I
10 shared and wondering would it even go here, or how would
11 we list this as a lessons learned? One of them was to
12 ensure that when we roll around to the same cycle in ten
13 years, that the redistricting is included, and I guess,
14 verbalized or marketed along with the census work so that
15 it doesn't look like a second set of now let's go back
16 out with something brand new. But would that be for -- I
17 don't know if that would be on the census side or our
18 side, but I just want to make sure that we don't lose it
19 in some place.

20 It seems that the feedback I was receiving is that
21 it seems like we did this whole big push effort, money
22 spent, et cetera, to talk about census, and that then we
23 know is a part of redistricting or kind of dovetails into
24 it or is the purpose, and then we start and we go back
25 out again like we're introducing something brand new. So

1 I just want to name that and see if there's a place we
2 can figure out how we can own that or at least send that
3 feedback forward to the Census Bureau. Thank you.

4 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

5 Any other questions, comments for the lessons
6 learned subcommittee?

7 Commissioner Akutagawa. Commissioner Akutagawa.

8 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'm going to turn my video
9 off; hopefully, it'll help with the streaming.

10 I had a similar question to Commissioner Turner. I
11 believe I was told that there are some -- I guess, some
12 questions about the funding for the new Commission if
13 we're going to try to have the new Commission take part
14 in the census -- the tail end of the census outreach. So
15 I do wonder, for later consideration, does it make sense
16 that as we're sunseting as a Commission, that perhaps
17 we'll need to consider taking on more of the kind of
18 census outreach bridging role between us and the next
19 Commission if there's this budget question. And I think
20 Director Claypool may be able to add some clarity on
21 that.

22 CHAIR LE MONS: Director Claypool.

23 MR. CLAYPOOL: So there are two approaches that can
24 be made on this. The first one is that at the end of
25 this process, you are going to be asked to go into a

1 negotiation with the legislature and the State Auditor's
2 Office and to make changes to statute, and then it will
3 go over to the legislature, and they can -- they will
4 vote on it. Last time, that's how you were transferred
5 away -- this Commission was transferred away from the
6 state -- Secretary of State's Office and put strictly
7 under the purview of the State Auditor's Office as far as
8 the transition went. There were three or four other
9 items that changed in the way that that the Commission
10 worked.

11 So you could approach this and say that you would
12 like it to change in some type of statute, that there be
13 some linkage between the census process and the
14 Commission's process, and then they would consider that
15 possibly in putting that with the Census Bureau's job to,
16 at the end of their process, make sure that it coincided
17 with your efforts -- with the new Commission's efforts to
18 start. That's one process. Marian and Kary can give you
19 more information about what's required there.

20 But the second one is if that didn't get in, and
21 there's a high possibility that it wouldn't, that it
22 might be too much linkage, they might consider it kind of
23 a bridge -- bridging too far. Then you as a Commission
24 could wait until those efforts started, and then you
25 could start advancing the idea that there be some linkage

1 early in the census process when we get to that point in
2 ten years. So those are -- there probably other ways to
3 do that, but those are the two that come to mind to me
4 right now.

5 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that, Director
6 Claypool.

7 Any other questions or comments on this topic?

8 Thank you so much, lessons learned subcommittee.

9 I'd like to go back to our COI tool, or communities
10 of interest tool subcommittee. Commissioners Akutagawa
11 and Kennedy.

12 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa, you
13 would you like to start?

14 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Actually, Commissioner
15 Kennedy, I'm going to defer to you on this one.

16 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay.

17 The one outstanding issue that we have that we still
18 need to give a response to Statewide Database on is
19 whether or not we are going to set up a .ca.gov. address
20 for the communities of interest tool, or whether we are
21 going to just leave the addressing of the tool with them.

22 And we do also have a -- sorry, I need to get back
23 to a document that I had a second ago. The -- they have
24 been moving forward with a couple of different names, one
25 is Draw My CA Community. They've also reserved Draw My

1 Community and My CA Community. So recalling our other
2 earlier discussions, we wanted something that was
3 memorable and not too long, so it would be useful to get
4 any further input on those.

5 But the main issue is whether or not we go with a
6 .ca.gov URL or just leave it without that. And that ties
7 into the cybersecurity subcommittee and whether or not by
8 having a .ca.gov URL for the COI tool, we would have
9 better protection in any way, or we would have stronger
10 cybersecurity support from the state if we were to go in
11 that direction. So I would ask the cybersecurity
12 subcommittee for any input they have, and then ask the
13 Commission at large for their input, both on the .ca.gov
14 question, as well as on the main part of the name.

15 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fornaciari.

16 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Sure. So yeah, I talked
17 to Karin and Jaime about that. They -- so first of all,
18 the -- their systems are hosted by Amazon Web Services,
19 and so they host the -- many of the biggest ecommerce
20 sites on the planet, so their security is -- I feel
21 comfortable that their security is very robust.

22 Having the URL that -- whether it's a .gov or not,
23 from a security standpoint, doesn't really matter because
24 it just points to the same place, so it's not going to
25 get us any more security. But from a credibility

1 perspective, I think having a .gov address is important.

2 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Yee.

3 COMMISSIONER YEE: I was just shaking my head in
4 agreement.

5 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Thank you.

6 Commissioner Andersen.

7 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Just with the names and all
8 this, I was just wondering if we could get Director
9 Ceja's input because I believe consistency in the naming
10 of the COI tool location and our -- whatever our little
11 logo is, I believe the consistency through all that would
12 be very important. And I'd really appreciate
13 Commissioner Ceja's -- I mean, Director Ceja's -- excuse
14 me -- input, please.

15 CHAIR LE MONS: Director Ceja, we can't hear you.
16 No.

17 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Maybe his laptop is muted.

18 CHAIR LE MONS: Are there other Commissioners that
19 have questions or comments?

20 Commissioner Akutagawa.

21 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I guess maybe this is more
22 of a question for Commissioner Fornaciari. I read about
23 the recent hack that was enacted on a number of
24 government entities through a company called, I think,
25 FireEye or something -- something kind of odd like that.

1 I don't know if California was impacted by that, and if,
2 you know, I mean, I guess maybe there's not much that can
3 be done, but are those things that we should be concerned
4 about, especially as it relates to the COI tool, even if
5 it's hosted by Amazon Web Services?

6 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, I just, in general,
7 I don't think there's any foolproof cybersecurity
8 approach at all. I think that if sophisticated hackers
9 want to hack our system, wherever it is, they'll hack it.
10 I think we just have to do the best we can. And I think
11 that Amazon Web Services, that's their business to keep
12 those websites up and running, and so the incentive that
13 they have to provide the latest and up-to-date security
14 is, I think, really high. So I mean, I personally feel
15 comfortable with that outcome -- or with that -- with
16 them hosting. But I mean, cybersecurity's tough,
17 there's -- you know, just have to do the best you can.

18 Commissioner Taylor, do you have any thoughts on
19 that?

20 VICE CHAIR TAYLOR: No, I agree, of course, it has
21 to be of concern, but you just try to address it in the
22 best manner possible. And again, with Amazon Web
23 Services, that happens to be one of the best, it's what
24 they do, so we can have a little bit of faith in them,
25 but we just try to mitigate the situation accordingly.

1 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So but that's something we
2 have to think about with regard to how we're managing our
3 data, right? We're hiring a database manager to set up a
4 database for us and manage it, so we really need to be
5 cognizant of where we host that data, which server, and
6 who's managing the server, so. It's something we're
7 going to have to work through as we go along.

8 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.
9 Director Ceja.

10 MR. CEJA: Thank you so much. I don't know what's
11 going on with my computer today, but I have to restart it
12 every time.

13 Yes, Commissioner Andersen, on the address, .ca.gov
14 would make sense just to be consistent and show that it
15 is a state function, an extension of our website.

16 As far as where that COI tool is going to live, I
17 think that's a conversation that we were having with the
18 COI tool folks is, do we set up a splash page with their
19 own COI tool and then link it up to our website, or do we
20 have it live on our website? And I think that's a
21 conversation that we need to nail down. It could go
22 either way.

23 We still would make the COI tool available on our
24 website if they were to have their own splash page with
25 their own name, so that's not a problem. It's just a

1 problem -- it's just an issue of ensuring that the COI
2 tool does live on our website, and we can make that
3 happen either way.

4 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen.

5 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, Commissioner -- I
6 mean, Director Ceja. I was actually saying in terms of
7 the naming, I believe Commissioner Kennedy was talking
8 about, you know, they have -- we've tossed around a lot
9 of ideas: Draw My Community, Draw California, you know,
10 that part -- that portion of what will the -- what will
11 it be called. Thank you for the ca.gov, but it was the
12 first part that for consistency was with our branding.

13 MR. CEJA: Yeah, so either of those would work. And
14 going back to my point, if they're going to name the COI
15 tool or the splash page something -- one of those names,
16 it wouldn't be a problem connecting that to our website.
17 So as far as -- I mean, we can vet the names itself and
18 see which one makes sense, like you said, for our
19 branding and what we're trying to achieve with our
20 website, but those sounds good to me.

21 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy, how would you
22 like to proceed in closing the loop on the name
23 recommendation if they are waiting for us to give them
24 some feedback, as well as the ca.gov?

25 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I would like to have an

1 opportunity to speak with Commissioner Akutagawa about
2 that, and then we can finalize our recommendations and
3 come back with those either before the end of this
4 meeting or on the 22nd. But it would be a very brief
5 discussion at that point.

6 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Can you try to do that by the
7 end of this meeting as there are no subcommittee reports
8 slated for the 22nd meeting?

9 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. Very good.

10 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Turner.

11 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Just wanted to -- thank you,
12 Chair -- ask Commissioner Kennedy real quick, on the
13 suggestions that you gave earlier, the ones that included
14 community, all of them were -- was having it spelled all
15 the way out? Okay. Thank you.

16 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes.

17 CHAIR LE MONS: Any other questions, comments for
18 the COI tool subcommittee? Okay. Thank you very much.

19 We're going to move on to item 9 on our agenda. It
20 is 11:43. That gives us about an hour and two minutes to
21 dedicate to getting the conversation started, so
22 that's -- so we could either do that, or we could jump to
23 item number 10, which will probably take about thirty
24 minutes, and -- or maybe not even that long, and handle
25 the two policies.

1 I'm open to suggestions, and I probably could do
2 this by a quick show of hands. Would you like to jump
3 right into the line drawer RFP -- oh, you know what? I'm
4 sorry. Let's move on to number 9. Ignore all of that
5 other verbiage.

6 We're going to move to number 9 with Commissioners
7 Andersen and Sadhwani.

8 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you,
9 Commissioner Le Mons.

10 Thank you to the data management subcommittee. That
11 really brought this discussion to a very, very focal
12 point. And I believe the only items that were up for
13 discussion is this delineation between who -- what the
14 line drawer does and what the data manager will do. And
15 I think for everyone's understanding of how this works,
16 could --

17 Director Claypool, could you please bring up the --
18 your "wire diagram", I believe you call it? And if you
19 could maybe even just for -- I could quickly walk through
20 it, or if you'd like to, and the idea being all the
21 information that's coming in, where is it going, so
22 therefore, it's very obvious who is handling what. And
23 as long as the Commission sort of says, yes, that is our
24 understanding, then I believe everything will fall in
25 place as far as this matter. And then there are two

1 other side matters for it. So if that would -- Director
2 Claypool, is that okay?

3 MR. CLAYPOOL: I am asking Kristian first if he can
4 bring it up because he'll do a far better job than I
5 will.

6 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. It also is one of the
7 handouts; if everyone can look at it. It is -- I can't
8 remember exactly what it's titled.

9 MR. CLAYPOOL: It is --

10 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Data Management Flowcharts
11 12/09 BB posting (ph.).

12 MR. CLAYPOOL: Right.

13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Before posting. So if
14 everyone wants to pull that up. Or if we could have it
15 on screen. That way, I think the public could see what
16 was going on.

17 MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes. Hang on. We're working --

18 CHAIR LE MONS: Kristian, are you going to be able
19 to bring that up?

20 MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes, he will.

21 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay, great. Commissioners, once
22 the screen share happens, of course, it goes down to a
23 very small window of my being able to see who would like
24 to speak. So if you could use the hand raising function,
25 I can see that in my side view. It'll help facilitate

1 making sure that you're able to add your comments as long
2 as the screen is being shared.

3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: While we're waiting for
4 that, I might just say, because the Commissioners, I
5 believe, have the document itself.

6 Basically, the idea is the blue or items that -- oh,
7 there we go, and if you can scroll up, please. Yeah.
8 There we go. Okay.

9 MR. CLAYPOOL: Thank you, Kristian. It's going to
10 have to be a --

11 CHAIR LE MONS: Can you make it larger, Kristian,
12 and can you just show the image without all of the --

13 MR. MANOFF: Yeah, just a second.

14 CHAIR LE MONS: Excel formula?

15 MR. MANOFF: Jesse will help you with the Zoom.
16 Stand by.

17 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Thank you.

18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Just basically, though, for
19 the public's viewing, we have three circles over on the
20 left. Two are orange. One is blue. Those circles, or
21 ovals, represent information that's coming in from the
22 public.

23 The first bubble -- the first oval is communications
24 directly into the Commission itself -- via fax, phone
25 call, public comment, something like that. The second

1 orange oval is information coming into the Commission
2 through public meetings. And then the blue oval is
3 information that's put into the COI tool.

4 And then what happens with that information is then,
5 proceeding down the chart -- again, going on the left,
6 anything coming into the office will include two
7 different types of information. Basically, some people
8 might actually write in an acceptable -- they might bring
9 a map. This is being their COI tool. You know, their
10 community of interest -- a picture of their community of
11 interest. What do they want, redistricting.

12 If it is in the form of an actually -- a GIS-
13 compatible file, that will go all the way -- essentially,
14 it will be going over to the line drawer. If it's all
15 verbiage, as we might just say -- it's, I'd like you to
16 do this, or it's on a napkin, or something like that,
17 that would drop down into -- see, the top. You know,
18 there's the rectangle top and a bottom on both of it.
19 The top of the rectangles are essentially GIS formats,
20 and this is for, like, maps.

21 If something comes in from -- directly from the
22 public, and the first oval drops down -- ooh, that is
23 indeed a map, it will ultimately go over to our line
24 drawers, essentially. The information that is not will
25 go down, and then it will be handled by our data manager.

1 Then, if you're moving over to the public Commission
2 meeting -- the second orange oval, dropping down below
3 that, in that public meeting, that's when the line drawer
4 would be there. And anything they take in, obviously, is
5 compatible with their GIS format. They would be taking
6 that directly to themselves.

7 Anything that also comes in, which is verbiage --
8 is, I just want this, or people walk away, they don't
9 actually draw a map. They won't give information enough
10 such that a map can be drawn, that also will be handled
11 by the data manager.

12 Then the blue -- following the blue oval down,
13 anything that comes into the COI tool, that is -- will be
14 sent from the COI tool to either us and/or directly to
15 the line drawer. Either way, that's at our discretion.
16 But all that information would go to the line drawer
17 because it's maps, essentially.

18 The only item that would come down to our group, to
19 the Commission, is if some of those COI's are in a
20 different language. And therefore, they need to be
21 translated. Then we would have to translate that. And
22 again, that information would -- if it's just the part
23 that is also associated with a file, that will ultimately
24 then go back to the line drawer as it is translated.

25 So then dropping down, that's the nice little

1 triangle there -- or that's not a triangle, diamond -- is
2 what the data manager would be doing, the converting,
3 coding, translating, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.
4 Putting it all into a nice, large oval of data.

5 And then going up on the right, further over, the
6 large, blue oval is everything that the line drawer has.
7 That will be all the files from which the line drawer can
8 actually produce any maps that we would like and begin
9 the line drawing process.

10 And then you'll notice, dropping down, the
11 Commission. And we have connections to all of this.

12 So are there any questions on that? And is that
13 basically everyone's kind of understanding?

14 CHAIR LE MONS: Again, I can't see. Can we get rid
15 of the image now that we've walked through it?

16 Director Claypool, please. You had your hands up.
17 Director Claypool.

18 MR. CLAYPOOL: So one possible caveat to what you
19 just saw on that wire diagram, and you probably all have
20 it up on your screens already, is that if we have to put
21 everything onto our website, then there would also --
22 obviously, that Commission, that line to the Commission
23 would also be a line to the Commission's website so that
24 we could post it there. So --

25 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fornaciari?

1 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Sure. There's -- so in my
2 conversation with Karin and Jaime the other day -- I just
3 want to be clear that we are -- the folks, the data
4 management folks and the line drawer understand this.
5 Their vision is to upload periodically, batch upload the
6 data from the COI tool to a database that we manage. And
7 then, we review the input and filter out whichever input
8 we -- that we aren't going to use, whatever the criteria
9 we use for filtering it. And then that data -- the
10 information we decide we're going to be using -- that
11 we're going to decide we're going to be using for drawing
12 lines, then that information will go to the line drawer.

13 So it's -- it's kind of a slightly different picture
14 than you've got there. So I just wanted to be clear that
15 we understand that.

16 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.
17 Commissioner Sinay?

18 I see you, Commissioner Turner.

19 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. There's a couple of
20 typos, but I'll just email them.

21 But I wanted to make sure, on the first orange
22 bubble where we say Commission communications, we kind of
23 felt -- we had this challenge, too, because we haven't
24 quite approved the communications. And so we had
25 followed -- I had followed off -- I had followed up with

1 the data management team to see if we had agreed what
2 they would be. So all those are written. And so I just
3 want to make sure that, if we're going to put anything in
4 there, that that we either broaden it, or that we just
5 leave it open to be determined, just so that folks know
6 that we're still working through that piece. On --

7 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay, could you expand
8 on that? What are you saying?

9 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sure. So in that first
10 bubble -- my understanding -- I -- I left the meeting
11 last time thinking that we had agreed that all
12 information was going to come in either our website,
13 public comment, public meetings. Or there was a fourth
14 one that I can't remember. And when I followed up to
15 understand if we had already agreed on what that data
16 input was going to be -- the approved data input we were
17 accepting, Commissioner Ahmad said we're still working on
18 that. Let's -- I'm not, you know -- yeah, we don't have
19 approval. So I may have misunderstood that piece.

20 And so I just want to be careful. What's hard is,
21 as we're building anything, any plan, or any map, or
22 any -- not map -- visual, that we go back to what has
23 been approved, or what's not been approved, just so that
24 we're consistently giving out the same message. And so
25 that was that was my piece. Hopefully, that's a little

1 more clear.

2 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that. Can you
3 reintroduce that in item 11? Because that would be an
4 opportunity to clarify that as it relates to --
5 especially that cross-sectional aspect of the
6 conversation. I'm going to have Commissioner Turner, and
7 then we'll go to Director Ceja.

8 COMMISSIONER SINAY: And I have one other issue,
9 sorry -- one other question.

10 CHAIR LE MONS: Sure. Sure.

11 COMMISSIONER SINAY: On the COI tool -- on the third
12 bullet. Wouldn't it be better just to call it the COI
13 tool and take out the Statewide Database? Because it is
14 a CRC tool, they're building it for us. So it's
15 important for us -- you know, for the community to know
16 that it's directly -- that it's ours versus it's someone
17 else's and it's coming to us.

18 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner
19 Turner?

20 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair.

21 I'm wanting to respond to Commissioner Fornaciari.
22 We absolutely did not understand that the COI tool would
23 in turn send data to a data management tool. That's
24 outside of anything I believe that I've been exposed to
25 or was expecting. And it is not how we designed the

1 process.

2 The COI tool primary use, in addition, was to help
3 the line drawers be able to draw maps. And with our
4 help, Commissioner Andersen. Yes, with our help, et
5 cetera. But I did not see the COI tool sending
6 information into a data management tool.

7 We talked about the compatibility of both. Should
8 we need to send, perhaps, information through a data
9 management tool into anything that could be formatted
10 into a shapefile or GIS, but not the other way around.
11 And so we've not designed the process to hold GIS data or
12 maps from the COI tool into our data management tool.

