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CHAIR FORNACIARI: Welcome, everyone, to the November 4th through 6th meeting of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. I'm Neal Fornaciari. I'm the chair for this three day meeting. Commissioner Kennedy is vice chair. And we'll start with the role.

MS. JOHNSTON: Good morning, commissioners. Give me a second here.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Fornaciari?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Kennedy?

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Sadwhani?

COMMISSIONER SADWHANI: Here.
MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Sinay?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.
MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Taylor?
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Present.
MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Toledo.
CHAIR FORNACIARI: He has not joined us yet.
MS. JOHNSTON: No. Commissioner Turner?
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Morning. Here.
MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Vazquez?
COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Here.
MS. JOHNSTON: And Commissioner Yee?
COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.
MS. JOHNSTON: Thank you.
CHAIR FORNACIARI: Do we have a quorum. Tell them that we have a quorum.
MS. JOHNSTON: We have a quorum.
CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Well, thank you very much.
MS. JOHNSTON: Thank you.
CHAIR FORNACIARI: We'll move on to agenda item number 2, general announcements. I have a couple of things. First of all, because of the way the meeting ended last time, I don't think we had a chance to properly thank Commissioner Akutagawa for her job chairing the five days. And I think we should take a minute and give her a round of applause. Thank you.
It is a ton of work --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, thank you.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: -- as you'll all find out. Preparation and execution is -- there's a lot behind it. So a few more general announcements for the folks tuning in. Agenda item 10 has been postponed until the meeting next meeting to be held November 16 through the 18th.

Agenda Item 13, the general access presentations will take place at 1:30 on Friday, and we have speakers from the Partnership for the New Americans, the Disability Rights, California and Empowering Pacific Islander Communities. Again, so will be at 1:30 on Friday.

I also wanted to note that there are a number of written and public comments posted -- written public comments posted on our website. And I want to thank the individuals and organizations who took the time to provide that feedback to us. We genuinely appreciate it and are working to use your feedback to improve the process.

And then finally, just a comment to my fellow commissioners and the public regarding the meeting handouts. You know, our goal certainly is to have everything out by a couple of days ahead of the meetings posted and out with this quick turnaround meeting. You
know, we were working on stuff up until late yesterday, and I know things didn't go out until yesterday evening. And so I will ask for your grace on that for us this time around. Next time it should be better.

Whoops. Sorry about that. No one ever calls me. I apologize.

But if anyone needs some time before a topic to go through the pre-reads that they didn't have a chance to look at, let me know. And we will make the time to give everybody a chance to digest the pre-reads. So with that we will go to public comment.

So if you, Katy, could read the directions please.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair.

In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. The telephone number is 877-853-5247. When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed. It is 93489457215 for this week's meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID simply press the pound key.

When you have dialed in, you will be placed in a queue from which a moderator will begin unmuting callers to submit their comment. You will also hear an automatic message to press star 9. Please do this to raise your
hand indicating you wish to comment.

When it is your turn to speak, the moderator will unmute you and you will hear an automatic message that says the host would like you to talk and press star 6 to speak.

When you -- please make sure to mute your computer or livestream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your call.

Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when it is your turn to speak. And again, please turn down the livestream volume. These instructions are also located on the website.

The Commission is taking public comment on -- is it general public comment at this time? Okay.

We do have someone in the queue. If you'll press star -- please state and spell your name for the court reporter and then share your comment.

MR. ALBERT: Hi, everyone. My name is James Albert and it's spelled J-A-M-E-S; last name Albert, A-L-B-E-R-T.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Go ahead.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Please, go ahead.

MR. ALBERT: Okay. Hi, everyone. My name is James Albert. I'm a member of the League of Women Voters here in the San Bernardino area. Just want to introduce
myself and make myself available to you all. I'm very interested in how this process unfolds and being an active participant through this entire process. Again, I'm in the City of San Bernardino. I've been a 20-year resident here and look forward to understanding how it all works and again, being an informed constituent.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Well, thank you for that. We appreciate your interest in the process. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And that was the only person in the queue at this time.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Well, we'll wait for another minute or so. The instructions have finished on a live feed, so we'll give them another minute or two.

Okay. Well, it doesn't look like anyone else has joined the queue at this point. Thank you, Katy.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: You're welcome.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Well, we will be taking public comment again after lunch and at the end of the day, if you didn't get a chance to get in this morning.

So we'll go on to item 4. Oh, one more just sort of general announcement. I'm going to propose that we have our closed session today. After lunch, we'll come back from lunch and take public comment and then then go into closed session at that time, just to give everyone a heads up.
So action item or item -- agenda item number 4, Commissioner Updates. Item of interest to the commission. I have one. I just want to let you all know that I had a conversation with Lily Irvin-Vitela, who is the director, and Melanie Sanchez Eastwood, who's the deputy director of New Mexico First. They asked for someone to come speak with them next Monday about our outreach approach.

So we just had a pre-meeting there. They put together a commission to kind of talk about recommendations for redistricting in New Mexico. So I'll be meeting with them Monday for a half hour or so, and I will give you another update at our next meeting. But they're really excited to hear what we're doing here and what our approach is. So I just want to share that with you all.

Does anyone else have an update that they'd like to share? Commissioner Sinay, then Sadwhani.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I met with Amy from Philanthropy California just to do updates since they had an RFP out for -- a request for proposal out to fund regional organizations. The organizations don't know yet who's gotten the funding, so they couldn't show that. But there will be they are granting around 350,000. And we talked about how their work and our team can
complement each other. Moving forward, kind of what's their what -- where we were in our thinking and where they are on their thinking and we being the full commission. So it was a good conversation. I think we'll get a lot of support working closely together.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay, great. Thank you.

Commissioner Sadwhani?

COMMISSIONER SADWHANI: Yes. Thank you. Good morning, Commissioners. I actually wanted to respond to one of the public comments that we received from the black census and redistricting hub. First, thank you so much for taking the time to write that extensive letter. I know. I'm sure all of the commissioners really appreciate it. Certainly I do. I actually think that it was in response to some of the comments that I had made that may have been somewhat mischaracterized. So I just wanted to, you know, just to say that I had mentioned the organization to uplift the good work that they are doing. And a secondary comment was -- that I had made was that given the broad array of organizations and folks and communities that we want to speak with, we may need to think about using videos, but it was not specifically that we would need a video training from that organization. So I just wanted to say that, you know, I
don't know if anyone from the organization that's listening today, but certainly, you know, I just wanted to clarify my intent of my comments and I so appreciated the letter. While I'm not on the access committee and I'll leave that for the access folks to it to figure out who will who will be presenting. I certainly recognize the historical perspective and need -- for the need for the perspective of the black community as it relates to the Voting Rights Act. And the Voting Rights Act, as we know, was specifically put in place in 1965 in response to the discrimination blacks faced in and their right to vote.