13 They were to work in conjunction with each other.
14 The data manager would be taking all of the verbiage, any
15 of the non-GIS information there to be able to help us
16 interpret it. We would have access to pull it, to look at
17 it, to round out any information. But the COI tool was
18 to be used solely by data, by the -- the COI tool, in
19 other words, was not supposed to send information to data
20 management.

21 So I just wanted to state that and see where does
22 that take us from here?

23 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that, Commissioner
24 Turner.

25 I just want to add that my understanding equals that

1 of Commissioner Turner. So it sounds like we definitely
2 need to get some clarity as to the expectations of the
3 COI tool. And I don't know if the COI subcommittee has
4 some understanding or can speak to this.

5 Commissioner Andersen?

6 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I will let, if Commissioner
7 Kennedy or Commissioner Akutagawa, I believe it is, about
8 the COI tool. If they want to speak first, but
9 otherwise, I can definitely go into what exactly is going
10 on with the COI tool in terms of output.

11 So if Commissioner Kennedy, or if the COI tool
12 subcommittee wants to say anything first; otherwise, I'll
13 be happy to go.

14 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Go ahead.

15 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy, do you have
16 anything to add here?

17 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: No. Go ahead.

18 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay, go ahead, Commissioner
19 Andersen.

20 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Commissioner
21 Fornaciari is absolutely correct. The COI tool -- it is
22 an input only with the Statewide Database. And
23 Commissioner Sinay said, yes, it is considered our tool.
24 People -- the public can go into that -- however they
25 access it, and they will create a document. And the tool

1 itself creates several files. One of which is a PDF,
2 which is a picture of what they've drawn. One of which
3 is a -- well, it's a CVS file. It's a map compatible,
4 GIS compatible. And there's also a, like, essentially, a
5 text file that that is embedded with those. So for the
6 line drawer -- anyway, so it creates -- that's what it
7 creates.

8 Then, they are planning -- the COI tool plans to --
9 export, and in groups, with say, a nice, little cache.
10 When they get a certain number, they will then forward
11 those to someone to use. The someone would either be us,
12 or a line drawer, or a combination of both. But it is
13 going -- they're not storing that. I mean, they are
14 storing it, but they're not doing anything further with
15 it.

16 And we may not then go into that to use. It comes
17 out of there -- this is a security divide. So their
18 output is what we will get. And while we can direct --
19 say, no, we want all that output to go to our line
20 drawer, or we want all that output to go to us, or we
21 want the PDFs to go to our data management. And we want
22 the other portion to go to our line drawer.

23 And the issue is here how -- when the public --
24 well, there are two issues. One is who manages it; what
25 do we want to do with it? And in terms of the what do we

1 want to do with it, we obviously want to make maps.

2 We also have an obligation to let the public know
3 what we're doing, or they've sent something in. And this
4 is where I believe Commissioner Sinay mentioned -- or I'm
5 not quite sure who mentioned it, the idea of putting a
6 map out such that each COI tool is represented by a map
7 of California, such that each COI that has been created
8 is a little dot on that. And then where would that be
9 hosted?

10 And these are the issues that we have to discuss,
11 decide on, because it is -- someone needs to hold on to
12 that. That is not the Statewide Database managing that.
13 So -- and in our wire diagram, basically all of the
14 information from the COI tool was being exported, we
15 decided, to the line drawer.

16 So essentially -- then, it would be up to them to
17 then export or create some sort of map. And there is
18 this overlap of the PDFs. Are we trying to put those on
19 so the public can look as a public comment on our
20 website? I think that is an easy thing that we could put
21 on -- could go into our data managing world. Because
22 what else are they sorting, sort of and that sort of
23 thing. But that's an idea.

24 But those are -- that is what's happening. It is
25 not being stored. The data -- the Statewide Database,

1 and then our line drawer is just taking from that
2 database. So there is a need for -- like, a landing spot
3 for this data.

4 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that, Commissioner
5 Andersen.

6 What I'd like to do, hopefully, is redirect this
7 conversation back to the needs of the line drawers RFP.
8 And this portion of the conversation, I think, has a life
9 at number 11. So if there is no objection to that --
10 Commissioner Sadhwani?

11 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Actually, to that specific
12 point, right, as Commissioner Andersen laid out, this is
13 germane to the line drawer RFP in that if we want the
14 line drawer, whoever that person or entity would be, to
15 create such a system, to organize all this, to be able to
16 analyze it, right? Then we need to include it in the
17 RFP. However, if we as the Commission say, no, no, no,
18 we want some external data management of it, then we need
19 to know that to keep it out of the RFP. Right?

20 It likely would have an additional cost. Well, for
21 sure, will have an additional cost. And therefore, we
22 need to know whether or not it is the intention of the
23 Commission to have a line drawer be able to manage this.

24 While the map idea with the little dots would be
25 beautiful and really helpful, I don't know if we'll find

1 a line drawer who's able to do that or not. So I think
2 we do need that direction in order to move this portion
3 of it forward.

4 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

5 Commissioner Akutagawa?

6 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, I just want to say that
7 my understanding is similar to what Commissioner Andersen
8 just laid out. And that was part of my understanding of
9 the reason for the data management subcommittee is to
10 figure out what are we going to do with all of this data
11 that is going to be collected, of which the communities
12 of interest tool that the Statewide Database is creating
13 for us? What are we going to do with all this data that
14 does also include data coming from that particular tool?

15 I would advise that we (audio interference) data
16 instead of just turning it over to a line drawer, partly
17 because I think we should maintain some control of the
18 data that we receive. And that means that that should be
19 included in our database or our data management system.

20 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Thank you for that.

21 Commissioner Turner, then Commissioner Yee.

22 COMMISSIONER TURNER: The Statewide Database is
23 creating a tool that they actually don't hold in a
24 database? I don't know. I'm not sure where -- the
25 Statewide Database is creating a COI tool that the line

1 drawers need. Let me let me wait and see where the
2 conversation goes.

3 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay.

4 COMMISSIONER TURNER: I'll wait (indiscernible)
5 Chair.

6 CHAIR LE MON: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner
7 Turner.

8 Commissioner Yee?

9 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. Thank you. So as I
10 understand it, you know -- so in 2010, so much of the
11 input came from public testimony at the thirty-four
12 meetings. And it was very challenging to, you know, do
13 something with that because they didn't have a full data
14 management system in place to record, analyze,
15 categorize, all that. And that was kind of the original
16 impetus for our interest in getting a data management
17 piece added to our capability.

18 They also did not have the COI tool, right? They
19 had some limited sites where people could go visit and
20 play with a computer and draw something, but that was not
21 widely used.

22 Chair, we have the COI tool -- will have the COI
23 tool, which let's imagine, could generate half the input
24 that we get from the public, right, if it's widely
25 deployed.

1 So I think it surprises me that we weren't thinking
2 that that COI tool output would go to data management
3 because that's so much of the public input that we're
4 getting. And wouldn't we want that correlated? You
5 know, wouldn't we want all the input from the public
6 about Fresno, you know, whether it came from public
7 testimony, COI tool, written submissions. Wouldn't we
8 want that all in one place so that we can go to it and
9 see it all together?

10 Because it really -- for us, it shouldn't matter
11 kind of where the info came from. Right? As we're, you
12 know -- if this is the meeting where we get to talk about
13 Fresno, we should just have all the Fresno info kind of
14 all together in one place where we can look at it and
15 consider it. It doesn't really matter where -- how it
16 got to us. It should be in one place.

17 So I can see why technically data management may not
18 have thought that it would be taking the input from the
19 COI tool. But conceptually, I would -- wouldn't we want
20 all that data to come together in one place? That would
21 be my expectation.

22 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. I'd like to make a comment.
23 And then I'll go to Commissioner Turner, and then
24 Director Claypool.

25 I sort of am along the line of the logic -- or at

1 least I think along the line of the logic that
2 Commissioner Turner was alluding to. And that is, if the
3 Statewide Database, who manages all kinds of data and
4 stores all kinds of data -- that's number one.

5 So this is not someone who just built an input tool
6 for someone, in my mind, just based on the nature of the
7 work that they do. So the thinking was that, yes, they
8 would be taking in this COI tool data -- using the COI
9 tool to take in this data, but it would be housed in a
10 database that we could certainly access. We could
11 approve access to the line drawer that we ultimately
12 bring on to that data. So it's just about where the data
13 sat, right? And where it's housed, and how it's
14 organized.

15 So we would have complete access to it; it's our own
16 data. And when we were ready to archive that data, we
17 could secure it all in one chunk and put it in an
18 archive, which would be different than how we're using it
19 for the line drawing process. So whether it's all housed
20 in one place during the actual process is, to me, not a
21 given. You can draw data from multiple sources or
22 process for a particular outcome.

23 And so I'll just say that that was my logic is that
24 we would be pulling from the data from our data
25 management team, which was initially introduced -- and I

1 might have missed this, but it was initially introduced
2 to manage anecdotal data in particular. Because there
3 was a lot of anecdotal data received that was ultimately
4 unable to be processed. It was very difficult to
5 organize it, store it, et cetera. And so that was really
6 in terms of what I recall when Director Claypool
7 introduced that need and that gap, that that was sort of
8 the impetus.

9 And then, as we had other conversations as expanded
10 when we found out -- I guess some people already knew we
11 had to translate all of the other languages on the back
12 end. I recall being in shock that that was something
13 that we were supposed to do. So that became one of the
14 tasks that this data management team was going to have to
15 be responsible for as well, or find a vendor or
16 something.

17 So now, it sounds like we're clarifying that
18 basically, the Statewide Database is only going to take
19 that in and give it to us. They have no intentions of
20 storing it and have no intentions of giving us a
21 (indiscernible) of accessing that data once they've
22 received it. They'll receive it, and in cache batches,
23 they will forward it to us to do with what we want.

24 So I'm just trying to sort out what I think I hear.

25 I think with that, I said I was going to go to

1 Commissioner Turner, and then Director Claypool, and then
2 Commissioner Akutagawa.

3 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, and I'm glad you went
4 that route to just kind of help me solidify in my mind.
5 Because, yes, I am totally taken aback that the U.S. --
6 excuse me, that our Statewide Database is not going to
7 control that information.

8 So one of the challenges that we have in meeting in
9 separate subcommittees and getting information piece
10 parted is that it's really easy to have this train kind
11 of derailed. And so I am glad we're having the
12 conversation here.

13 And of course, we can do anything -- we're the 2020
14 Commissioners, right? So but we need to determine what
15 it is. So we started out with a task that I believe was
16 to create a tool -- is what Commissioner Ahmad and myself
17 walked away with -- create a tool that will be able to
18 house any and everything and be able to take in the COI
19 tool as one piece of -- one trail of information.

20 But in addition to that, we talked about videos, and
21 pictures, and emails, and drawings, and public testimony,
22 and all of these various forms. And we went off, and we
23 met with six, seven, eight different people and told them
24 our task.

25 And from that point, we received counsel from all of

1 them saying, this is really broad. And you absolutely
2 can do it for perhaps three, four million dollars -- five
3 million. Or you will have people that will tell you they
4 can do it, and they really won't deliver, ultimately.

5 And because you have it so big, how do you get so
6 far down the trail and then determine, oops, they
7 promised this, but can't deliver. Do you unhire them or
8 fire them at this point and start over? Because of
9 course, like everything, failure is not an option.

10 So through the conversations we had, and then coming
11 back before this body, we determined that the
12 recommendation is that this really is larger than it
13 should be and should not be trusted in one -- or hosted
14 in one particular place. Through conversations we
15 determined, you know what, matter of factly, the COI tool
16 with the GIS and the shapefiles, and what have you, will
17 be able to house that information.

18 And the line drawers -- at one point, I thought the
19 counsel we received, or through one of our subcommittees,
20 said that the line drawers would not even be looking at
21 non-GIS information. And that would be up to us to look
22 at. So if they're not going to look at it, then they
23 certainly don't need it.

24 And again, not thinking in terms of the line drawers
25 not having access directly to the COI tool, or that it

1 would go away or cease to exist on the Statewide
2 Database, that we would now need to own and hold, and
3 control that.

4 So we came back with a recommendation that then got
5 really clear, at least for the moment in our minds, that
6 said, you know what, if we now come up with a tool -- the
7 Airtable is one, there are several others -- that can
8 take on all of the anecdotal, all of the verbiage, the
9 testimony that is non-GIS, nonshapefile related, that
10 really can be categorized and can be -- you can do all
11 kind of ad hoc reports to pull by city.

12 And the information can be matched with what the
13 line drawers are telling us that they've received.
14 Easily accessible. So we talked about perhaps being
15 compatible if need be, but not necessarily. So I don't
16 know where we missed it, what conversation I missed that
17 said that the Statewide Database was only going to send
18 clumps of information to us and that they were going to
19 cease to maintain it or hold it. That does come as a
20 surprise, I'm sorry to report, for me and our
21 subcommittee. It was not what we heard or designed, and
22 I'm -- I would have a question of the Statewide Database
23 to why aren't they maintaining this with all of the other
24 database. I mean, it's in their name.

25 And so yeah. So what I'm still hoping is that for

1 the data management, what we wanted them to do is to be
2 the person on our team that managed the information from
3 a primarily non-GIS and ensure that it was working in
4 conjunction with that it, nothing was hitting the ground,
5 that all information was being input. And as far as the
6 language piece, we took testimony that said that no data
7 system or tool should do any translation; that indeed, we
8 needed to have languages, whichever we choose,
9 interpreted it before we try and either have it input
10 into a COI tool if it's mapping or before we try and
11 categorize it in a tool such as Airtable. So that's kind
12 of where we are and where I am with the information and
13 what my belief was. Thanks.

14 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. I have Director Claypool,
15 then Akutagawa, Fornaciari, and Sinay.

16 Director Claypool.

17 MR. CLAYPOOL: Thank you. So first of all, it's
18 helpful to remember kind of the genesis of the COI tool.
19 It's a requirement that the legislature enter into a
20 joint project with this Commission to supply line drawing
21 capabilities to the public, and so they developed this
22 COI tool so that the public could indeed do line drawing.

23 I had heard in our past conversations that the
24 information would be transferred across to us from the
25 Statewide Database so that we could then incorporate into

1 the line drawing process, and we had the conversations
2 about -- as well as about translation.

3 The next thing I'd like to think about is that there
4 is no difference between our line drawer and us. Once we
5 have hire our line drawer, that database that they keep
6 is our database. Whatever they're keeping, we own it.
7 That's our product, that's what comes in, and so I'd like
8 to think of the line drawer originally as it was
9 conceived in this line drawing as being more of, that's
10 one database that we're going to maintain through our
11 line drawer, and they're going to use it to help us put
12 together the maps that -- and iterations of the maps or
13 whatever you want to call them so that we can do the line
14 drawing

15 And then down under the data management piece that
16 we were looking at, we're also going to have to have our
17 own management system, whether it's through Airtable or
18 whatever proprietary software we choose to use, where we
19 convert things that don't fit, we always use our napkin
20 example, but also to just -- to make a -- have our
21 storage and have a place where we can query, and then our
22 line drawer -- we can use it with our line drawer or our
23 line drawer can come to it as well. So we're using both
24 our databases that we own.

25 Now we have this third component that our legal

1 team's going to have to tell us about, and that's whether
2 or not we have to post everything that comes out of the
3 COI tool, and that -- if that's the case, then we're
4 going to have to expand our system to be able to link a
5 lot of this information that our data manager's going to
6 take in and link it to our website so that we can let the
7 public see what's -- see their own posting, and then also
8 see what others are posting.

9 I think it's -- they're all part and parcel. I
10 think we're -- what we're talking about is just where
11 we're maintaining information and how much we're
12 maintaining there and that we're going to have to have
13 the system similar to the 2010, the system we had, but
14 significantly more sophisticated. Airtool -- Airtable
15 will give us that level of sophistication. But in the
16 end, we own everything that's in these two databases, and
17 that's -- and so they are part and parcel us.

18 The last thing I'd like to say is I don't know that
19 the Statewide Database is necessarily not going to store
20 all the stuff that comes off the COI tool. That's a
21 question that we have to ask them. I just remember in my
22 conversations that they were going to transfer that to us
23 because that was the only way that information was going
24 to be able to go public and the only way that people
25 would be able to see what they were going to do.

1 So I think that this -- we're -- what we want to do
2 and all the things we're talking about fit under this
3 diagram. It's just how much we're going to have to do on
4 the data management end ourselves, and that will be
5 directly affected by what our legal team tells us we have
6 to post. That's all.

7 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that, Director
8 Claypool.

9 Commissioner Akutagawa.

10 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think, Director Claypool,
11 that was actually very, very helpful. I think the only
12 thing that I would just then add is my understanding
13 about all of the data, including the COI tool data, and
14 it -- and I think this is what Commissioner Turner is
15 still saying, that all of the data would be collected in
16 one place so that analysis could take place, and I think
17 that's similar to what Commissioner Yee was also saying,
18 but it sounds like the Statewide Database is still going
19 to hold the data. I mean, it's not like they're just
20 going to get rid of it once they turn it over to us, but
21 my understanding was that it would all be consolidated
22 into one major place so that we would have everything
23 together so that there would be other data analysis that
24 could be conducted, whether it's by the line drawer or
25 whoever else, whether it's us our whoever else would need

1 to look at it.

2 CHAIR LE MONS: I guess I want to have a clarity
3 point on that. So Commissioner Yee and Commissioner
4 Akutagawa just mentioned this idea of all in one place,
5 and I think when I'm talking about it, I'm talking about
6 it more about accessibility as opposed to whether or not
7 it all sits in one bucket or multiple buckets. So I
8 think that that might be an important clarity point.

9 With what Director Claypool just said, it sounds
10 like it's able to sit in any number of buckets, all the
11 buckets we own, and it doesn't have to "sit in one
12 bucket", and that's what the one place, is the one bucket
13 that I'm pushing back on. Like, does any number of
14 buckets it might be, they're all our buckets, but we
15 should be able to access them in direct access whenever
16 we want to.

17 So I am adding to the list, Commissioner Sadhwani
18 and Commissioner Ahmad, and I will go to Commissioner
19 Fornaciari.

20 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So a couple things. First
21 of all, it's all just data, right? It doesn't matter,
22 it's all data; it's all ones and zeros. If we can build
23 a database that's going to intake, you know, something
24 written on a piece of paper, you know, we can build a
25 database to store all the data from the COI tool, okay?

1 It's not a big stretch to do all of that and have it
2 all in one place. And if it's not all in one place,
3 that's fine too, but we are -- we do need to remember
4 that, you know, we need to in some way review all that
5 COI data, make sure it's all valid data, make sure, you
6 know, we want to use it. We have to -- I imagine there's
7 probably some analysis we want to do on that data. So
8 you know, I think from a convenience standpoint, it would
9 be better if it was a database that was managed by us,
10 but it could be more than one database as long as we all
11 had access to it.

12 But I just -- the point I want to make though is,
13 you know, I think we're on the right path here. I think
14 hiring a person, a data management person is the right
15 answer, and that person, you know, if they can build the
16 database that we were talking about, they can build
17 another database or the same database to store all the
18 data from the COI tool, and then we would be able to mine
19 that data and ask access that data in a pretty
20 straightforward way.

21 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay.

22 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I didn't want to -- I don't
23 want to complicate things, but I was thinking in -- I'm
24 thinking on the back end when we're -- this process is
25 coming to a close and where do we put that data. That's

1 the same issue that the census is having a conversation
2 around right now with their big tool and all the
3 information they collect with the SwORD tool. And so I
4 don't know if it makes sense for staff to speak with
5 census, see where they're falling on -- in that, and we
6 piggyback on that contract or whatever, but again, this
7 is where the census is behind us, but there may be some
8 linkages on how we do this type of connecting.

9 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen.

10 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, thanks. I wasn't sure I
11 was on the list. Thank you, Director Claypool. I think
12 you put things in very, very, very concise order. And
13 Commissioner Fornaciari, you're absolutely right; this is
14 all data. And so the only thing that I -- my preference
15 would be on that little -- you know, on our chart, our
16 bubbles is I believe the COI tool, which is the blue, as
17 it drops down, that entire rectangle below it should be
18 orange, which means it first comes -- oh, I'm --
19 everything from Statewide Database, COI tool correctly
20 comes to us, and then we with can ship off all the GIS to
21 our line drawer that we went, and then we have the -- we
22 have it so the -- it's exactly as Commissioner Fornaciari
23 said and Director Claypool said.

24 Basically, we need to, at some point, figure out
25 all -- are the COIs are legitimate, they're not, how they

1 fit together, that sort of thing. That analysis part has
2 to happen. It would be easier if we just -- you know,
3 it's all in one. We don't need to actually get it
4 delivered over to us from a contractor. So -- but we're
5 only taking a small portion of that COI tool information
6 that we would then continually use, which I believe would
7 be the PDFs, and the GIS essentially would be -- we'd
8 send off to the line drawers because they need it to
9 draw, and I believe that's the only distinction here, and
10 it is very straightforward.

11 The Airable, whatever, could put all this
12 information together. It's -- I believe it all works
13 together very well. This is not as complicated as we're
14 all sort of seeming to make it. And as far as the line
15 drawing, I'm tying it back now to what we need for the
16 line drawing RFP, is the line drawer would indeed be
17 responsible for collecting all the GIS files, whether
18 they be from us, from the -- say, hey. Make sure the
19 Statewide Database -- make sure that you are sending us
20 the files. They can do that however the Commission
21 decides, and then they will help us along the way.

22 You know, they're collecting that information. If
23 we want the line drawer to help us put -- do a little
24 coding to help us put this -- the COI tools on a symbol
25 of the State of California and put little dots in it

1 where they are, we can do -- have them ask as
2 specifically, can you write that little program for us,
3 and they can do that. GIS, what we know, it will just
4 repopulate. That part could be on our website. That --
5 that's a separate item.

6 And then the other item would be would we like to
7 have full maps. Before we do any line drawing, we'd like
8 to see everything, and the line drawer could indeed pull
9 this information together and put it on a map. Then we
10 would post what that map looks like on our website. So
11 I -- that's the information I think that we need from the
12 line drawer, and I don't believe that -- then how we do
13 the data management, how it all fits together, the people
14 inputting it into the Airtable, I think is totally
15 consistent, and then we analyze it. And I don't believe
16 there's any confusion in that in terms of who is
17 responsible for what. I think that's kind of a very
18 clear delineation.

19 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that, Commissioner
20 Andersen.

21 Commissioner Sadhwani next. I -- I do have a
22 question I'd like to insert in here because it's directed
23 to the subcommittee of Andersen and Sadhwani. So
24 Commissioner Andersen just laid out clarity, yet it feels
25 like the subcommittee doesn't have what it needs to move

1 forward with the RFP. So if between the two of you, if
2 you could help us understand what you really need us to
3 do so that you indeed have clarity, because it doesn't --
4 on one hand, it's illustrated as it's very clear and it's
5 very simple and it's just data, but then on the other
6 hand it's, we still need checked boxes, boxes checked
7 that aren't checked, and we still have discussion to have
8 to get clear on getting you where you want to go.

9 So of course, please make whatever comments around
10 the data and all that stuff that we're talking about now,
11 but if you could really help guide this discussion toward
12 getting the clarity you need to move forward so that you
13 can get your RFP completed and ready, would be wonderful.

14 So Commissioner Sadhwani.

15 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. I see
16 Commissioner Andersen raising her hand, and I have to say
17 actually when Director Claypool kind of laid out the line
18 drawers are part of the Commission, the COI tool data can
19 go directly to the line drawers, and they can help manage
20 all of this for us, and yet that is our proprietary data,
21 we will hold it, that made a lot of sense to me, but I'm
22 wondering if -- I can give me time back to Commissioner
23 Andersen.

24 I do still have a couple other thoughts, but I
25 actually didn't understand what you just said,

1 Commissioner Andersen. You were talking about we would
2 take the data, and then we will give to the line drawer.
3 That's very different from what Director Claypool had
4 actually just said. So maybe you can clarify that.

5 My understanding was aligned with what Director
6 Claypool had just said previously, that the COI tool data
7 would go to our line drawer, they would organize this
8 database on our behalf, we would own that database, and
9 we would need to come up with some plan at the end of
10 this entire process for that data to be stored for public
11 record, right? But if that's not -- if that is not what
12 you had just said, then if you could please clarify.

13 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you,
14 Commissioner Sadhwani, for putting it like that. I --
15 obviously, it wasn't clear what I said, and what I -- my
16 point is absolutely, the GIS data, that is indeed going
17 over to our line drawer who will be storing all of it for
18 us. My delineation here is I want to make sure that
19 we're not saying, and the line drawer is going to take
20 all the PDFs and put those into a data management system
21 for us so that they -- that the line drawer is now
22 managing a whole bunch of data, which really they're not
23 going to be using for their line drawing purposes.
24 That's really only for us. That's the delineation.

25 So you know, and that's why I said if maybe -- if

1 they -- if the download pack that comes from the COI, if
2 it came through us, we pull the PDF out, sent the rest to
3 the line drawer, if that was the cleanest, otherwise,
4 it's the other way around. It goes from the Statewide
5 Database to the line drawer, they pull the PDFs out and
6 send them to us, but what I don't want is I don't want
7 the line drawer now having to manage a bunch of
8 information that we -- we are -- only we're using,
9 they're not going to be using at all. So that was --

10 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I --

11 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That was the --

12 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I see. Chair Le Mons, may
13 I --

14 CHAIR LE MONS: Yeah, absolutely. Absolutely.

15 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. So that makes
16 perfect sense actually in one -- in the delineation of
17 PDFs. So I think the piece then that will need to be
18 determined at some point in time, and it doesn't
19 necessarily need to impede the RFP moving forward, is
20 where we will take the -- those PDFs and who will
21 actually be putting them onto the website and how we will
22 have the web capacity to store that much information,
23 because it will potentially be a whole lot.

24 So I would perhaps ask Director Ceja to assist us
25 with that piece as it relates to the website. I believe

1 Marian had previously said to us that yes, indeed, if we
2 receive COI maps, they need to be made publicly
3 available, they are public comment, and as with all
4 public comment, we have to make that available.

5 So that is a piece that we will have to decide, and
6 I think, to me, the cleanest way is if the Statewide
7 Database, if it's possible for them to create two places,
8 rights, that they're sending PFDs in one direction and
9 the shapefiles from GIS to our line drawer directly, that
10 would make perfect sense.

11 My other point that I originally wanted to make,
12 however, was actually going to back to something
13 Commissioner Fornaciari had mentioned about the data
14 manager, that that individual who will -- who we would
15 hire to help manage that anecdotal data coming in,
16 perhaps using Airtable or something else like it, I
17 actually -- you know, Commissioner Fornaciari and I had a
18 short conversation about this idea previously this week.

19 I think -- I just wanted to uplift this idea. I
20 certainly support the hiring of a data manager and
21 relating staff. If there's a need for students, for
22 people to input, I'm happy to help with that; I have
23 access to a whole lot of really great ones. But I think
24 the key piece is that person, that data manager, should
25 be at a high enough level to help us both coordinate with

1 the line drawer so that we can have -- ensure that
2 there's some connectivity between that anecdotal piece
3 and those shapefiles as well as have the ability to
4 provide some of this analysis.

5 I think that we can all envision a perfect world
6 where we're going to have a beautiful tool where we can
7 click on a map and we'll pull up all of the COI tool and
8 all of the anecdotal pieces and all of these things, and
9 I hope for 2030 that they are able to do that. You know,
10 I'm going to cross my fingers we can do it for 2020, but
11 if we don't get to that, I think we can still survive. I
12 think we can still move forward with our process and
13 utilize a lot of the information coming to us, and I
14 think making sure that that data manager has the highest
15 possible level of skills to help us facilitate that
16 process would be really important. So I think that the
17 hiring of that person is extraordinarily important for
18 that kind of (indiscernible).

19 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

20 We have about eight minutes before we're going to
21 break for lunch. I have a couple people in the queue,
22 Commissioners Ahmad and Turner. So I just want to have a
23 little time check there to give people a chance, and
24 Director Ceja.

25 So with that, Commissioner Ahmad.

1 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Pass.

2 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Turner.

3 COMMISSIONER TURNER: I'll pass.

4 CHAIR LE MONS: Director Ceja.

5 MR. CEJA: Awesome. Thank you. So as far as
6 capacity for the website to hold PDF documents, we have
7 unlimited capacity to hold documents. So we can do that.
8 As we're having this conversation, a little voice in my
9 head keeps ringing, and it's Commissioner Kennedy. I --
10 in previous conversations, he's told us that the
11 information that we get from COI tool and everything else
12 will have to go to the Commission itself, not necessarily
13 the line drawer, because you're going to be drawing the
14 lines, and the line drawer is simply going to be drawing
15 the lines based on whatever capacity you all decide the
16 lines should be. So that -- I just wanted to mention
17 that because that's stuck in my head.

18 And as far as the data manager, I completely agree.
19 I think that's a great idea because as I start to take
20 all the messages from online that come in with questions
21 or even public comment about where they want to see the
22 lines, will someone on staff be available to email back
23 and say, hey, thank you for your comment on you need to
24 keep Los Angeles together. What does that mean? Can you
25 draw it on this COI tool that we have on our website?

1 Who will be that person on staff to do that, to get more
2 precise information? And if a shapefile is the end goal,
3 that -- we need somebody on staff to be able to do that,
4 to take them there.

5 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Yee, then Director
6 Claypool.

7 COMMISSIONER YEE: Somehow I'm still not clear. So
8 the COI tool. Let's say in March we get 5,000 COI tool
9 submissions, and each of those submissions has a PDF file
10 and a shapefile. Who does what with that? You know, who
11 looks through those PDFs and figures out what part of the
12 state, you know, each one refers to and tags it for that
13 part of the state that it can be retrieved, when we get
14 to Fresno, here's all the Fresno submissions. Who
15 figures out whether 200 of them are actually identical
16 and were a form submission, and you know, still legit,
17 but we want to know that? You know, who does that level
18 of processing? Is that the data manager?

19 The shapefiles all go to the line drawer, we're
20 saying. What does the line drawer do with them? You
21 know, I mean, the line drawer acts in our -- on our
22 behalf, so they get these 5,000 shapefiles and does what
23 with them, with the raw data? You know, I don't
24 understand. I mean, yeah, it's easy for them because
25 they speak the same shapefile language, but you know, the

1 line drawer acts on our behalf, right?

2 So it's like, there's a level of analysis and
3 processing there that need to happen that isn't the line
4 drawer's responsibility, I don't think. So I'm still
5 confused at -- sorry. Was I on mute for all of that?
6 No.

7 CHAIR LE MONS: No, no.

8 COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. So that's all. Still
9 confused.

10 CHAIR LE MONS: Director Claypool.

11 MR. CLAYPOOL: So similarly to the way the line
12 drawer will take in your a data at a public meeting and
13 it'll get coded there as being in Fresno at this time,
14 this person, and will take information, I was under the
15 impression that what the COI -- what the Statewide
16 Database was asking us when we were asking for the things
17 that we wanted people to fill in was that was some -- a
18 perfected measure of COI -- of coding so that it can also
19 be brought in in the same way and attached to Fresno,
20 what's your -- where's your neighborhood, you know, the
21 rest of that so that they would be bring it in the same
22 way and use it in the same way. We have this many
23 statements about Fresno, and it -- you know, and it
24 looks -- the COI information looks like this. So that's
25 the -- was my understanding of the way the COI would come

1 in.

2 Who stores it and who looks at it? Well, the data
3 manager's going to have a team of either students or
4 whomever is going to be doing this work. To Director
5 Ceja's question, if there's additional information that
6 needed to be taken in, I would assume that that person
7 handling it, that one point would say, I don't have
8 enough here, and the data manager would tell that person,
9 you know, send an email back and ask them if they can
10 give you additional information.

11 So I see the data management as being in that vein
12 of managing that data, making sure that it comes to some
13 form that can be utilized by our line drawer and by this
14 Commission as you're making your decisions. It's a
15 little bit more, to Commissioner Sadhwani's statement,
16 that then we would also ask this person to be an analyst
17 as well. It's going to have to be an awfully specialized
18 person. I'm not sure if that's a separate thing that we
19 would -- might -- we might want or whether we can get
20 somebody who can encompass that many talents, but that's
21 my statement on that.

22 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa.

23 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes. Thank you, Director
24 Claypool. That was what I was also thinking about. I
25 think along the lines of what Commissioner Yee was

1 saying, again, I just want to say when we first enacted
2 this subcommittee, and I'm only speaking upon this
3 because I was the chair at the time, that was my
4 understanding, what Commissioner Yee expressed.

5 Director Claypool, this is also partially based on
6 our conversations about the reams of data that the 2010
7 Commission received. I think we've already talked about
8 just, you know, the differences between what we have and
9 what they had, but I think either way, we're still
10 talking about what are we going to do with all this data,
11 not just collect it, but how do we process it in such a
12 way that we can use something out of that data, and
13 that's what I think us as a Commission needs. I mean,
14 we're not going to sort through all those, you know,
15 reams and reams of different kinds of data no matter how
16 it's going to be stored.

17 I do wonder though, based on what Director Claypool
18 just said, whether or not -- I know this complicates
19 things more, but my thought is that we do need somebody
20 who's going to be a little bit more capable of maybe some
21 level, I don't know if it's some level of analysis, but I
22 mean, we don't need just someone's who basically going to
23 make sure that our systems are maintained and that we
24 have the right database tool.

25 I think that -- the level of skill and I think

1 ability to think analytically and critically about what
2 the data is going to do is a different level of skill
3 than just somebody who is just going to make sure systems
4 are maintained. And while there may need to be then
5 maybe someone else that can provide more specialized
6 analysis, maybe this is coming back to the line drawer,
7 maybe that's where the line drawer will need to take part
8 in that more specialized analysis because they'll know
9 what to do with the data, but we will need somebody who's
10 going to be our data manager who is going to be, I think,
11 at a higher level of skill in terms of what to do with --

12 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that --

13 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- the data.

14 CHAIR LE MONS: -- Commissioner Akutagawa.

15 With that, we're going to break for lunch. Ponder
16 this discussion. We'll pick it up after lunch. If the
17 subcommittee on this item can walk us through the final
18 steps to make sure that they got what they needed from
19 this discussion before we go to public comment, that will
20 be great because we talked about a lot this morning, and
21 I'd like to -- I want -- I'd like to spend a few minutes
22 just wrapping this up before we go to public comment,
23 which is a little bit different, and we usually go right
24 to public comment, but I'd like them to be able to talk,
25 not only about this, but anything that's happened this

1 morning. So enjoy your lunch, and we'll see you all back
2 at 1:45.

3 (Whereupon, a recess was held)

4 CHAIR LE MONS: Hi. Welcome back, everyone. I hope
5 everyone had a really lovely lunch. Prior to us breaking
6 for lunch, I mentioned that we were going to do sort of a
7 summary and wrap-up of number 9 prior to going into
8 public comment. However, we will go directly into public
9 comment. I understand we have people queued up, and I
10 don't want to have the public wait any longer than
11 necessary, and we will then continue after that.

12 So Jesse, if you could introduce our first caller,
13 invite them in.

14 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: In order to maximize
15 transparency and public participation in our process, the
16 commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To
17 call in, dial the telephone number provided on the
18 livestream feed. The telephone number is 877-853-5247.
19 When prompted, enter the meeting ID provided on the
20 livestream feed. It is 93989466294 for this week's
21 meeting.

22 When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply
23 press pound. Once you have dialed in, you'll be placed
24 in a queue from which a moderator will begin unmuting
25 callers to submit their comment. You will also hear an

1 automated message to press star 9. Please do this to
2 raise your hand indicating you wish to comment.

3 When it is your turn to speak, the moderator will
4 unmute you, and you will hear an automated message that
5 says, "The host would like you to talk", and to press
6 star 6 to speak. Please make sure to mute your computer
7 or livestream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion
8 during your call. Once you're waiting in the queue, be
9 alert for when it is your turn to speak, and again,
10 please turn down the livestream volume.

11 These instructions are also located on the website.
12 The Commission is taking public comment at this time.

13 Good -- good afternoon, caller. Could you please
14 state and spell your name for the record, please?

15 MS. BEDY: Yes. My name is Sarah Bedy, that's
16 S-A-R-A-H, and my last name is Bedy, B-E-D-Y.

17 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. Your time
18 begins now.

19 MS. BEDY: Thank you. Good afternoon. My name is
20 Sarah Bedy, and I'm a resident of Long Beach. I'd like
21 to thank the Commission for hearing my comment.

22 Politically, demographically, and legally, Long
23 Beach is an integrated part of LA County and very
24 different from Orange County. I am alarmed to hear that
25 your Commission is considering separating Long Beach from

1 the rest of LA County for the purpose of your outreach
2 efforts and instead including it with Orange County.
3 This outreach plan, if enacted, would diminish Long Beach
4 residents' participation and representation in a process
5 that is supposed to increase accurate representation for
6 each community.

7 Lumping us with a different county would inherently
8 create bureaucratic challenges in coordinating
9 communication, outreach, and engagement, thus decreasing
10 participation and awareness by the people of our
11 community. We are nearly half a million people who
12 deserve full knowledge of an engagement in this process.
13 Please do not marginalize our diverse, vibrant city.
14 Ensure that Long Beach is included with LA County, where
15 we truly are, in your Commission's outreach effort so
16 that those efforts are efficient and inform and engage
17 the people you are hoping to reach. Thank you for the
18 important work you're doing on behalf of Californians.
19 That concludes my comment.

20 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Ms. Bedy.

21 Jesse, do we have other callers?

22 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We do, Chair.

23 CHAIR LE MONS: Continue.

24 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Caller, if you could
25 press star 6 to unmute yourself, please. Caller with

1 phone number ending in 6337, could you -- could you --
2 oh. Please state --

3 MS. GOLD: Yes, hi. This is Rosalind Gold,
4 R-O-S-A-L-I-N-D, and the last name is Gold, G-O-L-D, and
5 I'm with the NALEO Educational Fund. And I understand
6 that matters related to the outreach and the really
7 thoughtful strategy map that the Commission put together,
8 the drafts are going to be discussed later today. I
9 wasn't sure whether there would be another public comment
10 period available before that discussion starts. So I
11 just wanted to ask the Commission whether now would be a
12 good time to share our organization's comments on that
13 draft strategy map, or should I wait to closer time when
14 that discussion is forthcoming?

15 CHAIR LE MONS: Ms. Gold, proceed.

16 MS. GOLD: Great. So I first of all wanted to let
17 the commission know that together with Advancement
18 Project California, NALEO Educational Fund cocoordinates
19 a working group of advocates, community-based
20 organizations, civil organizations that are working to
21 ensure that redistricting is accessible to all of
22 California's diverse communities and that this working
23 group will be getting a letter to the Commission,
24 probably by first thing tomorrow morning, that is going
25 to provide our perspectives with respect to the outreach

1 strategy map. So I just wanted to highlight the fact
2 that that letter is forthcoming.

3 I would like to use this time now to speak just in
4 my capacity as NALEO Educational Fund to highlight some
5 of the issues that have occurred to us as we have looked
6 at the strategy map, which again, was very thoughtful and
7 thorough.

8 So first of all, in proposed action 1 in the
9 strategy map, the Commission proposes asking staff to
10 develop a grantmaking structure to fund "local groups".
11 Now, we know there's going to be more discussion on the
12 grantmaking later, but again, we just wanted to highlight
13 the fact that as you think about grantmaking, you
14 shouldn't necessarily frame it as just funding local
15 groups because it's vague, and it could exclude funding
16 for statewide or regional efforts that are in fact
17 working with local partners. Perhaps a term like local
18 initiatives, local efforts, right?