And so we are you know, Commissioner, you and I are working on developing both a briefing book for four commissioners, as well as a series of trainings. So I would look forward to reaching out to Mr. Woodson or others from that organization to ensure that their voices are included, at least on that side. And as mentioned, the access speaks to that.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thank you. Any other? Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. Thank you. Director Claypool and I met with Sonia and we're getting her last name now, forgive me, from the California Census regarding our -- this commission's outreach and initial
engagement points with the census networks that we agreed
to be doing to try to get -- really as a means to tap
into the grassroots networks and the trusted messengers
within each of these groups, in each of the very vast and
diverse subregions and communities throughout the state.

And we had a very great conversation with her,
provided her additional context behind sort of our
outreach. I'm not sure how many of you have actually
made contact with either the census staff person assigned
to the region or the sort of the more community
representative for your particular regions.

But we had a good -- Director Claypool and I had a
great conversation with her. And my understanding is
that she was going to provide sort of a green light and
some additional information for us as a commission about
how the networks worked for the census so that that will
be incorporated into the presentation next week from the
California Census Director.

One thing that related to our meeting last week is
also one of the public comments. I think there's still
some confusion around the folks in the community about
what exactly the purpose was of the framework, I'm not --
the framework that we adopted a few weeks ago as a
mechanism for the Commission to begin our community
outreach and engagement in earnest, in light of the fact
that we are still not fully staffed, particularly on the community engagement side.

So just wanted to reiterate to the public that the framework that the Commission adopted two weeks ago in my mind is a working and probably in all likelihood temporary framework for the Commission to divide up some of the initial community engagement workload, for lack of a better term, so that we each have a better understanding of exactly what it takes to do community outreach on a level that happens for the census that happened for get out to vote. These are things that not all of the commissioners are deeply familiar with. And so really, we have used this regional framework as a way to jumpstart our own thinking and conversation.

But certainly, it is not a framework or division of labor or relationships that we are married to beyond this initial fact finding and relationship building purpose. And I think that was also an important message to reiterate and communicate to Sonia at the census and for our sort of census staffers that we will be contacting or have contacted.

So again, just for the public, just wanted to let you know that we understand and appreciate the feedback we received that, you know, we know that these regions are large and vast and contain many communities of
interest and sort of subregions that have different interests and needs. And we respect that. And we really part of why we want to engage these grassroots networks is to understand and learn more about the vast diversity contained across the state. So those are my comments on Twitter.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So I have a question for you. So where we at with regard to the individual groups reaching out? Are we to wait until next week or we carry on at this point? We got the green light to go ahead?

COMMISSIONER SADWHANI: My understanding is we got the green light to go ahead, although given even how much workload these census stops are in terms of winding down their actual work. The main -- scheduling for each of their time to get an hour could be a bit challenging. So I would say my understanding is we got the go ahead to continue to schedule things. But those actual conversations with the census staffers, the regional staffers, may not actually happen until closer to the end of the month, just given their workload.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just to add to that. I think what's critical is to contact the CBO, contact if they're still even hired; most of them, their contract ended at the end of October. Those are the ones that have the
most -- they're the ones with the relationships they receive the money to allocate it to us. But we definitely have the green light to build on what the census created. And we're being highly encouraged by the census director.

The director of the census was a different person than who Commissioner Vazquez and Director Claypool spoke to. And you're all highly encouraged to really play with the tool that Commissioner Ahmad sent to all of us. They're looking for where that's going to be place, where the homes are going to be for that. But that has a lot of the information we need to understand each of the regions and we'll learn more about it. But definitely, you should be asking to have your own account and start getting to know the regions.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Sinay, you used an acronym, CBO?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: A community based organization, so we sent you two leaders for each census. One was the hired staff by the census.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Right.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And they're kind of the contract manager. And then the other one was the community based organization. They were the ones managing the on the ground relationships.
CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Very good. Thank you. I just wanted to make sure I understood that and that our audience knew what CBO meant.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I just wanted to bounce off of what Commissioner Sinay said. You said the tool that I set. So I just want to make sure everyone is aware of what that tool is, including the folks listening. It's the statewide outreach and rapid deployment tool out of the California Census 2020 office. It's a tool that is used for census staff and planning for the outreach efforts.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thank you. Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. Just for further clarification. One, Commissioner Ahmad, would you be able to rescind that link? And I don't know if that should be put onto the commission's website.

And then secondly, just for clarification, in terms of the community based organizations with the two contexts, Commissioner Sinay, I think you're referring to the document that says community and sector based organizations. It's a document that was put out by the California Census 2020 Group. Is that the -- I think that's the document you're referring to?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: I believe so. I believe so. I don't have front of me. But we had kind of simplified it. So we gave you each kind of in our report two week, two meetings ago, exactly the links. So I can look for it.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, that's where it's from. But I just want to make sure that that's what you're referring to. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Well, I just wanted to say that in reaching out to the smaller nonprofits that are the community based organizations doing the census work, I have encountered quite a couple that where the staffer, the on the ground staffers are no longer with the organizations. And so that is an issue, especially in the more rural and smaller communities. But even in Morin County. So it's something just to think about it. And so the sooner we do it, probably the better.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Anyone else? Okay. Very good. Thank you. We'll go on to item number 5, I believe. It would be the executive director's report.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Good morning, everyone. First of all, you're going to see me doing this a lot because we are in a different building and I have to keep turning
the lights on behind us. We're actually in a different room; we had to move to a center room because there's construction going on all around our building. And periodically you'll hear construction going on in the bathrooms behind this room. So we will probably be here at least through this set, and possibly through the next one. So that's why the surroundings look different.

The first thing I'd like to talk about is the individual that Commissioner Vazquez and I met with was Sonia Logman-Harris. It's important that you remember that, because if you're asked out in the field about who you've spoken with, it is Logman, L-O-G-M-A-N dash Harris, H-A-R-R-I-S. She is the personnel director for them. And it was it was a delightful conversation. I'm very impressed with the census and the people that they hired.