19 We also explicitly suggest that the Commission
20 explicitly require these initiatives to target
21 underrepresented communities, particularly those
22 communities or regions where there are not a lot of
23 outreach, engagement, or activation initiatives going on.

24 And you know, the scope of work or related documents
25 for that type of work with local groups should also

1 specify that grant recipients have to demonstrate that
2 they have worked closely with and are trusted by their
3 target communities and have the linguistic and cultural
4 competency needed to reach and engage their targeted
5 communities. And then there should be some language
6 strongly encouraging those grantees, local grantees or
7 whoever the grantees are, to coordinate their efforts
8 with existing statewide and regional initiatives.

9 Going on to the size of the grants, the strategy map
10 indicates that the size of the Commission grants are to
11 be determined. We actually think the best solution to
12 have investing in a way that will have an impact is to
13 maybe have different tiers of grants. Maybe a tier of
14 small grants that would help those groups that just need
15 funding to buy us -- to rent space to hold a workshop or
16 just need funding for a quarter-time staffer to help them
17 coordinate or do their redistricting work. But then
18 maybe there could be a tier of larger grants to help with
19 larger scale campaigns or collaborative initiatives.

20 And I just want to emphasize again that the
21 Commission should assess the extent to which providing
22 resources to a regional philanthropic organization or
23 collaborative would be another effective approach.

24 Ultimately, our bottom line is there is not a
25 one-size-fits-all approach grants -- to these grants, and

1 there needs to be flexibility in the types of activities
2 and the types of entities that the grants would be
3 funding. And that we also think that the Commission
4 should assign the task of determining the tiers and
5 activities which will be funded to an appropriate
6 existing committee.

7 Okay. Proposed action 2, which is the use of
8 outreach budget funds, we wanted -- hope that in your
9 discussion that you clarify more about some of the line
10 items as to what they mean, what do engagement tools
11 civic tech, communities sharing their input mean, what is
12 intended by collateral, and we are also interested in
13 learning about whether the costs of the community of
14 interest platform that the Statewide Database has
15 developed is included in the foregoing costs or is
16 covered by another line item in the budgets.

17 And another very important recommendation for us is
18 we would really like to know where the funding in the
19 outreach budget or other part of the Commission's budget
20 is for translation services. We strongly recommend that
21 the Commission include a separate line item in its budget
22 that is specifically allocated and earmarked for
23 translation services.

24 The Commission has also recommended putting together
25 what they call a community communications advisory group.

1 We just want you to take some key points under
2 consideration as you think about how to make this group
3 effective while not also adding another layer of
4 bureaucracy or a large, unmanageable dialogue to your
5 work. You know, can grantees and should grantees or
6 potential grantees be part of the advisory group? Should
7 there be subcommittees, you know, thinking about the
8 Census Counts structure, is that a good structure for
9 this particular -- by the way, we're not necessarily
10 suggesting it is. It's just something that should be
11 thought about where you have subcommittees focusing on
12 specific ethnic, cultural, linguistic groups. And what
13 is going to be the time commitment and work expectations
14 for members of the advisory group?

15 And we know it's at least previously recommended,
16 that the Commission establish a language accessibility
17 advisory committee and accessibility advisory committee
18 for persons with disabilities. So we want to -- we would
19 like you to think about if you're going to also create a
20 community communications advisory group, like, how are
21 you going to integrate what the language accessibility
22 advisory committee does and the persons with disability
23 accessibility advisory committee does with the work of
24 the group, of the community group, if there is a separate
25 community communications group.

1 So bottom line, we just want to make sure that also
2 as the Commission develops any materials, that it has
3 really good two-way relationship with these groups that
4 represent underrepresented communities and that there
5 should also be a disability accessibility component from
6 the very beginning baked in to how the community
7 communication advisory group operates.

8 In the background section, of the -- right after
9 proposed actions on page 2, the Commission has set forth
10 certain goals, and our concern is that under these goals,
11 there is one or two references to "metrics", and we
12 really again want to emphasize that we have concern about
13 trying to quantify what impact you want to have the
14 Commission reach. Certainly, quantifying deliverables
15 from grantees or quantifying what you would like them to
16 do in terms of activities makes sense, but quantifying
17 impact is much more difficult. And again, there's going
18 to be flexibility needed in those metrics, and this is
19 very consistent with our recommendations for a broad
20 range of activities and tiered dollar amounts for the
21 grants.

22 And secondly, as you think about how money is going
23 to be allocated and what your deliverables and goals are
24 for particular areas in the state, think about the fact
25 that we might need more extensive and intense engagement

1 efforts for areas that are densely populated,
2 demographically diverse, geographically remote, or have
3 experienced significant demographic changes.

4 We also suggest that later on when you talk about
5 accessibility considerations, as you identify -- you've
6 identified a lot of really important barriers, we'd
7 recommend that you include socioeconomic and job-related
8 constraints as part of those barriers that make public
9 participation and engagement challenging, and we actually
10 see some redundancy in those factors. I think, like,
11 technology and mobile device access could be combined
12 into one category.

13 Okay. Moving on to the really thoughtful proposed
14 strategy map matrix, we just were hoping that in your
15 matrix on page 4 when you think about getting ready in
16 December, that there is envisioning some kind of role for
17 an expert on talking points. We'd like to understand
18 exactly what the role of the expert on talking points
19 would be and what kind of entity would take on this role.
20 You know, for example, is the Commission envisioning
21 securing a contractor, what would the role of the
22 contractor be, would it be different from the role
23 Commission's communications staff or other commission's
24 contractors? So we would just like to clarify what that
25 "expert on talking points" would be.

1 Also under potential tools for outreach engagement
2 phase, which is on page 6, the Commission appears to
3 envision some kind of online academy, train the trainers
4 on how to use the COI tool, and then the language says,
5 "Community group may be doing this". Now, we again feel
6 there needs to be clarification of these academies, okay?
7 First of all, we don't know whether it's a typo, but it
8 almost seems like is there some vision of one community
9 group rather than a large number of community groups
10 conducting these academies?

11 Also, given the Statewide Database's role in
12 developing and beta testing the COI tool, we think the
13 commission should explicitly indicate that the Statewide
14 Database should be actively involved in developing the
15 content and format of the academies, but that certainly
16 the -- there -- we know that community groups are
17 intending to develop, train the trainers, and online
18 capabilities of these types of academies, and we will be
19 working with the Statewide Database. So you know, any
20 clarification that you might think might be needed for
21 this purpose would be helpful.

22 Finally, in the reflection phase, in the purpose of
23 the reflection phase, it says, "The Commission indicates
24 that the purpose is to present draft maps based on
25 initial input and available data to receive community

1 reflections". We would hope there would be some
2 clarification of whether this is draft -- present draft
3 maps, meaning draft maps of actual districts, are these
4 going to be visualizations, are those going to be draft
5 community of interest maps? I think that's another area
6 where clarification would be helpful.

7 So I know this has been a lot of things to say. I
8 did just want to get these points out there before you
9 started your later discussion this afternoon. I'd be
10 happy to take any questions, or if you would like me to
11 call in at a later time, please let me know.

12 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that, Ms. Gold. I do
13 want to remind, public comment is two to three minutes.
14 I did let you go on, but in the future, if you have that
15 kind of substantive response, if you wouldn't mind
16 putting that -- those comments in writing and sending
17 them in, that would be awesome. You can feel free to
18 call back if you like. Unfortunately, we won't be
19 entertaining any questions at this time. Thank you so
20 much for your comments, Ms. Gold.

21 MS. GOLD: Just very quickly, there will be some
22 form of this -- these recommendations that will be in
23 writing. It's just unclear who it will be coming from.
24 So you will be having this in writing. Thank you for
25 your patience, and yes, I -- point well taken on keeping

1 comments short.

2 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you so much.

3 Jesse, do we have any other callers in the queue?

4 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We do, Chair, one more
5 caller.

6 CHAIR LE MONS: If you'd invite them in, please.

7 MS. MORALES: Good afternoon, Commissioners. My
8 name is Margo Morales. I'm a resident of Long Beach. I
9 also hoped to be there as part of the Commission. I'm
10 one of the -- was one of the final six --

11 CHAIR LE MONS: Sounds like we've lost Ms. Morales,
12 Jesse.

13 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I think we have her back.

14 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay.

15 MS. MORALES: I'm back.

16 CHAIR LE MONS: Wonderful. Great.

17 MS. MORALES: I'm back. I'm not sure at what point
18 I got muted. My name is Margo Morales. I am a resident
19 of Long Beach. Congratulations on your appointment. I
20 had hoped to be there as part of the Commission. I was
21 one of the final sixty candidates. But today, I am
22 calling as a representative of Long Beach. I'm
23 representing my fellow residents to speak against your
24 proposal that we be removed from the County of Long Beach
25 in your outreach regions and combined with the County of

1 Orange.

2 Long Beach, as the previous speaker said, is a very
3 diverse community, vibrant community. Our points of
4 interest are vastly different than those of the residents
5 of Long Beach (sic). To move us out of our county of
6 residence in Long Beach and move us into the adjoining
7 county would discount the voices of the residents of Long
8 Beach.

9 We have vastly different viewpoints on a multitude
10 of issues, and I believe to align us with Orange County
11 would also serve to disenfranchise our diverse population
12 and discourage their voices being heard, diluting the
13 comments that you hear from the residents of Long Beach
14 because they'll be overshadowed by those differing
15 opinions in the County of Orange.

16 So I really hope that you will take the time to
17 relook at that outreach effort and move us back into the
18 County of Los Angeles. I recognize Los Angeles is a very
19 large area, but actually, the comments that you're going
20 to receive from the residents of Long Beach will align
21 much more closely with those of the other residents of
22 Long Beach than they will at Orange County. Thank you
23 very much for your time today, and good luck with your
24 mission.

25 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Ms. Morales.

1 Was that our final call in the queue, Jesse?

2 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: There's one more caller,
3 Chair.

4 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Please invite them in.

5 MR. WAGAMAN: Hi. My name is Michael Wagaman,
6 W-A-G-A-M-A-N. I spoke to you previously about the COI
7 tool. I want to note that I'm calling in today as a
8 private citizen, and I am not calling as a representative
9 of the legislature or the Statewide Database, but that
10 said, since I'm somebody who knows about the tool, I did
11 want to say that first it is my understanding that the --
12 that the Statewide Database will of course continue to
13 keep the data collected, and it will not be deleting data
14 or throwing it away. What they also are going to be
15 doing is sending that data to you, and the question is,
16 what are you -- you going to do with at that point?

17 As Commission (sic) Andersen said, it's actually a
18 lot less complicated than it might feel, and as
19 Commissioner, I believe Fornaciari noted, it's really all
20 just data in different formats, and it's on purpose that
21 it's in different formats because different formats are
22 useful for different uses.

23 First, you're going to get what is basically a
24 table, and a table is a format that is friendly to doing
25 things like importing into software like the Airtable, I

1 think, discussed earlier by Commissioner Turner. That's
2 a format that's helpful to your data managers as it
3 allows them to do things like sort and aggregate and
4 analyze, speaking to some of the issues -- issues that
5 Commissioner Akutagawa was speaking to earlier.

6 Second, you're going to get a PDF. A PDF is a
7 format that's friendly to showing both the map and the
8 written narrative for a COI in the same place. That's a
9 format helpful to the public, as it lets them see both of
10 those pieces of data in one place without any specialized
11 software.

12 Third, you're going to get a shapefile. A shapefile
13 can be used with mapping software in the same way you are
14 going to have shapefiles for city and county boundaries
15 so that you can create all those different kinds of
16 geography equally. That's a format that will ultimately
17 be helpful to your line drawers because if the Commission
18 says, keep community of interest A whole, those line
19 drawers will then be able to instantly know that you're
20 saying we want these census blocks to be kept whole and
21 kept together in your maps.

22 As Commissioner Sadhwani identified, your task is
23 deciding which of these formats are going where and what
24 is done with them once they get there. Does the GIS file
25 need to be vetted before it goes to the line drawers, or

1 is it just transmitted directly? Do you want the line
2 drawer simply to have them available, or do you want them
3 to do additional work, like creating this pin map that's
4 been discussed? Because if you do, you need to put in
5 the RFP.

6 How do you want to provide public access to data
7 coming from the COI tool? Are you posting these
8 individual PDFs, the aggregate database, both? And as
9 Commissioner Yee noted, all of these decisions should be
10 treated in concert with all of your data streams. Are --
11 how are you posting public testimony applies not just to
12 the COI tool, but to emails, public hearings. How do you
13 want public testimony from all sources coded so that it
14 can easily be found, and you can find all the testimony
15 from Fresno, as Commissioner Yee referred to. That's
16 something your vendors from your data manager RFP are
17 going to want to know so they know how to bid properly.

18 And how do you want to make sure that testimony that
19 has maps gets in your system and has do you want to make
20 sure that testimony that doesn't have maps gets in your
21 system so that data flow isn't biasing your process and
22 your deliberations. Those are my comments. I hope
23 they're helpful to your deliberations, and thank you and
24 good luck.

25 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Mr. Wagaman.

1 Jesse?

2 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: There are currently no
3 callers in the queue, Chair.

4 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you so much.

5 Okay. We're going to return to our discussion on
6 item number 9. Before we jump in, I know there were two
7 outstanding -- at least two outstanding questions that we
8 wanted our counsel to address, if possible, and I know
9 she was going to bring back an answer after lunch.

10 So I wanted to go to Chief Counsel Marshall and
11 check in.

12 MS. MARSHALL: Yes. Good afternoon, everyone. Just
13 in brevity, in regards to an nonattorney for the Voter
14 Rights Act, any attorney, law firm, or legal entity in
15 our out of the State of California must be in good
16 standing with the California State Bar. There are
17 limited exceptions and various restrictions in regards to
18 the licensing requirement, but regardless of the status,
19 an attorney must be in good standing as determined by the
20 California State Bar.

21 And it's my opinion that it services the best
22 interest of the commission as well as the State of
23 California for us to have a California-licensed attorney.
24 And the thing about that, it's not an attorney that's --
25 that actually has to be here in California. It could be

1 an attorney anywhere throughout the United States, but
2 that could be part of the firm that has multi-
3 jurisdictional practice and that attorney in that
4 particular practice, whether they're here or in Kentucky,
5 they have licensure in California. So the language as it
6 stands is fine.

7 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that, Ms. Marshall.
8 And were you able to get any clarity for us as it relates
9 to our requirements with posting COI information as
10 public comment or any other public comment?

11 MS. MARSHALL: Well, in regards to COI, just my, you
12 know, preliminary response in terms of that, any COI
13 information pretty much is -- is -- any COI information
14 is public information. I think our big issue would be,
15 how are we going to frame that to release it? So it goes
16 back to data frame or how are we going to put it out
17 there, but I'm sure in any case, there may be some
18 exceptions, but in general, that information does need to
19 be released.

20 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Does anyone have any
21 questions for Ms. Marshall? Okay. With that, I'll turn
22 it back over to our subcommittee leads, Commissioner
23 Sadhwani and Andersen.

24 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. So I think Mr.
25 Wagaman who had called in presented quite well many of

1 the questions that had remained lingering for us.
2 Commissioner Andersen and I had a few moments to speak
3 during the lunch break. I think that she and I at least
4 are now on the same page, that there is clarity, that
5 there are some unanswered questions, but that doesn't
6 necessarily prevent the RFP from moving forward, but we
7 do need to make sure we're all on the same page, that you
8 know, the PDFs will have to go in one direction. The
9 other data will likely go to the line drawer.

10 The one piece Commissioner Andersen had raised in
11 our conversation at lunch, and please feel free to jump
12 in here if I mischaracterize it at all, is the extent to
13 which the Commissioners would want access to the COI maps
14 at some point in time in the shapefile format. So for
15 example, when these maps come in, if we are sending
16 directly to the line drawer who will compile them -- and
17 hopefully we will include in the RFP that that will be a
18 part of their responsibilities, that we would expect some
19 level of analysis, such as this pin map that has been
20 mentioned -- will -- is it the perspective of
21 Commissioners that they want to have access to seeing
22 those maps at any given point in time in their shapefile
23 format, or is access to the PDFs, which would be posted
24 online and is what the public would see, is that
25 sufficient, right?

1 And so I think she and I were using the example of,
2 okay. Say there's an area of California that you want to
3 give additional thought to or consideration of, you know,
4 on an off day which we're not in session, would you want
5 to be able to access those from a map or viewing the PDFs
6 alone would be sufficient? Knowing that, I think we can
7 look -- have a better idea of how to structure the RFP in
8 such a way, right? Are they creating a tool then that
9 anyone can access, or is it something that only they can
10 access? So you know, Saturday comes along, and you say,
11 let -- I really want to think more about Fresno, right,
12 would you all want to be able to pull that up and be
13 looking at it in some format beyond PDF?

14 Commissioner Andersen, did I accurately --

15 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Basically a -- make a little
16 simpler is if it's all with the line drawer and you say,
17 you know, boy. I -- you know, I didn't quite get all
18 that. What were they saying about that around Fresno?
19 I'd like to have a look at that, you would have to go --
20 if the -- if all those shapefiles with line drawer, you'd
21 have to go to the line drawer and say, hey. Could you
22 show me that, please? Instead of, if it's with our
23 database, and then we could say, oh, we could have a look
24 at it.

25 Now, this does not mean we're drawing any lines, any

1 district lines whatsoever. This is to review it in its
2 entirety for our own consideration. And I know I'm
3 personally a visual learner. When I need to cogitate,
4 think about something or other, possibilities, I like to
5 be able to see it. If we're only looking at individual
6 PDFs, that is not a conglomeration. It's not one map.
7 They're all individual little pieces. Like you're
8 looking at different pages in a book, as opposed to one
9 map and you can look at an area. So that is a
10 preference. And the only difference that would -- with
11 that is, in terms of are we -- it's, essentially, where
12 is data when? If it all comes into us and then, rather
13 than taking all of that and fold it over to the line
14 drawers, do we have it such that we can access it,
15 versus -- and the line drawers would have a one clean
16 copy that they would use and would never -- it's a -- it
17 might be a little cleaner as I'm trying to say. It's
18 just a question of storage space.

19 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that.

20 Commissioners, I do have a question regarding that.
21 Commissioner Andersen, in that example that you gave, are
22 you envisioning -- you talked about conglomerates. Are
23 you envisioning actually doing overlays of COIs and --
24 are you actually envision working in some software that
25 takes and combines these maps on your own, individually?

1 Or Commissioners, for that matter, doing that? Is that
2 what you're describing?

3 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: The idea is -- and I believe
4 for us to be able to follow along with the line drawing,
5 unless we're just looking at it strictly on a screen,
6 that we would, indeed, have it on our own computers. So
7 with that in mind, then we could look -- not draw -- we
8 could look -- well, we could draw whatever we wanted, but
9 you can't submit it -- you look at the conglomeration.
10 So yes, we would have a GIS software. It wouldn't be,
11 oh, I want to pull in my own or something. It would be the
12 same as the line drawers are using, is my --

13 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani?

14 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So I think this is where we
15 have a little bit of a separation in our view on this.
16 My sense, especially from the conversations that we had
17 with line drawers, is that it's probably in the best
18 interest that, as Commissioners, we do not have that
19 software in front of us. Though, that is a decision for
20 the Commission to make, but that it can become
21 extraordinarily confusing if we have access to that.
22 While we may make agreements not to draw our own lines,
23 that -- it opens up a Pandora's box, if you will. In my
24 mind, this question has to do with what kind of data
25 management the line drawer would create for us with this

1 whole pin map idea.

2 And again, I'll go back to my earlier comment that I
3 think, while -- while I certainly support additional
4 analysis, if it is feasible to do so in the time that we
5 have, right? We, hopefully, will have census data in a
6 few months and we will be starting this process in a few
7 months. I don't know how easy it is to develop such a
8 tool as we keep describing in that amount of time. So if
9 we can do it, great. But if we can't, we will -- we will
10 carry on even without it. So I mean, I would leave it
11 there. I -- you know, I think that for me, I don't
12 envision Commissioners, you know, using Maptitude or Esri
13 or one of the other mapping softwares on our own. But
14 that, of course, is a decision that the Commission needs
15 to make.

16 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. One thing to add in
17 that is, you know, when Commissioner Sadhwani was saying,
18 you know, to submit, there have been, like in Arizona,
19 certain commissioners were actually drawing. Hey, I
20 think we should do this, and then they would bring that
21 up on the map during line drawing process -- the actual
22 district line drawing process. That is not at all what
23 I'm talking about. I'm saying, the ability to -- you
24 know, we're looking at sections, we need to approach a
25 section, and we are, like say Fresno, we're -- you know,

1 how is Fresno fitting in with, you know, Stockton, say.
2 And that's anyways a jump, but -- and to look at what --
3 where are the COIs, where are they in this area? If we
4 wanted to think about that over the weekend, we would
5 have to ask -- the line drawers would have to come and
6 then pull that and then send it to us. So it would be
7 like an additional request, as opposed to us having to
8 look at it however we wanted. And it's a subtle
9 difference, in terms of -- and it really only has to do
10 with our -- it's the storage of the GIS, where is it
11 stored?

12 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

13 Commissioner Fornaciari?

14 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I guess that was going to
15 be my question. What would -- what's the difference --
16 specifically, what's the difference in the RFP between
17 your two options?

18 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.

19 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Or that where the
20 statement of work? I mean, specifically, what's the
21 decision you need and the difference?

22 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: There is very little
23 difference. As Commissioner Sadhwani, that's the -- oh,
24 the only thing is, in terms of there is a line. Do we
25 want the line drawer to be drawing the -- to doing the

1 quick code about sorting the PDFs? I'm sorry. About
2 having the PDFs represented as a dot on a symbol that --

3 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. That -- but that's
4 not -- I thought you were talking about Commissioners
5 having access to the shapefiles, which --

6 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That would not affect --
7 that would be -- that would not affect -- it's a question
8 of does the COI -- it's the only way it would affect what
9 the line drawer does, which is completely contained
10 already in the RFP, is where are they gathering those
11 files from? Are they getting them -- is the State -- are
12 the COI tool people are sending it directly to the line
13 drawer, or are they getting it from our website, or are
14 we sending it to them? That's the only difference, and
15 it's the same. You say -- you ask the line drawers to
16 gather that information, so --

17 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani?

18 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, I would just -- you
19 know, I am not a data storage person by any means, per
20 se. But I do think it's a little bit -- a little bit
21 more different than that.

22 If -- you know, Commissioner Andersen, if you wanted
23 to have access to this on a Saturday, then if the
24 shapefiles go directly to a line drawer, and let's say
25 they're being stored by the line drawer, then they would

1 have to be uploaded somehow, somewhere. Those
2 shapefiles, we're not talking about PDF -- shapefiles to
3 some sort of server that we all could access on a
4 Saturday, right? If not, then they could just be held
5 there. And it sounds like the Statewide Database is also
6 going to be holding another copy of them, right? So I
7 think it does have some greater -- some greater
8 components here, because it -- if we want them to be
9 accessible to us at any given point in time, and if you
10 want to have the same software as a line drawer, then we
11 need to think about then where is it -- what is the
12 server in which those are being stored on? How is it
13 that individual Commissioners are tapping into it, and
14 what is the cost of Commissioners to have access either
15 to GIS or to an actual mapping software package, so that
16 we can access all of that? So I think it's actually
17 adding a whole other component that we would need to
18 think about then.

19 The side for the Commissioners, we can work on that
20 separately, but we would still need to build into the RFP
21 what our expectations for the line drawer would be in
22 terms of where those document -- where those shapefiles
23 get stored and how they would make them publicly
24 accessible, or at least accessible to the Commission.

25 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fornaciari.

1 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So I'm just going to offer
2 this. I don't think we have to make that decision right
3 now. I think either way, it seems to me that the line
4 drawer has to have the capability to store the data
5 files. If we decide, at some point as Commissioners,
6 that we want to have access to the data, then -- I mean,
7 then we can decide to have that data also be on our
8 servers and have access to our servers, for instance. Or
9 we can decide down the road. But either way, the line
10 drawer has to have the capability to store and manage all
11 that data. And so I think there are two separate
12 questions. The one about us having access, we can figure
13 that out later.

14 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Yee.

15 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. I'm trying to -- you know,
16 we haven't done this yet, so I'm trying to imagine how it
17 will actually feel and what I'll actually find myself
18 wanting when we get to this stage in the process. I
19 can't imagine that I'm going to want just raw shapefiles
20 without the accompanying commentary, and reasons that
21 people give for their maps, and why we should be on this
22 side of the freeway and not the other. I mean, just the
23 raw uncontextualized pile of shapefiles, you know, I'm
24 just not going to find that high priority to look at.
25 It's not really going to affect my thinking. I'm going

1 to look for those PDFs, look for that commentary. You
2 know, look for reasons that people are giving for the
3 shapes that they're drawing.

4 So I'm still a little confused why the shapefiles at
5 the line drawer -- I mean, what we're going to do with
6 them. I mean, the line drawer can conglomerate them and
7 show us kind of a heat map of areas that people are
8 commenting a lot about. But in terms of actually making
9 decisions, or you know, wanting to look at them on a
10 Saturday, I just don't find myself imagining that I'm
11 going to want to do that.

12 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

13 Commissioner Akutagawa, then Sinay, then Vazquez.

14 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I want to just echo what
15 Commissioner Yee just said and just one other additional
16 thought. I think what I may be hearing from Commissioner
17 Sadhwani is, I think from a RFP perspective, if I were
18 the line drawer, I think that there's going to be a cost
19 difference. Because if fourteen Commissioners have
20 access to this data and I'm getting input from fourteen
21 different people, it's going to create more time, more
22 sorting, more communication, more everything. And I'm
23 sure they're probably going to have to, like, account for
24 all of that time that, as they're getting input from
25 potentially all of us, I would -- though, I would echo

1 what Commissioner Yee said. I can't imagine myself just
2 looking at the raw data files. I would want the
3 additional commentary and the other suggestions. And so
4 I think that -- I think we should take that into account
5 that likely, if a line drawer is looking at the idea that
6 we're going to have access to this, they may want to
7 increase their cost, because there's going to be more
8 time.

9 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

10 Commissioner Sinay.

11 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I did attend the national
12 conference, the State legislature webinar that's -- its
13 recording on data management and software. And this is a
14 critical question that they say you need to figure out
15 is. Because if all of us are going to have access to all
16 of that, that's a huge cost, because you have to buy
17 certification for everybody who's going to have it. So
18 that's a real -- it's an increase, so the cost is a
19 factor. And I also liked what Commissioner Yee said, is
20 we're not here to just draw lines and look at just
21 numbers to draw the lines. We're here to draw lines
22 based on numbers and community input. And so we do -- it
23 is required -- it is a requirement that we put a face on
24 the map.

25 And so if you're just getting shapefiles without the

1 narrative, that's not what we were asked to do. And
2 finally, we've really been asked to do this collectively.
3 And so there may be things we want to look at
4 individually, but that's not what we were asked to do.
5 We were asked to really struggle and work on this
6 together. And so if you're interested in Fresno, great.
7 You should get to know Fresno more. But maybe it's a
8 demographics and other things that you need to be looking
9 at, so that you're better prepared, so that we,
10 collectively, work on the maps.

11 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you Commissioner
12 Sinay.

13 Commissioner Vazquez.

14 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I very much agree with
15 Commissioner Sinay's last point. I will say, and I am
16 very happy to be corrected on this point, but I seem to
17 remember in one of the initial presentations on the COI
18 tool that there is, basically, like a notes section of
19 the shapefiles that will include the text of the
20 narrative in the shapefiles. Because that's also how --
21 my understanding is, that is also how the line drawers
22 are going to be -- that's data that also gets
23 incorporated and they need to be able to reference that
24 in real time when they're responding to our, like, hey,
25 we've moved the line here. So I guess, at least as we're

1 considering this, that it's not just a shapefile. My
2 understanding is that that narrative, that qualitative
3 data, is associated with the shapefile and importable and
4 viewable in GIS software.

5 CHAIR LE MONS: Director Claypool.

6 MR. CLAYPOOL: So I'd like to go back to something
7 that our chief counsel had said earlier and also a
8 sense -- and Marian Johnston has also come in on and
9 basically said that under Government Code Section
10 8253(a)(2), all data considered by the Commission must be
11 made public. And so this means that our big database,
12 our data manager is going to have to handle all of the
13 information that we receive. In fact, it was -- the
14 opinion of our counsel that, as soon as the COI data is
15 received by the Commission, all that data must be posted
16 and made available to the public. So to start with,
17 we're going to have to have a data management system that
18 can handle all of the data. And that's something that I
19 had mentioned to start with.

20 The second thing I think is very important was what
21 Mr. Wagaman had said. I think it was kind of
22 instructive. This COI tool has been set up with, one, a
23 table that could be imported into an Airtable, two, a PDF
24 that the public can see and be put in one place. And
25 three, a shapefile that's going to be made -- going to be

1 needed by the line drawer. This COI tool is set up by a
2 line drawer to accommodate this Commission in all the
3 ways that it needs to be accommodated. And so I think
4 that it sets up nicely. We're going to be able to post
5 all this information, because they've set up the PDF.
6 We're going to be able to sort it for the Commission when
7 they need it, because they've set up a table that will
8 transfer into the Airtable. And they've set up the
9 shapefile to transfer to the line drawer.

10 When we look at the two different systems, again
11 looking at more functional areas of this Commission,
12 rather than competing interests, I think that this can
13 set up very nicely to take care of all our needs with
14 what we're going to get from the COI tool, without
15 necessarily having to, maybe, go to a great deal of
16 expense or even over-thinking what we're trying to do
17 with it. That's all.

18 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you Director Claypool.

19 Commissioner Ahmad, then Commissioner Toledo.

20 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. I just
21 wanted to raise a piece about data integrity. So when I
22 think about myself as a private citizen submitting a
23 comment, where does that comment go? What is the path
24 that it travels to get into the final draft map? So the
25 more times that data piece is touched, whether it be by

1 the fourteen of us, whether it be by different data
2 management systems, the more chances there are for it to
3 be lost, for there to be errors within the coding, the
4 tagging, et cetera.

5 So I just wanted to lift that up and in the
6 conversation it seemed like, you know, we were trying to
7 pull a piece of information and send it to multiple
8 different places. So just something to consider. And
9 that's why we will have a data manager who will be an
10 expert in this process, who would be able to best advise
11 us on how to take that piece of information from a
12 community member into the pathway that would make it the
13 most effective in our conversations. Just wanted to
14 uplift that. Thank you for this conversation. It's
15 really exciting.

16 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.
17 Commissioner Toledo.

18 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. I've been thinking
19 about this. Once that data is transferred over to us, we
20 take ownership of that data, right? We will translate
21 whatever needs to be translated, we will analyze it, code
22 it the way we need it, and improve upon it, hopefully.
23 And to me it doesn't really matter whether the line
24 drawers have the data. It's our data and we should have
25 access to the data. Of course -- and what matters is

1 that the data -- you know, that they're securely -- that
2 the data's secure, that the data is -- that the data is
3 available to us. That the data's available to the public
4 in a manner that's meaningful and that we can
5 meaningfully use it when we need it. And so but overall,
6 I mean, we own the data; it's our data. And we'll have
7 to work with our data management team to ensure that it
8 can be used meaningfully to that -- you know, to the
9 extent that we need it. Thank you.

10 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

11 Commissioner Sadhwani, can we safely say that, based
12 on the conversation, you're understanding, coupled with
13 Commissioner Andersen's understanding, coupled with
14 Director Claypool's understanding, that you have what you
15 need to move the RFP forward?

16 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. And I might just
17 say --

18 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.
19 That was a direct question.

20 So Commissioner Sadhwani.

21 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, yes.

22 CHAIR LE MONS: Wonderful. So that was two yeses.
23 So with that, we're going to move on. Do we really need
24 anymore discussion on this, Commissioner Andersen?

25 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: One thing I believe is, it's

1 going to put everyone's mind at rest here.

2 CHAIR LE MONS: Let's not assume. I don't think no
3 one's mind is not at rest.

4 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, okay.

5 CHAIR LE MONS: We are where we need to be. We've
6 talked about this for quite some time. I think the yes
7 is what we really needed in this. So if you can hold
8 that, I mean, I'd really appreciate it. Because I'd look
9 to move the agenda forward.

10 Does anyone still need anymore commentary on this,
11 besides Commissioner Andersen?

12 So Commissioner Andersen, can we move forward? Yes?
13 Thank you.

14 So let's move on to agenda item number 10. And
15 that's going to be administrative policies that we need
16 to review and adopt. And we have two policies that are
17 being brought forward by Commissioners Fernandez and
18 Fornaciari.

19 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. The two proposed
20 policies that we have, that we sent out earlier or that
21 were posted are the communications protocol and also the
22 personnel policy, and so if you have any comments. We
23 are going to make a slight change to the personnel policy
24 under 3(a), because it talks about making the -- hiring
25 employees at public meetings. And then we actually go

1 into the process for the executive director, deputy
2 executive director. We're going to change that line to
3 just say the hiring of executive staff, because we really
4 don't know what the future may hold and we kind of wanted
5 to just make it more of a generic-type of statement, so
6 that we don't specify positions. But we're open to
7 feedback on the policies from the Commissioners and
8 staff.

9 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fornaciari.

10 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I just wanted to
11 say that for the personnel policy, you know, we had some
12 conversation about sharing the resumes with all of the
13 Commissioners for review. And you know, after getting
14 some feedback from Director Claypool and the legal team,
15 you know, there was some concern about sharing resumes
16 broadly.

17 So we're proposing here sort of a compromise
18 approach where once a candidate is selected by whoever is
19 going to be supervising them, that the resume and the job
20 description will be forwarded to the administrative --
21 finance and administrative committee for us to review.
22 For us to talk to the hiring manager and understand, you
23 know, what the decisions were. And that would happen
24 prior to these candidates being presented to the
25 Commission.

1 And then -- and then, you know -- so we would have
2 asked the questions we expect that the Commission would
3 be interested in and we could answer the questions that
4 the Commission has. But instead of, you know, making
5 resumes become public information, that the compromise
6 approach would be to have the subcommittee review the
7 candidates and then just be prepared for discussion with
8 the entire Commission.

9 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioners?

10 Commissioner Sinay.

11 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just in reading the employee
12 evaluation, at the very beginning it says we'll adopt
13 evaluation criteria for the executive director, and then
14 that there will be evaluation for the executive director.
15 Do we have a time frame? I mean, we're a very short-
16 lived group. But so we need, you know, just clarity on
17 that.

18 And then on hiring -- when it comes to firing, do
19 all firing -- this might have been in there and I missed
20 it -- but is all firing through the Commission, or can
21 the executive staff, you know, do firing of people that
22 they have hired on their own? And do we need to write
23 out in detail -- in more detail how the firing takes
24 place of the executive director, if need be? If it has
25 to happen.

1 CHAIR LE MONS: Director Claypool.

2 MR. CLAYPOOL: So I think we need to distinguish
3 between two different things here. There will be firings
4 where there's an adverse action with an employee, and
5 that has to occur with the Commission. There will be a
6 lot of staff that we bring on, particularly if we use the
7 student assistance, and we will just run out of money to
8 pay them on their thing. And so that would be an
9 administrative let go, if you will, of the staff and it
10 wouldn't be subject to this Commission. So it really
11 depends on the terms by which staff are moving on.

12 But for your principal staff, it would seem that
13 your Finance and Administrative Committee would always
14 have to be notified if somebody were -- if we were
15 letting someone go who had been more of a permanent staff
16 member, the circumstances under which it was occurring.
17 And then if it rose to that situation where we needed to
18 have a vote, then we could bring it to a vote. But so
19 it'll be situational, Commissioner.

20 COMMISSIONER SINAY: And is firing and dismissing
21 the same thing or legally, are they two different things?

22 MR. CLAYPOOL: In my mind, firing and dismissing are
23 the same thing. Because in my mind, you're letting
24 someone go that you brought in. Whereas, with something
25 like an RA that's running out time on their contract or

1 something like that, that's a different -- that's a
2 different circumstance. Or a contracted student whose --
3 there's no longer any money to pay them. But under any
4 circumstance, it should always go up through the Finance
5 and Administrative Committee, just to let them know
6 what's going on. So it wouldn't be -- it wouldn't be
7 without a notification.

8 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So yeah, just to clarify.
9 In section E we talk about dismissing/firing folks with
10 processes and the vote required. So if we decided that
11 we, as a Commission, wanted to terminate someone, it
12 would -- we would handle that in closed session and it
13 would require the majority vote.

14 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy. We can't hear
15 you, Commissioner Kennedy.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear you.

17 CHAIR LE MONS: No problem. While Commissioner
18 Kennedy gets his audio together, does anybody else that
19 has any comments regarding the two policies that are on
20 the floor?

21 I think we can hear you now, Commissioner Kennedy.

22 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. Sorry. On point
23 E, do they have the ability to request that we discuss
24 that in open session, or is that necessarily in closed
25 session?

1 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes. They do have the
2 ability to request that we do it in open session.

3 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. So that needs to be in
4 there. The one other comment that I would have on this
5 one is, even if only as a framework for future additions,
6 that it be reorganized slightly. So you would have
7 status, hiring, evaluations, firing. So just a logical
8 order to it. And then if other things get added, it can
9 still maintain a logical order to it.

10 CHAIR LE MONS: Are there any other comments or
11 suggestions or questions regarding the two policies on
12 the floor?

13 Commissioner Kennedy.

14 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I was just commenting on the
15 personnel policy. So on the communications protocol,
16 I -- in number 4, I think we're assuming that the
17 communications director is going to have time to read an
18 unknown quantity of incoming communications. And given
19 the massive amount of inbound communication that the 2010
20 Commission received, I'm not sure that that's realistic.
21 So I just want to flag that.

22 I'm wondering, 4(a), if we want to include the
23 deputy executive director in that group. In 4(a)(i), I
24 would say anything that is determined to be offensive or
25 threatening in any way would be reviewed only by the

1 chief counsel. I think that's one of the things that we
2 can say should just be with the chief counsel.

3 And then finally, on 4(b), again, you know, saying
4 two days, it's a nice aspirational goal. But I think
5 with the unknown quantity of inbound communications, two
6 days is probably unrealistic.

7 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

8 CHAIR LE MONS: Yes, continue. Go on, Commissioner
9 Fernandez.

10 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sorry about that. Yeah, I
11 can make the addition of the deputy executive director
12 and putting him in there. In terms of the communications
13 director, in terms of the responsibility for responding,
14 we could actually add "or designee". That way, when
15 someone else is hired, they can either -- it can be the
16 communications director, the staff, or they can split it
17 out. But I think that would answer or address your
18 concern, Commissioner Kennedy. So thank you for that.

19 And in terms -- I would have to ask Communications
20 Director Ceja, in terms of the ability to respond within
21 two business days; that was 4(b). And I do know that we
22 did forward it to him for review. I'm hoping, maybe, by
23 that time -- and when I say -- and when we put in there
24 respond, it could just be, thank you for your comment.
25 So I'm going to -- can I defer --

1 Chair Le Mons, can I defer to Communications
2 Director Ceja?

3 CHAIR LE MONS: Yes, please.

4 MR. CEJA: Yes, you're absolutely right. Every time
5 somebody contacts the Commission, whether social media or
6 website, it will set up automatic responses. Says, thank
7 you so much for your message. We'll make it a point to
8 get back to you in a timely manner. So that's the first
9 point of contact. And actually on social media, if you
10 don't do that you start getting dinged and your rating
11 starts falling as a page. So we definitely do want to do
12 those automatic responses.