She had asked for bios and I had gone on to our website; we only have eight of your bios. And I believe that the that the state auditor had asked the final six for bios. So I'm going to just ask the final six; did you give this your bios to the state auditor? Perfect. Because I've also got an emphatic from Commissioner Sinay. So we are -- I am -- I asked our contact over there if she would forward them to us. I would also like you if it's possible to provide a headshot.
I'd like to just get something on our website, even though we're going to update it. But I'd like the public to begin to be able to identify who you are and then maybe we can upgrade the method for getting to your bios there.

If I don't get a quick response from the state auditor, I may ask the six of you who were selected second to send them to me. And then we can also -- this is kind of a two for one. We can then also send them the link on to Ms. Logman-Harris so that she can, you know, know who you are and be able to present you out to the staff that you've been greenlighted to.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So on that topic. You know, the direction we were given from the state auditors for what was to be included in our bios was kind of different than what the bios for the 2010 Commission; and I kind of like their format better. And so what I was hoping was we could, you know, once we get our communications director in place and our web group in place was maybe that we could come up with a more consistent format for the -- consistent and effective format for our bios. I don't know how others feel about that, but that was my observation.

MR. CLAYPOOL: I believe that we're all in agreement that many things on our website need to be upgraded and
perfected, and that will certainly be something that should be on our communications directors list straight away.

The only thing I'm asking to do is this interim move, because she had shown an interest in being able to present all the commission out to staff. And then when we get Mr. Ceja on board, then we will be able to have him start to do that. The -- yeah.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yep.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Very good.

MR. CLAYPOOL: So now we talk about staffing. And the first thing we have an update on the deputy executive director position. It is at finance and SEO still. Raul's going to try to make an inquiry is where whether it's definitely cleared finance. The hang up will be the state comptroller's office and -- but we're still -- we spoke yesterday with members of the Department of General Services about some of the things that they're doing for us and that came up; and we asked and they were checking on it as well.

On the communications director, we have a report date, I believe, but I will leave that -- I was told --

CHAIR FORNACIARI: We haven't reported out who that is yet.
MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So I can do that next.

MR. CLAYPOOL: My fault. Okay, so that'll be reported out.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: I'll do that in agenda item 6.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay. I apologize. So then we have for our office tech, Ms. Cruise (phonetic), will report 1111. We already have Ms. Sheffield (phonetic) on board. We will have our budget analyst, Ms. Pacheco, will be -- has been asked to report tomorrow so that we can start to hand out some of the primary budget responsibilities. And the hire for Mr. Alfonso (phonetic) at the IT position, um, where we've solved a legal opinion regarding a question about his coming on board, and now we are sending him the paperwork to determine when he can start with this. And that would be our in-house IT.

And finally, in closed session, I have one other staff hiring decision that has to be made; and that would be for our deputy administrator.

On the budget. I didn't -- I had intended to send out a -- this week to try to complete the projected budget all the way through the legal -- the possible litigation to June 30th, 2022. I could not complete that budget, and I will have it for you by the end of this week so that you can review the projections before our
next meeting.

There are four things; I'd actually say three, but there are four things that I need to pin down before I can give you a fairly accurate estimation of the cost of this. And what we're going to have to ask for in our spring revision. The first thing is that we need to have the benefits estimate for hired employees. It's around 30 percent, but I'd like to know exactly what it is. And what that is, is it's whatever you are agreeing to pay your staff, we have to add 30 percent above it to pay for health insurance and all the benefits that are afforded to state employees. The process for granting and regranting outreach funds, I've sent a request to the Department of Finance requesting two things. Both the process, The State process, for making the grants and tracking the use of the funds.

And also which allocations we may grant -- that we can make grants from. Right now we know that -- we know I've been told that the outreach allocation, which is $2 million was intended to have some portion allocated in grants. But I'm also asking whether or not the unallocated portion could be used for granting funds. And so we're waiting for that.

I also asked the Department of Finance for the process for requesting the release of the allocated and
unallocated funds, and whether there are restrictions on
how the unallocated funds could be encumbered. This is
not only for grants, but this would be also using that
$3.9 million for your contracts and for -- can it be also
allocated for staffing positions in outreach or staffing
positions that will be required to be put in place for
some of the contracts that we'll have. So I just need to
know what the parameters are on the allocation so that we
can divide that money into the areas where we know it's
going to need to go.

And then finally, I've asked whether the
separation -- whether there can be the separation of
staff into operational roles into two different
allocations. And that's what I previously discussed.
Can we have the outreach staff that we intend to have do
our outreach? Can those staff be put under the outreach
allocation, or do they have to be under the general
operational allocation, which is $1,313,000.

So all those questions are with our contact at the
Department of Finance. They will get back to us probably
tomorrow or the next day. And then it will also answer
some of the questions that the Outreach and Engagement
subcommittee are waiting on in regard to the grant and
the regranting process. So questions?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Sinay?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can you clarify what is meant by grants, just to make sure that we're all on the same page on the definition of grants versus contracts and stuff? So what does the state bureaucracy refer to when saying grants; what does that mean?

MR. CLAYPOOL: So when I asked the question about the $2 million for outreach, I was told by a member of the legislature actually working with their staff that there was an intention that some of that money would be used the same way that the Irvine money was used. And so in my mind, it's the intention that they can give a grant out to an organization and have them do work similar to the way the Irvine Foundation did it.

As far as the State and how they see grants, I have to wait for that site from the Department of Finance, because it will tell me how we have to manage it and how we have to determine whether or not we've received what was intended when we gave the grant. But I believe the -- just the straightforward answer is they intended to be a supplant for the Irvine Foundation process.

Anything else? Okay. Contracting. We -- I'd like to talk to you a little bit about where we're at with the contracts. I laid out those rather onerous timelines last week, and we talked about the VRA counsel, the VRA consultant, the RPV consultant -- I'm sorry, Voting
Rights counsel, voting Rights Act consultant, the racially polarized voting consultant, and the outside counsel. As I understand it, all of these are going to flow through the committee, the VRA, the Voting Rights Act council committee -- subcommittee that we have right now, and that would be Commissioners Sadhwani and Yee.

I had -- we are hoping to get you the statements of work that were included in the contracts from the 2010 Commission, so that you can start working on making the modifications. And I'd actually hoped that we would have had them to you yesterday, but we're struggling with a couple of other things.

While you're working with those statements of work this week, Raul will be cleaning up -- will be cleaning up the shells, if you will, the actual 30 page part that goes with it that has all the boilerplates, so that we can drop your statements of work into them and then have the commission review the actual RFP so that we can prepare to approve them and release them. So that's where we're at right now with that part of the -- with that part of the RFP process.