13 But in terms of executing, like, a constituent case
14 or something, that might take a few days, depending on
15 what the matter is and who I need to forward it to. But
16 the first initial response should be automatic.

17 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa.

18 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I guess this question will
19 be directly to Director Ceja. Are you planning to hire,
20 like, any student interns or anyone like that that can
21 help you, you know, kind of be that first recipient of
22 the -- whether it's email, phone calls, you know, written
23 messages? Kind of like a legislative correspondent in
24 our House office or something like that?

25 MR. CEJA: So the communications manager should be

1 super helpful in that regard. I am open to getting
2 interns for design, for content creation. As far as
3 responding to online inquiries, I would like to keep that
4 within the staff, just so that it's more responsive and
5 there's some accountability. Because some of these
6 responses will require more than just an email back.
7 It's going to require forwarding it to the appropriate
8 person and figuring out who that is.

9 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fornaciari, did you
10 have something you wanted to add?

11 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: No.

12 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. So go ahead. No, yes? No?
13 Okay.

14 So with that, if we don't have any additional --
15 Ah, Commissioner Andersen.

16 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Back on number
17 1, the communication request from the Commission, we
18 definitely want it to go to the chair or the executive
19 director. But the individual designated by the
20 individual director, shouldn't that be "or chair"? And
21 where I'm thinking here is, we have a legal -- you know,
22 we're creating a legal subcommittee, in terms of the line
23 drawers. We're thinking about putting it -- there's a
24 designated Commissioner in there. So I just want to make
25 sure that the chair is involved in directing that

1 communication. It isn't -- it doesn't just go to the
2 executive director. So and I didn't know where it says
3 designee, is that -- was that what that was intending?

4 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm sorry. Which one were
5 you referring to? Was it number 1?

6 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Number 1.

7 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I mean, it has in there
8 chair and vice-chair already. So --

9 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right. But and then it
10 says, "or an individual designated by the executive
11 director". I believe it should be or chair. You have
12 designee, so I didn't know does designee mean the
13 executive director doesn't have to -- who could designate
14 a person? Is it only the executive director? That's the
15 way it reads right now, and I believe the chair should
16 have that prerogative, as well. And I -- like, you know,
17 parenthesis designee, and I --

18 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No. I got it. Thanks.

19 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.

20 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Are there any other comments,
21 Commissioners?

22 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I just --

23 CHAIR LE MONS: Yes, Commissioner Fornaciari.

24 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: We didn't completely
25 address Commissioner Sinay's question or comment on the

1 personnel policy. So we had talked about a annual
2 personnel review one year -- at one year after the hire
3 date. So yes. So for the executive director, we need to
4 adopt this policy and then I guess, it will be up to the
5 finance and administration subcommittee to work with the
6 executive director to develop this evaluation criteria
7 for the executive director, and then bring it to the
8 Commission for approval.

9 CHAIR LE MONS: So with that, can I invite a motion
10 from one of the Commissioners to approve -- well, an
11 emotion -- a motion. I guess I should just make one. So
12 can I invite someone to bring a motion forward?

13 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. I certainly will move
14 that we accept both -- that we accept both protocols --
15 the communication and the one that was submitted for the
16 personnel policy -- both policies.

17 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'll second.

18 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Let's go to public comment.

19 Jesse, you can read the instructions. Jesse?

20 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: In order to maximize
21 transparency and public participation in our process, the
22 Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To
23 call in, dial the telephone number provided on the
24 livestream feed. The telephone number is 877-853-5247.
25 When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on

1 the livestream feed. It is 93989466294 for this week's
2 meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply
3 press pound.

4 Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a
5 queue from which a moderator begin unmuting callers to
6 submit their comment. You will also hear an automated
7 message to press star 9. Please do this to raise your
8 hand, indicating you wish to comment. When it is your
9 turn to speak, the moderator will unmute you and you will
10 hear an automated message that says, "The host would like
11 you to talk" and to press star 6 to speak. Please make
12 sure to mute your computer or livestream audio to prevent
13 any feedback or distortion during your call.

14 Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when
15 it is your turn to speak. And again, please turn down
16 the livestream volume. These instructions are also
17 located on the website. The Commission is taking public
18 comment at this time.

19 CHAIR LE MONS: Jesse, could you clarify that the
20 Commission is taking public comment on item number 10,
21 the adoption of administrative policies?

22 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: The Commission is taking
23 public comment on item number 10, the adoption of
24 Commission policies and --

25 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Do we have any callers

1 in the queue?

2 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: There are currently no
3 callers in the queue, Chair.

4 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. So we'll wait our customary
5 two minutes.

6 Commissioner Fornaciari.

7 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'd like to ask a
8 clarifying question here. So Commissioner Kennedy
9 suggested that we modify the communications policy to --
10 it currently says "the director and/or the chief counsel"
11 will determine whether something is offensive or
12 threatening. Commissioner Kennedy suggested it's just
13 the chief counsel. I just want to check in with Director
14 Claypool.

15 Is there any reason why we wouldn't want to do it
16 that way?

17 MR. CLAYPOOL: It looked right to me when I read it.
18 I don't -- I think it's fine as written, so --

19 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So you think it's fine as
20 written? Would it be -- I mean, if we just have the
21 chief counsel take that role, is there any reason why
22 not?

23 MR. CLAYPOOL: Right. I'm reading it, number 1,
24 again.

25 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. It's --

1 MR. CLAYPOOL: Well, it --

2 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Or I.

3 MR. CLAYPOOL: You know, I believe it -- still I
4 would leave it there, only because if something comes in
5 and it's threatening, it would be more of a combined
6 effort to discuss it. Ultimately, your legal staff --
7 your chief counsel -- are going to make the decision, but
8 we're just talking about, you know, will be reviewed and
9 then -- you know, I thought it was right the way it was
10 written. But if you want to leave it strictly with the
11 chief counsel, then I'm good with making the change. But
12 if the chief counsel is not there for some reason -- on
13 vacation or whatever -- then it's going to have to be
14 dealt with by somebody else, so --

15 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fernandez.

16 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. When I was rereading
17 that last night, because it says "and/or the chief
18 counsel". So theoretically, it could be just executive
19 director or just the chief counsel. So I think that was
20 probably my concern, was the chief counsel may never be
21 aware of it. And let's say that the executive director
22 determines it's not threatening or offensive and the
23 chief counsel maybe looks at it later and determines it
24 was. So I guess, I was -- should we have both of them do
25 it, just one of them do it, or one/or? And I think

1 that's what Commissioner Kennedy was getting to. And I
2 do understand the benefit of having the chief counsel
3 review it.

4 CHAIR LE MONS: Would you like to make a
5 recommendation, Commissioner --

6 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I would like to hear
7 Commissioner Kennedy's thoughts.

8 CHAIR LE MONS: Well, before Commissioner --

9 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I'd like to hear Counsel
10 Marshall's thoughts.

11 CHAIR LE MONS: Before Commissioner Kennedy,
12 actually we'll go to Commissioner Akutagawa.

13 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was just going to
14 suggest, given, you know, what's been said about maybe if
15 one is not available, perhaps there's a designee. It
16 would be, you know, potentially the deputy executive
17 director, and then Chief Counsel Marshall can also have a
18 designee; perhaps Ms. Johnston. So --

19 CHAIR LE MONS: Director Claypool.

20 MS. CLAYPOOL: That touched on exactly what we're
21 thinking here. That it could be just the chief counsel
22 or her designee which, in this case, would then fall to
23 Marian. And then you would have your counsel involved
24 with it one way or another.

25 CHAIR LE MONS: So just for clarification,

1 Commissioner Fernandez, could you read the language to
2 make sure that Commissioner Turner and -- her having made
3 the motion and I forget who seconded it -- I apologize --
4 just to make sure that they're comfortable with that.

5 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I believe Commissioner
6 Toledo seconded it. And just "documents that are
7 determined to be offensive or threatening in any way will
8 be reviewed by the chief counsel or her designee".

9 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay.

10 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. That sounds great.

11 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: That's fine.

12 CHAIR LE MONS: Perfect.

13 Jesse, any addition -- any callers in the queue?

14 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Chair, there are
15 currently no callers in the queue.

16 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. So let's go to the vote,
17 please.

18 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Sadhwani.

19 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

20 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Sinay.

21 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

22 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Taylor.

23 VICE CHAIR TAYLOR: Abstain.

24 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Toledo.

25 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

1 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Turner.

2 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

3 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Vazquez.

4 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.

5 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Yee.

6 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

7 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Ahmad.

8 COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.

9 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Akutagawa.

10 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

11 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Andersen.

12 COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

13 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Fernandez.

14 CHAIR LE MONS: I think she -- oh, there she is.

15 Commissioner Fernandez, we didn't hear you.

16 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

17 MS. SHEFFIELD: Okay. Commissioner Fornaciari.

18 COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.

19 MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Kennedy.

20 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes.

21 MS. SHEFFIELD: And Commissioner Le Mons.

22 CHAIR LE MONS: Yes.

23 MS. SHEFFIELD: Thank you.

24 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Wanda.

25 MS. SHEFFIELD: You're welcome. Motion passes.

1 Sorry.

2 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Okay. It is 3 o'clock.
3 Well, it's 3:01. We're going to take our break. We'll
4 be back at 3:16, at which point we will pick up with
5 agenda item number 11. Enjoy your break.

6 (Whereupon, a recess was held)

7 CHAIR LE MONS: All right, everyone. Welcome back
8 from the break. We're now going to move into agenda item
9 number 11, which is our outreach and engagement plan.
10 And I believe Commissioner Vazquez is going to lead this
11 discussion. Is Commissioner Vazquez with us? I'm sure
12 she'll be joining us any second.

13 So just a reminder that there's going to be three
14 key points in this discussion and we probably won't get
15 through all of it today. We have a substantial amount of
16 time savings, so we will get as far as we can today and
17 then we will pick up in the morning. My goal is to wrap
18 up today at 4:30 and give you the rest of your evenings
19 with family. And then we can start back fresh in the
20 morning at 9:30 and pick up where we left off.

21 So Commissioner Sinay, do you want to begin this
22 discussion until Commissioner Vazquez's arrival?

23 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes. Sorry, I was just
24 checking. All right. Yes. We're in a -- if we can
25 start off with -- I would -- my thought is, on the way to

1 check off the three pieces is to start off first with the
2 regional -- the regional definitions. I'm going to try,
3 like I did last time, to stay away from the word "map".
4 And they were posted, as well as everybody was sent them.
5 And there it is.

6 So you know, we received a lot of comments from the
7 very beginning, not just today -- we've received a
8 couple. But we received comments throughout the process
9 of -- and I think it's great for us to hear from -- hear
10 from people, especially because these are the types of
11 comments we're going to be hearing once we go -- when we
12 get into even more granular detail. And so the only
13 reason we wanted -- it was an interesting conversation.
14 You think when you have a subcommittee of two that the
15 two of you will agree on things. And what we're -- I
16 think we're all learning is we're all very individual and
17 it's not -- you know, sometimes you need three so that
18 you can better agree or not agree.

19 But it was an interesting conversation that just
20 Commissioner Vazquez and I had about regions. Just like,
21 well, why are we even creating the regions? Why did we
22 have the regions to begin with? And just to take a step
23 back, the reason we started with the regions that we
24 had -- the first ten -- was because we knew the census
25 was wrapping up and the census had created very strong

1 infrastructure that we wanted to make -- see if we could
2 tap into.

3 There's Commissioner Vazquez. You want to continue?

4 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: When do I get to throw this
5 computer into the ocean? I keep asking. Sorry. So I
6 missed, literally, everything.

7 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I haven't said much, except
8 that --

9 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Great.

10 COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- you and I -- that even in as
11 a committee of two, that you sometimes end up not
12 agreeing with each other. And so that we actually need
13 committees of three to break the tie. But that -- and
14 then reminding people that we had chosen the census
15 districts -- the census regions because the census was
16 wrapping up and we knew that there was a strong
17 infrastructure. But from the very beginning, questions
18 had already come up. If some regions were too big, if
19 they were the right regions. And again, that the
20 regions -- well, you can take it from there, basically,
21 what the regions -- whatever you want to say.

22 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Thank you. Yes. So the
23 regions, I think as Commissioner Sinay alluded to, I
24 think -- I, personally, have gone back and forth in terms
25 of sort of the tradeoffs with identifying and formalizing

1 particular regions. And you know, the tradeoff of adding
2 potential political implications that we can't
3 necessarily control in the community and with our
4 partners. And you know, the utility and the efficiency
5 of being able to break up the work of outreach and
6 engagement across this huge, diverse state with, you
7 know, limited time and limited -- certainly not unlimited
8 staff capacity.

9 So with that in mind, we have decided as a committee
10 to recommend that we move forward with such an overall
11 strategy, which is to break up the state into these new
12 proposed regions. Again, and we invite and appreciate
13 the feedback we have already heard today from the
14 community about the proposed new regions. There was some
15 thinking behind sort of this new creation of the regions.
16 But again, certainly this is absolutely something for
17 folks to react to, respond to, and provide comments and
18 suggestions and feedback around, in terms of the actual
19 regional breakdown. And then we thought to put in
20 writing, hopefully, some more detail about what we hope
21 to use the regions as, based on, of course, approval from
22 the Commission to use these regions in such a way.

23 So I wanted to draw your attention to the narrative
24 report, along with the proposed regions. So I wanted to
25 make sure that we were all understanding, but at least

1 that this committee's recommendation is that we want to
2 use the regions, as proposed or as amended, to create our
3 outreach plan, given the time and capacity dedicated to
4 the outreach process. So again, we have a very large
5 state, limited time, limited staff capacity. And one way
6 to break up that work is to divide the state into
7 different regions.

8 And that regional teams assigned to these regions
9 will ensure that we're both broad, so that we have
10 dedicated eyes and ears at the Commission level, and of
11 course, at the staff level across the state, but that
12 it's also deep. So that when you have these, you know,
13 regional teams of two, that that allows for potentially
14 some deeper initial contacts, whether it be with
15 community groups, civic groups, leaders, individuals from
16 the community.

17 You know, we hope this is an opportunity for folks
18 to deepen the work that they may have already started in
19 particular regions with sort of making contacts, making
20 connections in that region, so that when we're ready for
21 actual community forums where we invite people to give us
22 input around communities of interest, in particular, that
23 we, as a Commission, have done some initial relationship
24 building.

25 We also believe that these regions will allow staff

1 and the regional teams and community leaders to identify
2 quickly where additional outreach and engagement efforts
3 are needed. And I found that particularly important,
4 that there's -- we hope that these regional teams are
5 part of a more rapid feedback loop. So that community
6 members, once you have established -- once you, as
7 Commissioners, have established relationships with folks
8 in these regions, that they're -- hopefully, that's
9 another mechanism for folks to deliver rapid feedback
10 about hey, we're not getting as much response in, you
11 know, such and such area -- this neighborhood, this city,
12 this suburb. And we found that -- felt that that was
13 really important, so that they knew exactly who sort of
14 at the top on the Commission they could deliver that
15 immediate feedback to, and not necessarily have to wait
16 for a business meeting, or submit written comment around
17 that piece that may be more administrative than
18 substantive.

19 I wanted to also make sure for the public and for
20 the rest of the Commission that these regions aren't
21 associated with line drawing. So definitely hear and
22 understand, sort of, especially the folks who called in
23 about the proposal for Long Beach and Orange County to be
24 grouped as a particular region, hear that feedback and I
25 think, certainly myself and Commissioner Sinay are

1 amenable to that -- to that -- putting back Long Beach
2 with Los Angeles County. But you know, I also want to
3 flag for folks that even if, you know, Long Beach had
4 remained or does remain with Orange County, that that
5 doesn't necessarily mean that lines -- those lines will
6 be contiguous within Long Beach, right? So these regions
7 have nothing to do with, ultimately, where lines for the
8 maps will be drawn.

9 And then also, we don't propose these regions as a
10 way to sort of, like, direct resources. The grantmaking
11 to local groups, et cetera, will have its own process for
12 identifying where the Commission's resources will go. So
13 really, this is a way to, again, to divide and conquer
14 labor-wise and capacity-wise, not as a way for us to
15 filter information or organize information, for us to
16 draw the lines themselves.

17 And I think also, to respond to one of the -- to
18 Jacqueline Coto's comments earlier today about this
19 proposal, these regions, we're not proposing and I don't
20 anticipate proposing a formula where each region gets
21 five community forums and then we have to figure out, you
22 know, where those five are going to happen. Part of why
23 we want regional teams is so that the regional teams can
24 have a hand in informing -- you know, we really are
25 probably going to need at least two in this community

1 because it's rural, because it's going to take, you know,
2 a lot of work and engagement, and more touch points to
3 get as much information as possible. Or you know, the
4 regional teams will say, you know, you should probably
5 have one up in this northern region and the southern
6 region because they're very different. They look similar
7 on paper but they're very, very different, based on what
8 we're hearing.

9 So again, that -- we're not grouping these regions
10 so that we can create some sort of rigid metric by which
11 we can just say oh, we had two meetings, two meetings,
12 two meetings, two meetings and we're done. So again,
13 trying to give us a structure, but also build in some
14 flexibility that means that some things are left
15 intentionally broad so that we are not unintentionally
16 tying our hands to a particular method down the line.
17 But also, we need -- we do need a structure by which to
18 plan out, really, our capacity and our meeting dates to
19 some degree.

20 Commissioner Sinay, anything you want to add?

21 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just two things. One, is just
22 to reiterate that we're really just looking at this for
23 the public outreach or the what we've been calling
24 redistricting 101 forums, as well as the community
25 forums. So really, all the pre-map and census work. And

1 once -- you know, again, none of this is connected to
2 line drawing or our assumptions of where the lines will
3 go.

4 Also, many people have relationships that go across
5 regions and -- you know, your relationship with an
6 individual, with an organization takes priority. You
7 know, you can choose, for instance, when the Pala Band of
8 Indians came to speak with us, they brought up that they
9 were having a set -- that they have these meetings and
10 that they would welcome us to talk in January. I quickly
11 connected with Commissioner Fernandez and said, you know,
12 do you want to follow up with them on that, so we don't
13 lose that opportunity, or should I since I'm in San
14 Diego. Either way would be okay.

15 And as I said earlier, you know, when people are --
16 like my local -- my contacts have been saying hey, we
17 would like a public outreach session. I've been clear to
18 say, hey, we're going to figure out who's the right
19 Commissioner for you, because they might be speaking with
20 college students and they might rather have someone
21 younger. Or they may be in Central Valley and would like
22 someone from the Central Valley or whatnot.

23 And so this isn't -- it's not a way to own, in a way
24 of -- it's a way to be -- hopefully, we'll have our eyes
25 and ears on the whole state in an organized fashion. But

1 we can't abdicate our responsibility of knowing the whole
2 the state and knowing all regions. It's just a way to
3 make sure that -- that we're paying attention.

4 And -- and -- and -- just on the -- on the Long
5 Beach question, I'm just going to share this just for
6 people to understand the whole way we're looking at this,
7 is ironically, Commissioner Vazquez and I didn't want
8 Long Beach to get lost in the bigger of Los Angeles, and
9 so I had nothing to do with it's similar to Orange
10 County, but Orange County is the smallest of the regions
11 and if we connected it with Long Beach then Long Beach
12 would get more attention than if it was part of --

13 And so that's kind of some of our thinking on, you
14 know, the very, very north, but at the very beginning
15 we've heard we've got to pull Sacramento out. But once
16 we start moving things around, it gets moved around a
17 whole bunch.

18 So the new regions were based on -- they're very
19 similar to the old regions. We did try to put numbers so
20 you know what's being moved around a little bit, but it
21 was based on community input, input from the different
22 Commissioners, as well as some research on how are other
23 people looking at the State of California, how have
24 others made regions? One of the things I wanted to bring
25 up, when you look at the regions, others use names, so

1 we've put names on there, which our identifiers are good,
2 but then sometimes those end up having political
3 implications. So everything we did, I was like, okay, do
4 we go back to just numbers so we don't get into political
5 implications? So I think that's about it. I'm sure you
6 all have some great comments and thoughts.