Later, we will be coming back with an RFP for the process for all of your videography all the way through the end of the process that 2022. But that's strictly the in-house videography. Once we have the outreach
plan, then we will be able to put together the final contract, which will be whatever videography is -- or whatever needs actually are needed to run our outreach and our public meetings. So those are the RFPs we have. The only other one that's outstanding, of course, is in the line drawer RFP, and that will be discussed later today.

So commissioner Sadhwani and Yee, that seems like an awful lot of work for you two. At this -- is there a way that we can share the joy with other commissioners to help with that? Or do you -- I mean, do you feel comfortable with it or do you -- would you like to see if we get some other commissioners to join in and help work on those?

Commissioner Yee, Commissioner Sadhwani, whichever?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: (Indiscernible).

COMMISSIONER YEE: You know, it just depends on what the statements of work look like as Raul is able to pull them out. And you know, how ready they are. How much work they're going to need to bring to, you know, up to date for our use. But since we haven't seen them yet, it's just hard to tell.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. My sense is, I think once we see those pieces from last time around we'll have
a better sense. From all of the conversations that we've had thus far, I don't think that the issue was with how the VRA -- how the RFP was written. I think there was some issues with the line drawer one from 2010 that needed to be addressed. But my sense was that the VRA ones were actually, you know, did the job. And then I think some of the decision making of the commission was needed a little -- some greater information, perhaps, it seems. But you know, my sense is that what was used in 2010 can be updated, hopefully relatively quickly, to move this process.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. I just -- it seemed like a lot. It could be a lot of work, and I just wanted to check in with you all. If something changes, though, please, you know, let us know.

I have Kennedy and then Akutagawa.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. I just have a quick question for the executive director. There's a note on the timeline that we were looking at last time or time before saying contracting requirements for legal counsel differ from general contracting requirements. And I'm wondering if we're applying those different requirements to the VRA council as well. I mean, is that a way that we can shorten the timeline on the VRA Council is to use the same process that we're using for the quote
unquote, general outside Counsel? Thank you.

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes, it would be the same process.

MR. CLAYPOOL: There could be just one consideration, and that's if you've identified who you wish to have do it. Then we can use that mechanism. If you're looking for individuals to give you a proposal about how they would provide those services, then we would use an RFP.

Now, a lot of this, it's the same thing is used in an interagency agreement. If we know that we're going to use a specific individual for a specific task, then we can use that interagency agreement. And then it shortens the process greatly. I believe with legal Counsel it would be the same way. We would -- we could -- if we knew who we wanted to use, then we could use that process. But if we wanted different people to bring us, say, for outside counsel, you want to see some proposals on who they're going to offer up as the attorneys who will handle the litigation for you and so on and so forth, and you want to compare those plans. Then you're going to need to use the RFP to get those proposals so that you can match them. So it -- the use of that shortened plan is primarily, I think for -- you know, has that distinction. Is that the way it looks to you, Commissioner Kennedy?
VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, I'm looking at the timeline. And the first element in the workstream for engaging outside counsel for litigation says create the RFP. So I'm still a bit confused. If that has to go through an RFP but takes less time than non-counsel RFPs, you know, is -- I'm still trying to figure out how the Voting Rights Act counsel is different from outside counsel for litigation if it's the contracting requirements for legal counsel differ from general contracting requirements.

MS. JOHNSTON: The difference would be as when they would provide the work. And it could be the same law firm. That remains to be seen. But VRA counsel is to give you advice right now on how to comply with the requirements. Litigation counsel is to have on standby in case you are sued once the maps or before the maps are -- so one is more directed advice to you and the other is directed at handling litigation.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Does that answer your question, Commissioner Kennedy? Wasn't it more around contracting and what the difference is in -- would there be a different contracting mechanisms for the two?

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. I mean, I'm looking at the timeline that the executive director distributed at the recent meeting and seeing that the timeline for
engaging outside counsel for litigation is several weeks shorter. I'm just wondering if that could be applied to Voting Rights Act counsel as well.

MR. CLAYPOOL: I'm just -- I'm looking at the timeline that we gave you. I will have to get back to you on that, Commissioner. And I just -- I don't want to speak any further, dig a hole any deeper than I am right now between the two processes. I do know that for attorneys there is a different criterion, and certainly the voting rights act counsel is an attorney giving you legal advice.

If we can shorten it, if that's possible, then absolutely we will, because we're trying to shorten every one of these timelines. But that will have to -- just allow me to come back to you on that.


CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay, Commissioner -- or did you want to respond to that, Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. You know, I can't speak to the contracting procedures. I simply don't know them very well. But one of the conversations that we have had in terms of some of the lessons learned from 2010, was that the VRA counsel could be outside counsel. It could be an attorney that we hire in-house, as well. And I know when I had -- when Commissioner Yee and I had
talked with Director Claypool, one of the things that, you know, I think that we have learned is that we want to be able to be somewhat flexible in our process to make sure that we get the right counsel. I think, you know, from our conversations with Mr. Enscheda (ph.), as well as the line drawer from 2010, it seems that the counsel -- there was one counsel, right, who did both VRA and outside litigation. And that that ultimately wasn't the best scenario for the commission.

It may be the case that we could find someone who could cover both of those roles as external counsel this time and do so in a better manner. But my sense of -- in terms of the conversation that Director Claypool and I had, was to maintain as much flexibility so that we can make the best choice possible for us. I hope that that makes sense.

I don't know exactly what that means in terms of the contracting piece, but my preference was to ensure that we can get the broadest pool so that we can get solid VRA counsel and solid external litigation counsel, as well. And again, maybe that's one firm, but it could be separate.

MR. CLAYPOOL: We had also discussed that it was better to go out with two different approaches to try to seek the best very VRA counsel possible, and the best
litigation firm. And knowing that some of them will say we can do both and would possibly present their proposal as this is who we would offer up for VRA counsel, and this is the price for us.

And so it could be -- that was one of the assumptions with Gibson Dunn was that by combining the two, that there would be some type of cost savings in it, although we do know that cost savings is the second priority. The first priority is having the best possible counsel for the best possible advice in that position.

So that's why you see two different counsels being approached here. And I will get back to you. I've made a note, Commissioner Kennedy, to make sure that I get back to you on the timelines.