7 CHAIR LE MONS: I'd like to make a suggestion as it
8 relates to this, is maybe not using the word "region" at
9 all and maybe using sector or zone as an alternative,
10 only because the regions have this -- there's a lot of
11 history attached to these regional maps that predate us,
12 and I find that we're always having to explain what we
13 don't mean.

14 We had a very similar kind of situation as it
15 related to using the census regional map. You know, we
16 needed to differentiate ourselves, explain how it didn't
17 mean certain things, and I think similarly with this one.
18 So it's just a thought that maybe we call it, you know,
19 outreach sectors or outreach zones and then that way we
20 know that we're talking about our outreach strategy and
21 it has -- it's not specific to all the things that we say
22 it's not specific to. So just a thought. With that, I'd
23 ask other Commissioners if they have any questions so
24 far -- questions or comments so far?

25 Commissioner Kennedy.

1 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. Noting first of
2 all that the Sierra Nevada region is not contiguous. I
3 don't know whether -- if that was intention, but it seems
4 odd. You know, I kind of -- I kind of end up going back
5 to a proposal that I had made earlier, which is if we
6 took as a starting point the 2010 Commission's map and
7 just separated the Sacramento region from farther north
8 and -- and made no further changes, to me it would just
9 be simpler to do that. There are still some
10 imperfections with that, but that's what I would like to
11 say at this point. Thank you, Chair.

12 CHAIR LE MONS: You're welcome. Other
13 Commissioners?

14 Commissioner Akutagawa.

15 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I just wanted to
16 acknowledge that, yes, it is -- it's not contiguous. Oh,
17 I said it right this time. It's not contiguous, but it
18 makes it difficult, but it's because of the similarities
19 between some counties and --

20 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa?

21 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. I was going to
22 actually -- so hearing the commentors that called in this
23 morning, I guess, I'm glad that they did. I was going to
24 make a similar comment that I think that putting Long
25 Beach in with Orange County is a little odd in the sense

1 that you have -- they're the only ones that are a
2 specific city, not a county like some of the other
3 places. I think you get into a slippery slope then also
4 too because who's to say that you don't incorporate
5 Encinitas into North Orange County, or perhaps even,
6 like, you know, Camp Pendleton and North County San
7 Diego. If you really wanted to start, you know, making
8 larger -- larger kind of regions.

9 So I think I would make a suggestion that in terms
10 of LA County, I know that on the, I guess, the proposed
11 document that you have there, you talked about east
12 side/west side, maybe breaking up LA into east side and
13 west side. I would also propose considering like maybe a
14 south bay in which you would include also Long Beach in
15 that so it would be like Long Beach, Carson, you know,
16 like, Gardena, Torrance, along those lines. Because of
17 the size of LA, it might just make sense to do more of
18 that.

19 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Vazquez and then
20 Commissioner Sadhwani.

21 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Thank you, Commissioner
22 Akutagawa. I just wanted to share my -- my
23 recommendation in the full Commission, and I haven't
24 shared with this Commissioner Sinay, but thinking --
25 thinking about my organizing work in LA, I -- I like and

1 am interested in thinking about a way that we could make
2 Los Angeles, in particular, a bit more manageable.

3 Given -- given what we've heard from the 2010
4 Commission about how -- how much LA's communities of
5 interest and LA's maps impact the rest of the state, that
6 there may be, in terms of initial outreach and
7 engagement, some thinking about dividing it up even
8 further, whether it's South Bay or east and west, but
9 also I want to acknowledge that the northern part of Los
10 Angeles County is also particularly -- it's very, very
11 different from the rest of the county. It's
12 geographically separated by the mountains, rural, and
13 desert, and very -- given very, very, very little
14 political and other resources, just generally.

15 So having worked in that region, just wanted to lift
16 up that there's also -- across LA we're going to find
17 pockets of, like, we are not -- we are not like the rest
18 of LA, you know. Certainly everyone in the San Gabriel
19 Valley would say that they are not part of LA.

20 Also, I do, just for the purposes of this
21 discussion, also want to acknowledge things. Yes, we can
22 get into slippery slopes, but also things are -- we have
23 the power to create our own boundaries and breaks for
24 some of these, so I try not to think of these maps and
25 decisions we make around these zones. I do like the idea

1 of trying to rebrand these as outreach zones, think of
2 them as -- as boundaries for our initial work, and not so
3 much, you know, these slippery slopes that we politically
4 have to try to appease everyone with this effort. We
5 need a way, in my opinion, to just manage the work and
6 move forward and we are -- we are going to make an
7 imperfect outreach zone framework, map, whatever. It's
8 going to be imperfect, and so I would just like
9 thoughtful feedback so that we can -- we can finalize
10 something and move forward.

11 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani.

12 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: First, I want to thank
13 Commissioner Sinay and Commissioner Vazquez for all of
14 their work on this, and I know y'all have gotten a lot of
15 heat about -- about this map. I very much support,
16 Commissioner Le Mons, your idea of rebranding it and just
17 calling them zones. I don't feel strongly, quite
18 frankly, about changing the map because I see this simply
19 as kind of an organizing tool for ourselves and that does
20 have any bearing on the districts themselves that we're
21 going to draw. But if, you know, if there is this severe
22 outcry, certainly I'm not opposed to changing it.

23 I do think though, once we change it for one region,
24 someone else is going to come back and want to change
25 theirs. I think it's opening up a can of worms. I

1 definitely hear you, Commissioner Vazquez. LA is huge.
2 There are so many things that we're going to have to
3 think about. I think in our conversations with Karin Mac
4 Donald, she has referred to it as a knot that we will
5 have to untangle. We are going to need to have a lot of
6 meetings in not just Long Beach, but across LA, thinking
7 about the various components and neighborhoods that exist
8 there.

9 My question, therefore, is in our last meeting, we
10 had come to some general agreement about a baseline
11 number of meetings and we said that that would be sixty
12 meetings in total, and that about thirty-five of those --
13 thirty-five to forty of those meetings would be with
14 communities collecting COI information. Is the next step
15 of this process for the two Commissioners who are
16 assigned to these zones to come back with some sort of
17 recommendation that staff will then think about and that
18 the Commission also will think about and approve and get
19 public feedback on?

20 So for example, currently I'm assigned to Orange
21 County and I've only got one zone. Would it be that
22 our -- you know, that Commissioner Akutagawa and I would
23 come back and say okay, of these thirty-five meetings, we
24 think that there should be two in Long Beach and that we
25 should make sure that we are prepared to receive feedback

1 in English and Spanish and Vietnamese, et cetera? Like,
2 is that the next stage of this? Because I think if I
3 have a sense of what the next step is, then I'll be able
4 to better answer whether or not these zones need to be
5 changed. Does that make sense?

6 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Vazquez -- Sinay? Go
7 ahead.

8 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to respond. Yes,
9 we kind of envision it that way, but we also have the
10 three points that we still need to look at during this
11 piece. So we've got that cross-subcommittee
12 conversation, and I think from those conversations we'll
13 glean more how we can use the region teams. So if we can
14 create the assignments at the end, you know, of all of
15 this, I think that would be the best way to do this --
16 the end meeting after all the conversations.

17 CHAIR LE MONS: Well, I have question -- a clarity
18 question on that. It sounds like, and Commissioner
19 Sadhwani, you can correct me if I'm wrong on this, that
20 it was really more about the purpose, like, next step
21 purpose, that would inform whether we have -- if we're
22 trying to define whether or not these particular zones
23 are the ones we're going to go with, what informs that
24 discussion and how do we get there and do you want us to
25 come to that conclusion now, like, do we want to define

1 that and move on or do you want to circle back to that
2 definition -- that defining?

3 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry, I'm laughing. I just
4 always feel that this a catch 22, in a way. Commissioner
5 Vazquez, do you want to answer?

6 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Go right ahead.

7 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Oh, okay, so you're leaving me
8 with the catch 22. Thank you. I think we, you know, as
9 with everything that we do like someone's like, oh, this
10 would have been great if we would have used these zones
11 to begin with. Yes, but part of what we're doing is
12 learning and moving forward as quickly as we can --
13 making adjustments as quickly as we can. So let's say
14 that yes, what you're saying, Commissioner Sadhwani,
15 makes absolute sense that these folks, along with staff
16 and community, will give us input as well, could come
17 back and say, look, as we were looking, you know, as
18 we've done our research and done our thinking, we think
19 that we should have two sessions in Orange County, you
20 know, make sure that they're -- that one is in the north
21 and one is in the south and in these languages. That
22 make sense. That makes absolute sense, because it can
23 get us starting to put the, you know, put more meat on
24 the bones and then we can keep moving around. So yes, to
25 that question.

1 And then as we have the conversation tomorrow, you
2 know, just about the class, what I'd like to do is do
3 kind of a conversation about, let's do the path of an
4 individual who wants to be engaged, you know, the
5 different -- the different types of meetings and
6 everything we're thinking of having. We may come up with
7 other things that we would add to it, so maybe we circle
8 back at the very end and say okay, for the region teams
9 this is what we want to see for next time. Does that
10 make sense?

11 So we start off with yes, what you said makes
12 absolute sense. If everyone can kind of come back to us
13 with the idea of what languages, where and how many, you
14 know, how many presentations, what languages, and the
15 locations, if you know. Not locations meaning the Elks
16 Club, but more in general.

17 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Turner?

18 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, and thank you,
19 subcommittee, for the proposals, the background, and what
20 have you. I'm looking, of course, directly at the
21 Central Valley and the proposal that's here and trying to
22 weigh in the conversation on what does this, kind of,
23 what does this mean when we say yes for this particular
24 zone? So the Central Valley, on one hand, I love that
25 it's Central Valley. Central Valley is an area that I

1 work in exclusively, but I also know that depending on
2 what we're determining we will do as a path forward, this
3 is a huge region, so it's about a six-and-half hour end
4 to end -- and north, we may want to consider putting
5 north and south Central Valley.

6 One of the things I also want to just name is that
7 as we propose what we think we're going to do, and to
8 come back and say how many meetings or what have you we
9 should have, if we all come back with proposals and I say
10 I need four and somebody says six and eight or whatever,
11 if we'll get to a place where it's like, okay, we can't
12 accommodate that number of meetings, we'll need to cut
13 back, that will change how I feel about whether or not I
14 think we should stay together as a Central Valley large
15 region or if we were smaller to begin with.

16 So to me that's part of that, you know, cyclical
17 conversation you talked about, chicken, egg, and
18 whatever. It's like, I can say anything right now with
19 the thought process that we will be able to accommodate a
20 size geography this large and then if we later need to
21 scale back, then I'll feel trapped in what we've landed
22 in this initial conversation.

23 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani, then
24 Commissioner Vazquez.

25 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think, Commissioner

1 Turner, that's like kind of exactly my thought process,
2 right. I so appreciate the folks from Long Beach calling
3 in and I just wonder if is the issue actually these
4 zones, or once we have whatever the outreach plan is
5 going to look like, will the real concern be what that
6 outreach is? So would their comments actually be more
7 informative to our process if we take that next step and
8 have whatever be, you know, the proposals will be. I
9 think yes, Commissioner Turner, I think you said it much
10 better than I, so thank you.

11 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Vazquez?

12 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Thank you, Commissioner
13 Turner, for those comments. In my mind, my hope is that
14 no one is caught in that kind of catch 22 in the sense
15 that, again, my hope is that we're not necessarily going
16 to have a formula in which, you know, we ultimately only
17 allow for five meetings per region, and so in order to
18 make sure that this, you know, potentially hard to reach
19 suburb gets, you know, meaningful outreach dedicated
20 towards it is by cutting it and moving it to a smaller
21 region or zone whereby it gets one of the five meetings
22 for that zone.

23 That's sort of what we were trying to say about sort
24 of what these maps aren't for, is that the hope is we're
25 not going to create a formula. My hope would be that if

1 there is a hard to count suburb or hard to reach suburb
2 or rural area or what have you, no matter what zone it's
3 in, it's the team's outreach that will identify that hard
4 to reach region and say whatever our outreach strategy
5 is, we've got to make sure, and I am going to take it
6 upon myself to make sure that that suburb, that rural
7 community is engaged.

8 So whatever meeting is held in this zone, I'm going
9 to make sure that it's accessible to this community and
10 that outreach happens for this community versus I
11 think -- the more I think in a linear sense of looking at
12 these zones, you only have five meetings per zone, then
13 that makes these zones and their boundaries much more
14 rigid and therefore more political. I'm trying to get us
15 to like -- zones are just for organizing our workload.
16 They are not for organizing -- they are not going to be,
17 at least I hope, aren't going to be a way to limit our
18 capacity. They're going to be a way to direct our
19 capacity.

20 CHAIR LE MONS: That's how I was thinking of it,
21 Commissioner Vazquez, is that the zone -- you said it, is
22 the way to direct our capacity. It's sort of like
23 getting the profile of that zone and understanding what's
24 needed and bringing those needs back and it not being
25 limited. Now, we may have global limits just based on

1 whatever, but it won't be determined by the zones
2 themselves. Is that a fair assessment?

3 Okay, other Commissioners? Okay, Commissioner
4 Akutagawa, then Commissioner Fernandez.

5 COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I hear what -- Commissioner
6 Vazquez, I hear what you're saying. I think I'm still
7 having -- I'm still struggling with now we're still going
8 to run up against I think some degree of limits. If I
9 use the case of Long Beach, for example, as a way to
10 ensure that -- and please correct me if I'm
11 misrepresenting this, but to ensure that they do get some
12 attention, you know, they could still remain within LA
13 County because they are still part of LA County in that
14 perhaps instead of, you know, I think the choice becomes
15 for LA County, is there a decision to go to Long Beach
16 and then use a meeting there, whether it's virtual or
17 otherwise, because I think that's the other consideration
18 too.

19 We will have these virtual meetings. It could just
20 end up reaching a lot more of the people that are just
21 outside of Long Beach. So the argument could be made,
22 yes, they could be part of Orange County, but yes, they
23 could also be part of LA County as well too and use Long
24 Beach as the center, you know, one of the centers for LA
25 County and then perhaps, you know, the San Gabriel

1 Valley, the Valley itself, you know, kind of like whether
2 you go out to Santa Clarita or Lancaster, you know,
3 Antelope Valley and then do something like in Santa
4 Monica, maybe something down in, you know, whether it's
5 south LA or go down to, like, Torrance, Gardena, Long
6 Beach -- I mean, Redondo Beach.

7 There are all these other -- I guess I'm just kind
8 of thinking about that. That, you know, choices are
9 going to have to be made where these meetings will be
10 located and if there's a concern that the Long Beach
11 maybe lost in the larger part of LA, you know, part of it
12 is just then being very mindful that hey, we will cover
13 Long Beach because it is a large city in LA County. I
14 think -- I think that's why I'm just kind of trying to
15 understand more what you're saying about like we
16 shouldn't be constrained, but at the same time we are
17 going to be because we have X amount of meetings that we
18 can hold based on the budget we have, I think is what I
19 understand.

20 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Commissioner Fernandez,
21 Commissioner Yee, and then Commissioner Sadhwani.

22 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: For me personally, I would
23 opt to just keep the zones that we currently have. I
24 already made one Region 1, which was the 17 county. I've
25 already made contact with quite a few of them. I also

1 agree with Commissioner Kennedy in terms of some of
2 the -- by moving some of the counties out, now they're
3 not contiguous with the Sierra Nevada region, and I think
4 that is important because oftentimes neighboring counties
5 do have similarities, so I think at this point it's -- I
6 don't want to say it's late in the game, but I've already
7 reached out to my counties at this point, so if we were
8 to split it up, I would still have probably two zones
9 with the same amount of counties that I'd still be
10 responsible for since I've already made that initial
11 contact. I appreciate the work you've put into it, but
12 for me personally, I think I'd rather just stay with what
13 we have.

14 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Yee.

15 COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, thank you to the
16 subcommittee. Certainly a lot of thought and
17 consideration went into this. You know, I really
18 appreciate Commissioner Vazquez's very eloquent, you
19 know, expression of our -- kind of our intentions and how
20 this should go. And I have every faith that -- have all
21 faith that, you know, our outreach and our plan and where
22 meetings end up will all be good, but I'm also just super
23 sensitive to, you know, people's feelings about these
24 things. You know, the two Long Beach calls we got this
25 morning. I mean, these are communities of interest

1 speaking up, right? And even though we're very, very far
2 from actually drawing district lines, you know, this is
3 kind of where starts, and they know it and we know it.

4 So sure, you know, just go ahead with the plan. You
5 know, I really do think it will all work out, but I'm
6 just trying to figure out okay, how do we reassure folks,
7 you know, that it will all work out and that these
8 concerns are being fully addressed? I'm kind of
9 wondering how we ended up with the ten zones? I mean, we
10 inherited the number ten from the census zones, I guess.
11 You know, I don't want to start all over. I just -- but
12 neither do I want to take those as set in stone if -- if
13 a few more zones would actually allay these anxieties and
14 just help us move forward. You know, fourteen of us, ten
15 zones, any number is going to be arbitrary, but just
16 wondering how committed we are to that number?

17 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani?

18 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I just wanted to clarify the
19 question that was raised about the number of meetings.
20 While we are building in a number of meetings to have
21 pricing on, we also asked for a price per meeting should
22 we go over. So while we have kind of a target, we can
23 most certainly do more if -- if -- if it is deemed
24 necessary.

25 CHAIR LE MONS: You could add, Commissioner

1 Sadhwani? Subcommittee, is it possible or could you
2 envision there being more zones than the current number
3 of zones that have been established? Okay, and then
4 Commissioner Kennedy, I wanted --

5 COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Just to clarify, just
6 quickly. Right now with the new region or new zone, it
7 would actually be eleven zones. We didn't put a number
8 on it because we kept the original numbers, so that's why
9 it's confusing.

10 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Commissioner Kennedy, your
11 comments earlier, I think it's worth exploring with
12 Commissioner Kennedy how strong his feelings are with
13 regard to his recommendation on advancing the previous
14 map as is. I think there's a few outstanding issues that
15 we need to put to bed, so I think it will be worth having
16 that discussion about adopting the previous map or not so
17 that we can decide we are or are not going to do that and
18 then move forward with what we are going to design.

19 I feel like different ideas sort of just kind of
20 swirl around each other and sometimes to move forward you
21 have to put some things to bed. So if Commissioner
22 Kennedy wants to make a strong case for his
23 recommendation, I'd like to create some space to do that
24 so we can at least understand and move forward with that.

25 Commissioner Sinay.

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: As everybody was speaking, I
2 was taking down notes and so there was different --
3 different recommendations or ideas that were put out
4 there, and that was the first one exactly. So if we
5 could -- I think that's a great place to start and then
6 maybe go down the different zones and bring up what came
7 up just so we put -- I agree, let's put some things to
8 bed so we can move forward.

9 CHAIR LE MONS: Awesome. Are you amenable to that,
10 Commissioner Kennedy? Do you want to take us -- make a
11 case?

12 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I mean, you know, the case
13 that I've made is that if we take the 2010 map and we
14 separate the Sacramento region from farther north, we end
15 up with ten regions. That region that's north of the
16 Sacramento metropolitan region that has roughly a million
17 people in it. And otherwise keep it as it is, which is
18 in some ways, certainly down in the south, it's identical
19 to what we currently have. You know, I don't know the
20 Central Valley as well as Commissioner Turner, so you
21 know, I'm going to defer to her when -- when we talk
22 about Central Valley. But I am sensitive to people in
23 the far north saying, you know, we always get lumped with
24 Sacramento. Sacramento gets the attention. We don't get
25 any attention. And I'm trying to address that with this

1 proposal without overly complicating things.