Commissioner Anderson?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: I believe, Commissioner -- I see you, Commissioner Anderson, but Commissioner Akutagawa is next.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. I guess speaking of timelines, I do have a question for Commissioner Sadhwani and Yee. I was glad that Commissioner Fornaciari asked this question, because I -- when it was laid out, like all the consultants that you would be having to manage. I hear what you're saying about you need to see what the RFP and what it all is
going to entail. But I am, I guess, curious and maybe potentially concerned about will there be an impact to our timeline if after you review it, and since we don't have all of the details yet that you have to be able to look now, will that delay the process if at some point after you have a chance to review it, you decide we do need to break out this work a little bit more. Because I'm just thinking about just how involved these conversations around contracts have been with just one person, much less four.

And so -- I mean, if you feel like you could do it, I mean, that's just fine. I think I'm just trying to be mindful of the timing, as well, too. And is it better to try to just say, you know, let's just spread it out now so that you'll have two groups of people simultaneously working at it instead of, you know, the two of you kind of trying to determine it and then deciding, okay, we do need to break this up and then we're that much further behind. And I'm not saying that you couldn't do it. I'm just asking that question.

MR. CLAYPOOL: So I think we're getting a couple of different things going on right here. Commissioner Sadhwani and Commissioner Yee will be looking at the statements of work. These are four or five pages, I think, pretty much at a maximum per contract. And then
they will be going through, and a lot of -- and I think there's a lot of truth to it. That we're going to be asking an outside counsel to do virtually the same thing this time as they did that time. To give you counsel to -- you know, to give you the best direction and to represent you.

Now, once we get past this and we -- and these RFPs come back in and they have to be scored and they have to be reviewed, and then they have to -- we have to make those determinations at that point, Commissioner Akutagawa, I believe that it would help to really split it out and let different teams handle it.

But with regards to the statements of work, Raul and I will be available to help you, you know, to be a guide for that. But if we have five contracts, or if we have five RFPs, we're probably talking about 20 to 22 pages of reading. And then, you know, totaled. And they're going to sound -- they're going to sound a lot alike as you go through them. So that's -- if that's helpful, that's the task at hand right now.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Just to follow up. It sounds like they can be split up later on. Like for right now, it can remain with the subcommittee, and then later on split it out then. Okay. I mean, that makes sense. I mean, it does seem to make sense that it would
all be under them. But at the same time, I do believe
that they have full time jobs, too. So I just want to be
conscious about that. And when I looked at that, I
thought, oh my gosh, that's a lot of work.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: It helps if I turn my mic on.

Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Thanks. I think I can help
out on this. I've been doing a lot of looking at the
contracts and types of contracts and things, and legal
services don't have -- actually, if you hang I'll switch
to this. Legal service contracts are not subject to
competitive bidding or advertising. You must be
authorized by the Attorney General, unless specifically
exempt by statute.

And so go back to where I can see everyone.

Basically, that's why, as I see it and I'll please -- the
subcommittee correct me if I'm wrong here, but there is
the outside counsel for litigation purposes. And we can
basically -- we have -- we did in the past do a do an
RFP, but it wasn't necessarily required as such. And
Raul can really speak to us more about this, because this
is his -- you know, he understands these particular what
you call it. But we want to be transparent and open.

But that's where the short window comes through -- comes
in, because legal services have different rules than the
regular RFPs and non IT services versus consulting services.

And so there's two aspects here. There's the helping us through litigation on the maps, and there's the VRA. And those are - I'm believing -- they're actually like there's -- they're maybe they're going to be the same, but chances are they are not. And that's where we're coming into. So there are two scopes of work for the different ones, but they're both going to be into types of legal contracts, unless -- and that's where the issue is, unless the VRA consultant is down as a consultant. But it's legal services, so that's where we need Raul to clarify.

And I think that's why it looks like there's the six-week scenario in one, and the really short period on the other. And so that -- if -- I think, Mr. Claypool, going back talking to Raul is going to work all that out. But the scope of work, you know, I feel quite comfortable that both Commissioner Yee and Commissioner Sadhwani, taking what they did last time, cleaning it up, will certainly get that moved forward. And they're -- so I think in this, it sounded like four different people. But I think it's one firm, and another firm possibly, or another guy or you know, person. I don't mean male or female, they're just a person.
So I think we're all envisioning a little more than is -- yes, they're five or six pages for each one. It's going to take a lot of work, but it isn't an unsurmountable amount of work, and I think we'll still meet all time frames that we're concerned about here. So I think that -- I hope that helped.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. I think Marian had something to add, and then Commissioner Toledo.

MS. JOHNSTON: Just for the Commission's knowledge, you are exempt from having to get Attorney General approval. It's in your statute. And we got a letter to that request for the 2010 commission.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I just want to say I think it makes perfect sense to have the committees work on the scope of work, finalize the revised, and to have those solidified. And then potentially have some kind of group that finds the ideal contracting vehicle and the smoothest works with staff on finding out that the most efficient ways to get these contracts brought to fruition. And so some kind of RFP group that isn't just working on the legal contracts, all of those are important, but all the other types of contracts that might be coming through.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Thank you, Commissioner
Toledo. Yes, Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I definitely have a lot to say about that when we get to the -- you know, the line drawing RFP. Because I'm essentially going to recommend what sub-committee uses what form, because I just did all that through the state contracting manual. So yeah, there -- there's a lot to be -- certain ones. We've been talking around about the particulars, and I can really quickly make that concise and come to a head.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: I don't want to have that conversation yet. I was waiting to have the conversation when it was the line drawing time.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Well, we will get there soon. Did you -- did Marian -- you responded. Did you have a comment, Director Claypool?

MR. CLAYPOOL: No, but thank you, Commissioner Anderson. It was a very clear and concise statement about how legal services can be procured. And -- but we do first have to get these statements of work out. And so we will have those to Commissioner Yee and Commissioner Sadhwani very quickly.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So Commissioner Toledo, I'm sorry. It's a little bit hard to listen and try to, you know, manage the meeting. And so was there an action you
were looking for me to take with your comment, or just
something for us to think about down the road?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: It was more of down the road.
We -- or later as we think through this. As Commissioner
Anderson, you know, speaks to the procurement work that
she's been thinking about. Perhaps we will -- we may
have an action later on. But for now, I'm -- just a
comment that I think the committees can do the scope of
work. I think that's appropriate. They're the most
knowledgeable and have the most intimate information.
And have been researching and thinking about the scope of
work the most. And then the more technical aspects of
the contracting process, and the procurement process, can
be done by a subcommittee that just focuses on figuring
out how to make that the most efficient, and just moves
that process out and makes it the most efficient as
possible.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Yeah. Thank you. And if
you guys feel like I'm missing something, just stop me.
Any other comments or questions at this point?
Okay. Director Claypool?

MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay. So following along, yesterday
Raul, Marian, and I had a meeting with the Chief Counsel
for the Office of Legal Services, the Assistant Chief
Counsel, the Chief of the Department of General Services
Procurement Division, and two of her assistants. And our conversation was to discuss our current CMAS (phonetic) contract for our -- our interim contract for video services, to discuss delegated authority.

And also, the IT procurement, your -- i.e., your computers. We asked them for a dedicated contract for our procurement services, expedited review and all of our contracts, not just the ones that we were rolling through right now, but the ones that we're proposing to push forward.

And also, a defined path for our procurement needs. The defined path, we've been getting bounced around between two different organizations and DGS as far as getting approval, because no one really knows how to handle an organization that needs to move as quickly as we need to move. And so the meeting was very good. We received assurances that we would receive as expedited a review as they can. And we told them -- we noted that we're coming into the holidays, and they said that the quicker we could get things to them, the better. And but they were -- they acknowledged that we had a special timeline. They gave us a point of contact, an individual that Raul has been working with, and they were generally helpful.

We were told that our -- that it will be a very
tough road on the delegated authority. The head of the procurement division thought that there would be some things that would -- that would stand in our way, particularly putting together a procurement policy and procedure manual that they require to be in place before they will allow delegated authority. We believe that that step is less onerous than they're portraying, and we're going to continue to work towards obtaining that authority before the main operations take off.

It's just at this point if this Commission doesn't get delegated authority, it has to become a negotiated agreement with the Legislature that the 2030 Commission is exempt from any procurement oversight except for possibly Office of Legal Services, and gets delegated authority. It's just each time that we've done this, it's been a stumbling block. We believe we can still make it work this time, but like I said, Deputy Shell -- or Chief Shell, the head of the Procurement Division, was just not -- she was a little pessimistic about it.

They also offered us several new services that the Procurement Division provides, including a one-time procurement option that they said could help alleviate our need for quick procurements. And we're going to go ahead and investigate using those as we move forward so that we can get the things that we need -- office
supplies and so on and so forth.

   And that is what we did between the three days
between the last meeting and this meeting. Are there any
questions for me?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. On the -- you
know, the delegated authority, the policies and
procedures, you know, we are working on that. How big of
a stumbling block is that? I.e., you know, do we need to
move that really forward or how much of the "policies and
procedures" manual do we need to have done?

MR. CLAYPOOL: It's actually a different -- it's a
Procurements Policy and Procedure manual. And it has to
be something that, you know, basically delineates what
our process will be for procurements, who's going to
oversee the -- who gets the two sets of authority to sign
for things, how we keep track of it.

   So we looked at it, and it didn't look to be -- we
saw a manual that had put in there for just -- you know,
review this, this is what it should look like. It just
doesn't look like that much. So I'm not quite sure why
that would be as big a stumbling block, and that's why
we're continuing to pursue.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Thank you.
CHAIR FORNACIARI: Are we going to talk about the org chart or not today?

MR. CLAYPOOL: Actually --

CHAIR FORNACIARI: I mean, is there a revised org chart? It's just --

MR. CLAYPOOL: No. I will have to revise that org chart to put in the permanent positions. I apologize. I do not have that now. It will come out with the plan that I'm going to send to the Commission at the end of the week.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

MR. CLAYPOOL: So.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Thank you. So the next agenda item is Communications Director Introductions/Update. I want to check in with the team responsible for hiring the communications director and just make sure, are we ready to announce our communications director?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: We have an official -- we have a start date. I'm not sure what the protocol is. I mean, our communications director -- did we want to issue a press release? Did we want that to be this person's first task? I'm (indiscernible) the name. We have a start date, but --

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. I just want to make sure
we're ready to announce that all the other candidates have been notified and we're ready to go.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Actually, that is a good question. I know this committee has a question in to Raul to see what, if any, communication -- if we have closed the loop with the other candidates.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: So pending confirmation that we have closed the loop with the other candidates, then we are ready to announce the hire in whatever manner we wish.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. We'll check in with Raul, then, on break and come back.

So we introduced our chief counsel at the last meeting. And she will be joining us on the 12th.

But counsel, update from Marian, please?

MS. JOHNSTON: I did not meet her when she came in this last time. Director Claypool did, and she sounded eager to start.

MS. CLAYPOOL: Very eager. And a delightful person, so.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Do we have a council update, Marian?

MS. JOHNSTON: Well, we're going to talk about it in closed session, but the Attorney General has agreed to
represent the Commission in the New York v. Trump litigation before the Supreme Court. And we'll be talking more about that in closed session.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Well, very good news. So for the public, we're able to join our amicus brief with the Attorney General's brief. And I just want to thank Marian and Commissioner Turner for helping make it so.

Okay.

Agenda Item 8 is update on the 2020 census.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: No new updates.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Wow. We are going to rocket through this meeting. Agenda Item 9-A, Action on Census. Commissioners Sadhwani and Toledo.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: We have no new updates and I think we'll be discussing it more in closed session.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Is there any other update on the hiring of the executive director?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: You all -- is that for myself and Commissioner Fernandez?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Oh, okay. You all heard the most recent update from Director Claypool just a few minutes ago.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. And we have hired the
chief counsel, so that action is complete. Is there
anything Commissioners Andersen or Toledo want to add at
this point? Or can we cross that off the agenda?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'll just say thank you very
much. It's been a pleasure working with Commissioner
Toleda, and I think you can take us off the list.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Well, thank you. Thank
you. And I just will say now thanks to all the hiring
committees for all the hard work you've done. I'm a
little remiss in thanking everyone.

Okay. So we just had an update on the hiring of the
communications director. And so we'll check in with Raul
and see where things stand there. All right.

What time is it? We have twenty minutes.

Okay. So now, we're at the Finance Administration
Committee. And we have put together a handout to review.
Two policies and procedures that we propose to bring
forward for approval with a little bit of background in
that document, too.

So I just want to check in. At this point, has
everyone had a chance to read it through or not? I guess
my real question is, does anyone need a little bit of
time to read that through and be prepared for discussion
of those two policies? Everybody's good to go? Okay.
Let me open that up.
So just, you know, are there any questions about the background? You know, I want to give you all, you know, what the requirements are here. And basically, the requirements are that we have a personnel communications code of conduct -- or Commission code of conduct, staff code of conduct, and records retention policies. Sort of we de facto decided we're going to have a per diem policy. And this is the list of other -- the complete list of the policies the 2010 Commission had.

Commissioner Fernandez and I have reviewed -- are in the process of reviewing the other policies. We made some initial updates based on feedback that we've gotten from the Commission. And as I mentioned in last meeting, we'll be bringing the other required policies forward in future meetings.

So is there any question on the background or where we're headed with this?

Anything you want to add, Commissioner Fernandez?

Okay.

Well, why don't we start with the per diem policy then. Is there any comments or feedback or changes that anyone would like to see with the per diem policy that we put together? Okay. Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just have -- on the very last paragraph, where it says -- or the last line,
"Commission staff will be responsible for reviewing". We probably need to put "for reviewing and processing all per diem and travel".

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So I added it here.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. So you have that --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm making notes, yeah.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. You're making notes?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Uh-huh.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thank you so much for that.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: On that same sentence, do we need or want to put a time, like within 48 hours of receiving it or by the 5th of the month or the 10th of the month, or is that not needed? I'm just putting it out there.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah, Director Claypool?

MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes. The short answer, Commissioner Sinay, there should be a time limit. We still have -- we're still clearing out some requests for per diem payments from the 2010 Commission that were forgotten, lost or whatever. So a time limit should be placed on this so that we can close out timely and that you -- and that you get paid.

I'm not sure right now -- we say Commissioners are
to submit their per diem claims monthly. I think that's a perfectly good timing. I guess staff could come back to you and say we haven't seen your TEC, so you know, so we can police that a little bit. Politely police it. But yes, the sooner we get it in, always the better, so we can stay current.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So what about the turnaround time on staff's part, I think was the question?

MR. CLAYPOOL: Oh, I'm --

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So what is a reasonable amount of time for staff to turn the requests around and get them submitted?

MR. CLAYPOOL: Well, we have to give staff a little bit of time to review them and make sure if there are questions, and it would go back. But they should roll out within two weeks of when we get them. Let me talk with Raul, but it shouldn't be any longer than that. I'm just saying that because I want to make sure with Raul because he's the one that's going to be rolling them forward through our staff, so. Can I come back to you on that one?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Did you want -- did you want to respond, Commissioner Sinay? And then I have Commissioner Turner and Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I feel two weeks is a really
long time, because if you have to -- if it's two weeks
until staff submits it, and then it's another however
long the state takes, not a good, efficient system. But
that was just my --

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm just shocked at two weeks.
I'm used to a quicker turnaround,

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah. I mean, I agree. I was
thinking more like a week at the most.

MR. CLAYPOOL: So I only -- I put two weeks out
there because I just wanted to make sure that we had some
leeway when I talked with Raul. We can make it a week.
I mean, we can turn it around --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: It feels like we have a huge
bureaucratic staff, so it should be done very quickly.
So I'm not getting why even a week would be -- you know,
it seems like this should be a priority for staff to get
the Commissioners payments and stuff done quickly. So
I'm just shocked that it would be that long.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Well, it is a priority. Part of what
I'm considering in this process, Commissioner Sinay, is
also coming back to Commissioners and saying, we need
this to be corrected or that corrected. So as long as we
could say that staff will turn it around in three days of
receipt, as long as we know that three doesn't start
until we have a TEC that can be submitted to the
Department of General Services so we can start the
process of getting you paid.

So I'm amenable to anything from three days to a
week, but it can't be less than three days. And that has
to be three working days. Three business days. It can't
include giving it to them on Friday and not seeing it go
out on Monday. So we can make it three days from the
time that we have a clean TEC, and we will work with
that. Does that sound fair? Okay. Three days.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. So actually, I'm not
good with it in three days. What I'd like to do is to
understand what the delay would be. I think the TEC,
from what I'm submitting, is a fairly simple document
with just a day count on it. And so what would help is
if there was understanding about what takes so long. So
this is something that, to me, should be automatic, that
should go out. And I love adding in whatever the time
period is from a clean TEC. Certainly, it would make
sense if something came in with missing information.

That's a different scenario altogether.

So whether it's three days or twenty-four hours or
forty-eight hours, the thing that I was going to say
before all of the other conversation ensued was just that
it would be helpful to know what the delay is for
something as simple -- that would appear -- without
knowing it, it seems like it should be submitted within
forty-eight hours of a clean TEC it goes back out. And
if that needs to be three days, I think just check that
and say, this is why that can't happen in three days.
But other than that, just pulling something out of the
air -- as long as we're asking for days, let it go back
out the same day. You see what I'm saying? Let's just
understand what the process is.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. So we'll check with Raul
at break then or -- does somebody have a comment? So you
have a response?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Kind of a response. But
now that I'm reading this again when it's not 11 o'clock
at night, I'm realizing that it's titled the Per Diem
Policy, and we're kind of intermingling a per diem
policy, which is kind of what we see as our time sheet.
And then, we're also talking about travel expense
requests, which are two separate documents. So I believe
what Commissioner Turner's referring to is a per diem
where you just put your dates, you know, you put the one.
So a travel expense claim would be if there were some --
you know, some sort of expense that you incurred while
traveling. So those are actually two separate documents.
So I'm --

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm just wondering. The per diem one should go smoother, I would think. The travel expense, you know, they'd have to review that to make sure -- you know, make sure the dates, the receipts, whatever else is needed for that process. But we kind of just added that at the end, the travel expense part. So I don't know if --

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So we --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Maybe we'll just clean that up a little bit.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: We need to clean that up? Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. We can clean that up a little.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: But I think within three business days should be fine as long as it's the clean one.

MR. CLAYPOOL: And thank you. When I was talking about the review policy, I was thinking strictly about the travel expense claims and things that require having receipts and tracking when travel was occurring. Yes, your actual per diem claims are pretty straight forward. It's just the number of days you worked and there
shouldn't be any issue with moving them more quickly. But I think it is a good idea if we go back to it and resubmit this.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So yeah, we'll clarify the difference between the travel claims and look at timing for those. Okay.

Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Did we establish a date that we should get them in by so that -- I mean, we've kind of left that open-ended. So why don't we have a date that we need to process our information and get it in by. Particularly the monthly form for, I think, all of it, actually. So my recommendation would be that we have to get it in by the 5th or -- it doesn't matter to me what day, but a day.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So we proposed within two weeks, but I think what I'm hearing from you is pull that in a little more --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Well --

CHAIR FORNACIARI: -- quickly.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: -- it's not like we're not -- I'm not suggesting we're not going to get paid if we don't get it in there, but I think having a targeted date, like with most things when you have to submit, there's usually a window, and then it can be more
systematized. Because there's fourteen of us. And if
we're all just entering them on different days throughout
the month for a two-week window. That's a lot to keep
track of, too. So that's three days for every person's
date, you know, kind of thing, so.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Something to think about.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Thank you. And then I
have Commissioner Turner, then Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Are you seeing Commissioner
Kennedy?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: I am not. Oh, he's -- was he
first?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah. Commissioner Kennedy?