2 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Commissioner Sinay, I think
3 that Commissioner Kennedy raised a couple salient
4 objectives, so hopefully you noted those.

5 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. Can I ask a clarifying
6 question?

7 CHAIR LE MONS: Sure. Let me finish my sentence,
8 please.

9 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Oh, sorry. My apologies.

10 CHAIR LE MONS: No worries. So hopefully as people
11 are making their case, because you guys are the most
12 familiar with the zones that you've created and
13 understand, you know, what's covered and how it's covered
14 I think better than anyone else. I mean, we can all have
15 read them, but you know what thinking went into it. So I
16 think really making note of what the various
17 Commissioners are making cases make and that can be a
18 part of our discussion in moving forward and making sure
19 that even if it doesn't look like at the end of the day
20 the adoption of 2010's map, we took into consideration
21 his intent, is really where I'm going with that. So with
22 that said, Commissioner Sinay, please.

23 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I wanted to clarify, so you're
24 looking at the 2010 map, so not even the redistricting
25 one, so we're going back to the 2010. There are some

1 significant differences between the 2010 and where we've
2 been with the -- the census. We were using the census
3 zones, and so I think what I would like to do is hear
4 from Commissioner Toledo because some of the significant
5 changes, you know, it's lumping -- lumping a lot of the
6 central, I mean, a lot of the coast with the Bay Area.
7 And my experience from living in the Bay Area was Sonoma
8 and some of those areas would rather not be lumped in
9 with the Bay Area, so I wanted to get your thoughts
10 since -- since that would be one of the major -- one of
11 the big changes.

12 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: The census zones that we're
13 using has Marin with the Bay Area and that, to me, makes
14 sense.

15 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Right.

16 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Although there are portions of
17 Marin that is very rural and closer to Sonoma and the
18 rest of the north coast. Certainly there's parts of
19 Sonoma that are very rural and there's parts that are a
20 little bit more urban and suburban and -- and I
21 particularly like the census map. I think it makes
22 sense, the regions that we're using, because Marin is the
23 most urban of the north coast regions up to the Oregon
24 border and it has Marin with the Bay Area, but Sonoma
25 with the north coast and so to me that makes sense.

1 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

2 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So that would be my feedback
3 on those two pieces.

4 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay, I'd like to make an
5 observation. It seems like that the context for that
6 discussion right there seemed a little bit different than
7 how Commissioner Vazquez sort of characterized where
8 we're going, and I could almost feel it coming from her
9 through the screen. And I concur and I think that it's
10 going to be really important to contextualize what we're
11 talking about, and like, why that makes sense, what
12 Commissioner Toledo just said, makes sense in that
13 context. However, if what Commissioner Vazquez described
14 is what our intention is with creating these zones, that
15 would be irrelevant basically. So Commissioner Vazquez?

16 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, if I could -- my
17 observation is similar to yours in that -- so I will sell
18 myself out as being not a -- I'm not a superfan of the
19 regions or the teams as, like, a concept, because in my
20 personal view I feel like it invites more political
21 tension than I think are necessary, and I say this
22 because in my view, in thinking about outreach, if there
23 is a community anywhere in the state that feels or that
24 is hard to reach for whatever reason, then we need to be,
25 like, it's our duty as a Commission to be explicit about

1 making sure that our outreach plan addresses those folks
2 and for me it shouldn't matter what region they're in.

3 So for me, again in my ideal world, and I don't know
4 practically how -- if this makes sense again for our
5 workload and all of the other things that I did discuss
6 in our proposal, which is potentially more efficient for
7 fact finding. It helps us best utilize the expertise in
8 an efficient manner, but really for me these zones then
9 invite this, well, we're not like them. You should pay,
10 you know, you should keep us with them.

11 We get into these conversations that ultimately bind
12 our -- the business, the administration side,
13 unnecessarily whereas, again for me, it should just be
14 that if there's a community that's hard to reach let's
15 figure out a way to the best of our ability to reach that
16 community. And that's also why I was trying to caution
17 us about these slippery slopes, because once we -- if we
18 separate out Sacramento because Sacramento's very tired
19 of being lumped in with the north, then for me I would
20 say, well, can we separate out the Valley from LA because
21 they're always called LA. They are not LA. For them,
22 they don't consider themselves LA and I, now as an
23 adopted Angeleno, don't really feel like they're
24 politically part of us either. They're their own
25 community.



1 So for me it just invites a lot of -- a lot of
2 challenges that I think we can work through and we're
3 proposing a way to move through them. Like, I just know
4 whether or not we adopt a regional map, know that for me
5 and my role as a Commissioner, I am going to do
6 everything we can, that no matter how these maps are
7 broken out, if there's a community that is hard to reach,
8 I am going to be looking at this overall plan to make
9 sure that that community, based on feedback from
10 Commissioners or the community themselves or from what I
11 know about that community, that they get the outreach
12 that they need given our limited resources but good
13 intentions.

14 CHAIR LE MONS: Well put, Commissioner Vazquez. Any
15 other comments, feedback, questions, clarifications?

16 Okay, Commissioner Sinay, do you want to continue
17 with the considerations that you were documenting?

18 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sure. I apologize that I
19 wasn't on mute that whole time. Hopefully my clicking
20 wasn't annoying. So one of the other considerations was
21 to just keep our original census zone number 1, just keep
22 it all together and so that's -- that's not changing.

23 CHAIR LE MONS: I think that was Commissioner
24 Fernandez. Do you need to add anything to the case you
25 made for that? Do you want to highlight any points about

1 why we should do that one?

2 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I guess the only reason I
3 want to keep is because I already started with it. At
4 the end of the day, I think we all need to step back
5 because every community is going to think, and they know,
6 that their community is unique, so they want to be
7 separate and they want to be special. But at the end of
8 the day, there's fourteen of us, right, and if we split
9 up then that's seven teams. And I like keeping at least
10 the counties together for now, because like I mentioned
11 earlier, they have more similarities, especially as they
12 go up north, they have more similarities than those that
13 neighbor each other.

14 At the end of the day, how we split it up, we're
15 going to have people that like it and people that don't
16 like it and we're going to have comments regardless of
17 how we do it. Do I prefer to keep it together? Sure,
18 why not? If we split it up, sure, why not? I mean, I
19 just need to know how to move forward because at the end
20 of the day we're not going to make everybody happy, but
21 our goal is to try to reach as many as we can, especially
22 the hard to reach. I think that's all I have to say
23 right now.

24 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Commissioner Turner?

25 COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I do like, I

1 think, keeping counties together, but I just wanted to
2 name for those that aren't as familiar with the Central
3 Valley. The Central Valley -- there's a Central Valley
4 and then there's a San Joaquin Central Valley, which is
5 actually what you've delineated in the new, or the
6 proposed change, and that's 4.3 million people from
7 Commissioner Kennedy. So I just wanted to name that so
8 that we're not thinking that it's just rural area and a
9 span from a geography perspective. It's greater than
10 four million people in that proposed area.

11 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Turner. I
12 would like to weigh in and say that I'd like to support
13 changing it and I'd like to support changing it to zones.
14 The reason is I think to adopt the 2010 map, we adopt its
15 history. I think to adopt the census map, we adopt their
16 history, and I'd rather we not keep saying what we're
17 not.

18 I'd rather we create our own and rebrand it and
19 define what it's for and about, and I think that the
20 intent and philosophy that has gone into it as described
21 by Commissioner Vazquez is innovation. As we talk about
22 the SWI, I forget the last letter, I think R, that was
23 mentioned earlier. I think this fits right there, and I
24 say why not? We also said that the same people who did
25 the initial outreach, which goal was to leverage the

1 outgoing census team and not let them get away, which is
2 why we did that. That step is now behind us. Our group,
3 I'm with Commissioner Fernandez, we still have some
4 lingering meetings to wrap up, but that has nothing to
5 do, in my mind, with this next step. Some of the
6 information, of course, we will be bringing forward, but
7 this is the beginning of us unveiling our new outreach
8 strategy from the 2020 Commission and I think it should
9 represent the innovative ideas here. That would be my
10 case for doing something different.

11 Commissioner Fernandez.

12 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm good with that. The
13 only caveat I would have is something that Commissioner
14 Kennedy also brought up, was that right now, zone 4, it
15 does have some counties that aren't contiguous, and I
16 would recommend that we do make them contiguous because
17 we're splitting up zones with counties in between. And I
18 would just recommend that maybe we try to put them into
19 either one or into the new region, because also if you
20 look at zone 4 right now you've got -- how many counties
21 is that going to be? Like, 15 counties or something like
22 that. So that's my only recommendation.

23 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Commissioners, is there any
24 other comments before I go back to Commissioners Vazquez
25 and Sinay to move us along on this?

1 Okay, Commissioners Vazquez and Sinay, it sounds
2 like potentially doing a little bit of zone expansion, of
3 having a couple more zones that either Long Beach has its
4 own zone or Long Beach goes back into whatever zone LA is
5 in and then some of these other recommendations. Would
6 that solve and still maintain -- would that solve some of
7 the concerns that the Commissioners have raised and still
8 maintain the integrity of what it is you're trying to
9 accomplish with your outreach plan?

10 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can I ask, so the two -- the
11 two that are part of the -- it's Placer County and El
12 Dorado County are the two that Sierra Nevada zone,
13 they're not contiguous, and my quick -- are those two
14 more valleys versus part of the mountain area? Is that
15 why they pulled them out?

16 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Are you talking to me?

17 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm talking to who knows those
18 two counties?

19 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: No, I mean, I agree where you
20 have them now, because they really -- I guess since I'm
21 from Sacramento, Sacramento area really is reaching out
22 to El Dorado, but then you've got -- I think is it Sierra
23 Plumas? I can't remember. Sierra Plumas and Nevada,
24 Lassen, and Modoc. Right, so there almost like
25 jumping -- they're jumping zones to go to a southern --

1 more southern zone versus maybe let's think about keeping
2 them with a northern zone?

3 COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think we were looking at it
4 as an eastern zone because it's part of the Sierra
5 Nevadas.

6 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, and I think Placer they
7 kind of consider Sierra, that county as well. I mean,
8 you just kind of keep creeping into the northern.

9 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. No, I can move those
10 back up.

11 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Right, right. Yeah, I think
12 that would be preferable.

13 COMMISSIONER SINAY: And is that just the Lassen and
14 Modoc, or keeping Nevada and Plumas below?

15 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I would -- I would move the
16 Plumas, the Sierra, is it Nevada also? Because right now
17 you're recommending putting them in zone 4, so I would
18 recommend maybe potentially moving them to the new region
19 or to region 1. I mean, we can talk about that offline.
20 That's fine.

21 COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, the community's going to
22 want to know where we're putting them -- the public.

23 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Oh, I'd have to --

24 CHAIR LE MONS: Do you want to give that some
25 thought and we'll go to Commissioner Kennedy?

1 Commissioner Kennedy.

2 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I mean, my
3 awareness of Placer County is that, you know, the western
4 part is very much tied in with the Sacramento region, but
5 the eastern part is very much tied in with Reno and
6 Sierra Nevada. So I mean, it's hard to divide Placer
7 County without addressing that dichotomy.

8 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay.

9 COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I'd be happy to touch base
10 with the registrar and get his thoughts on it.

11 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: No, I don't think we want to
12 go there.

13 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Vazquez is like, please
14 don't do that, about to make it political for real.
15 Commissioner Vazquez?

16 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah, I was just going to say
17 again suddenly I'm feeling very passionate about the
18 Antelope Valley. Like, those folks go to Bakersfield and
19 Fresno for many of their services because it's more
20 relevant and appropriate for them to engage in that
21 county. People are crossing county boundaries. County
22 boundaries don't mean anything to anybody except,
23 honestly, the politicians.

24 I'm caught up in attention because I feel like these
25 create a lot of challenges for us and we're embodying

1 these priorities that politicians have, because we know
2 that boundaries mean power and so I appreciate this
3 conversation because we're trying to make sure that
4 communities have the power that this process was designed
5 to give them back. So yeah, it just -- I really want to
6 be mindful even then as we think about breaking up
7 counties. I'm amenable to keeping counties together. I
8 think that makes sense from a practical standpoint in
9 terms of designing outreach.

10 I think, actually, the caller on the phone who
11 talked about Long Beach and its association with Orange
12 County versus LA County. I do think to the extent that
13 we utilize existing outreach frameworks, that many groups
14 have already organized themselves around county
15 boundaries, so I think there's a strong administrative
16 case to be made about keeping counties together. So I
17 hear and I think we should probably put LA, or Long Beach
18 back with LA, and then I would also try to pull us back
19 from thinking about breaking up counties.

20 I'm sort of of two minds about having the zones
21 contiguous as long as they keep counties together. So
22 would like a case to be made strongly one way or the
23 other. I think Commissioner Fernandez is working on
24 that, but yeah, I think my proposal would be let's keep
25 counties together in these zones.

1 CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Taylor?

2 VICE CHAIR TAYLOR: No, I was just going to sort of
3 mimic what Commissioner Vazquez said. If you look at the
4 design of Antelope Valley, Palmdale, and Lancaster, it
5 has more in common with some parts of San Bernardino than
6 it does with inner city Los Angeles, but then we can get
7 to a point where we can get so specific. Are we going to
8 differentiate between San Fernando and San Gabriel, which
9 you're going to say they're two different places. We
10 have the commerce district on the interior of east LA.
11 We can start to parse this out so fine that I think that
12 we need to -- our point is about penetration. We want to
13 make sure that we penetrate these communities as opposed
14 to what does it matter what district team is? Keep it
15 simple. Thank you.

16 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that, Commissioner
17 Taylor. So it's 4:20, and unless there's some burning
18 comments from Commissioners, I'd like to go and get our
19 closing. We could go get some public comment that might
20 inform what we've talked about so far, if you're open to
21 that, or we can continue this discussion and give
22 everybody a chance to sleep on it and continue it in the
23 morning. My hope would be that if between Commissioner
24 Fernandez, Vazquez, Sinay, and anybody who wants to help
25 make those adjustments to the zone recommendations where

1 that could be posted and then when we kick off the
2 conversation tomorrow it would start with this new place
3 and we could pick up our discussion from there. So I
4 think for a quick thumbs up, should we get some public
5 comment now? How do people feel about doing that, and
6 then that will sort of close out our day and we'll have
7 something to sleep on?

8 Okay, so with that, Jesse, if you could read the
9 instructions and we are taking public comment on the
10 current agenda item 11, specifically the proposed
11 outreach zone map.

12 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: In order to maximize
13 transparency and participation in our process, the
14 Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To
15 call in, dial the telephone number provided on the
16 livestream feed. The telephone number is 877-853-5247.
17 When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on
18 the livestream feed. It is 93989466294 for this week's
19 meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply
20 press pound.

21 Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a
22 queue from which a moderator will begin unmuting callers
23 to submit their comments. You will also hear an
24 automated message to press star 9. Please do this to
25 raise your hand, indicating you wish to comment. When it



1 is your turn to speak, the moderator will unmute you and
2 you will hear an automated message that says, "The host
3 would like you to talk" and to press star 6 to speak.
4 Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream
5 audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your
6 call.

7 Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when
8 it is your turn to speak, and again, please turn down the
9 livestream volume. These instructions are also located
10 on the website. The Commission is taking public comment
11 on item 11 at this time.

12 CHAIR LE MONS: I know we have a little bit of a
13 delay, so Jesse, the moment someone's in the queue just
14 alert me and we'll wait a few minutes.

15 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We currently have one
16 person in the queue, Chair.

17 CHAIR LE MONS: Please invite them in.

18 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Caller, if you could
19 please press star 6 to unmute yourself, please. Caller
20 with the telephone number ending in 55, please press star
21 6. Chair, they appear to be unresponsive.

22 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. We'll wait a couple more
23 minutes. Commissioner Sinay? You're on mute.

24 COMMISSIONER SINAY: That means I was unmuted
25 before, so I apologize again. I was curious to hear from

1 Deputy Director Hernandez and Director Ceja what they're
2 thinking about these maps? Not maps, zones.

3 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay, let's hold on that for right
4 now and we'll go to them provided there's no public
5 comment. Jesse?

6 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: There is currently nobody
7 in the queue, Chair.

8 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. So we'll hear from -- excuse
9 me, if Deputy Director Hernandez has something to add,
10 would you like to add that at this time?

11 MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, thank you. Great discussion.
12 I've been taking a lot of notes. I do like the idea of
13 zones and from an outreach perspective, you know, keeping
14 the counties together, and I'm thinking of when you
15 travel you want to go from one to the next to the next,
16 and if you're having to jump counties that just makes it
17 very difficult to really do outreach, you know,
18 systematically or effective or efficient, either one of
19 those two.

20 But it really makes it a lot easier if you're going
21 from one county to the next county and I foresee that
22 that is kind of the way that you'd be doing it. It's
23 kind of like a roadshow. You go from one place to the
24 next place to the next place and it just makes it easier
25 for travel purposes. That's just from my perspective,

1 but I do like the idea of zones -- outreach zones,
2 specifically. We can call them outreach zones. It just
3 makes it easier for us to identify what the purpose is
4 and then keeps that confusion to a minimum.

5 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. How about you, Director
6 Ceja? Do you have anything you want to add?

7 MR. CEJA: Nothing in particular. I do also agree
8 that Los Angeles is a huge geographical area and will
9 probably need more than one -- not region, what did you
10 call it?

11 CHAIR LE MONS: Zone.

12 MR. CEJA: Zones. Yeah, exactly.

13 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay, Commissioners. With that,
14 Jesse, still no one in the queue?

15 PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Chair, there is currently
16 no callers in the queue.

17 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay, so we'll close public comment.
18 And we have a commitment from the subcommittee to make
19 some adjustments, is that correct, to the current zones.
20 We can either get that posted -- well, let me ask?
21 Director Claypool, is it possible to get an updated
22 version posted by tomorrow morning, depending upon when
23 you get it?

24 MR. CLAYPOOL: I'll have to check with Raul. I
25 believe so, but if you can hold for just a minute or two,

1 I'll step across.

2 CHAIR LE MONS: Sure. Sure. If not, and Director
3 Ceja, that's why that awesome new website that you showed
4 us today is going to be amazing, because if we would just
5 be able to pop this right up. We know we're getting
6 there slowly but surely. As soon as Director Claypool
7 comes back, you know, I don't want to put you guys in too
8 tight of a time line, Commissioners Sinay and Vazquez.
9 If push comes to shove, tomorrow you can always use a
10 share screen to continue the conversation and include the
11 public in the visual aspect. We'll work it out one way
12 or another. Yes, Commissioner Vazquez?

13 COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I just wanted to be sure that
14 we'll get Commissioner Fernandez's stuff and make sure to
15 incorporate that before we put something up to the
16 public?

17 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez, then
18 Commissioner Toledo.

19 COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I just wanted to say that I'm
20 also going to forward some feedback to the Committee as
21 well.

22 CHAIR LE MONS: Awesome. Commissioner Fernandez.

23 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, I'm available right
24 after the meeting and I've got your number.

25 CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

1 Director Claypool?

2 MR. CLAYPOOL: So Raul is going to reach out to
3 Rihanna and see if she's available, but we would need
4 those changes by 6; is that possible?

5 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay, they'll shoot for 6. If you
6 don't get it by 6, we'll use plan B. Fair enough?

7 MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay.

8 CHAIR LE MONS: All right. Commissioner Fernandez,
9 did you have a final comment?

10 COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah, I just wanted to know
11 if Commissioner Toledo, if you were available right
12 after? Okay, thank you.

13 CHAIR LE MONS: Okay, with that we're going to
14 recess and reconvene in the morning at 9:30. Everyone
15 enjoy your evening and I'll see you in the morning.

16 (Whereupon, the CRC Business Meeting
17 adjourned.)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, of the videoconference recording of the proceedings provided by the California Citizens Redistricting Commission.



TRACI FINE, CDLT-169

June 7, 2022

DATE