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Just a minor
correction in the second paragraph. The citation is code
section 8253.6, but it looks like what we mean is 8253.5.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Very good. Thank you.

Then I have Turner, and then Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Just real quickly. I
was going to just support what Commissioner Le Mons said
of the size of our group since we do want this to move
quickly. And suggest that by the 5th of every month,
that we are also disciplined in getting in so that the
staff can move on with whatever their other duties are. And they can count on that, by the 5th I'm going to delegate time to get this taken care of and it'll be done.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Same on that. I completely agree with setting a time and a date for ourselves as well. Rent has the audacity to be due on the 1st. And we have grace period until the 5th to get it in, so maybe if we apply something similar to ourselves to get our staff the necessary information they need in order to process from their end as well.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Very good. Did you have a comment? Yes, Commissioner Fernandez, then Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I mean, that's great. I guess my other question is can we scan a copy in or do you need an actual wet signature on these per diem?

MR. CLAYPOOL: We can scan them.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: There's actually -- on the per diem you can do an electronic signature.

Commissioner Sinay, I believe?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So I agree with the per diem to get it -- you know, get your invoice in or your time sheet in. What I've always found a little harder is the
travel. Especially when you're traveling a whole bunch
and you need to organize all the receipts. And
sometimes -- if we're working full time, taking that
hour -- because it can take that long -- and so I just --
I think we can try, but I think we really need -- I know
personally, I like to hold my receipts until I at least
had a hundred dollars or 300 dollars when I'm being
reimbursed versus sending a receipt in for 20 dollars or
30 dollars. And so is it -- are we okay if we choose to
hold on to it until we have more receipts?
CHAIR FORNACIARI: I've got Commissioner Fernandez,
then Commissioner Turner.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I did ask Raul that
question --
CHAIR FORNACIARI: Oh, sorry.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- because I was wondering,
does it have to be done by month? Because that might be
how they track it. Or can you, like what you're
saying -- I mean, I only have one receipt for last month,
can I just combine it with the three for this month? And
I haven't gotten that information yet. So we'll follow-
up with Raul on that, and we'll get back to you.
CHAIR FORNACIARI: I have Commissioner Turner, then
Commissioner Le Mons.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. My suggestion would be
that we stick to the 5th. We are disciplined. And if, indeed, we have to -- because there's apps to help track it -- I travel extensively and do the same thing -- and can submit them and hold them. And if we're past the 5th, then we need to expect that it'll go into the next month's. And maybe that's okay, too.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner Le Mons, and then Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I support what Commissioner Turner just suggested. Also, I was going to say, I know we've asked the -- we've been really finicky about wanting budget variances and things of this nature, and this is one of the ways that you start to not have your budget variances be accurate when you're holding onto receipts or you're not submitting your time, and so we're not able to track. So again, I'll put that out there and reiterate a support for the comments that Commissioner Turner just made with regard to our discipline.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thank you. Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Just a quick clarifying question. The receipts for travel expenses, that's a different policy, right?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Well --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Or will be a different policy?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Well, we kind of lumped them
together.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: There wasn't a different travel policy --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Got it.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: -- before.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Director Claypool?

MR. CLAYPOOL: No, but I think that there should be two different policies because the TECs are just a -- you know, travel and so forth is just a different animal. It would be much easier for us to say on your time sheets, the 5th, and then we can -- the 1st to the 5th -- and follow-up on them with TECs. It's so much more difficult for staff because we won't always know that you have anything to submit. So that's going to be something that you have to, you know, police yourself on.

And I think that Commissioner Turner's idea about, if you don't have it in by the 5th, you just roll it over to the next one, is probably a good suggestion. But that's just my thought.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Well, any other comments at this point on this particular policy? I think at this point, Commissioner Fernandez and I have some homework to do. And we'll go back -- we'll put together two
policies, one for per diem and then one for travel expenses, and take your input. And then we'll bring those policies back to review.

We're up against a break at this point, and I can imagine this next one may take more time. So it's -- let's see -- 10:57. So how about if we come back at -- let's just call it 11:15, okay.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 10:57 a.m. until 11:15 a.m.)

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Welcome back after the break. We were going to continue with Agenda Item 9-E, and review the Commissioner Code of Conduct. So this reflects a lot of what was in the -- was currently in the policy manual with some modifications that Commissioner Fernandez and I and Director Claypool had some comments also. So I will open it up to comments and thoughts from the rest of the Commission. Okay. Wait. Where am I? Oh, there I am. I was up in the top corner and now I'm down in the bottom. I know. It's really hard.

Okay. So I get a resounding, everyone seems to be okay with it. Commissioner Kennedy?

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Just one thing. On the Act Impartially bullet point, I would actually like to propose adding members of the public into that.
CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. And you're taking the notes? Thank you.

Okay. I think that seems reasonable. Any other comments or thoughts? Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I'm sorry, I don't have something all written out, but I'm wondering if we should add something about fiscal prudence? You know, handling the taxpayers' monies with responsibility -- something to that effect. I don't see anything here, I guess, on that.

MS. JOHNSTON: Fiduciary responsibility?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Fiduciary responsibility? Okay. We could work -- I mean, so you don't have any idea for text in mind at this point?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I'm sorry, I don't.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Fiduciary responsibility would be excellent.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Okay. We can definitely do that.

Well, then, I assume, Marian, we need a motion to adopt this then?

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Would someone like to make a motion to adopt this with the suggested changes?
Director Claypool has a comment.

MR. CLAYPOOL: I was just wondering whether you wanted to adopt it right now, or wait until you had finished with the inclusion of the fiscal prudence line item before you adopt it.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Well, we can -- we can do that, and bring it back, or we can -- we could take -- we could approve it with that direction, and we can add a line item that way. whatever the Commission would like.

MS. JOHNSON: Vasquez.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: I'm sorry. Oh, Commissioner Vasquez? And then Turner.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Yeah, Chair, I'd like to make a motion to adopt the policy with the suggested amendments from Commissioner Yee.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

And then Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I was actually going to suggest that we receive verbiage before we write, but before we accept it.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. And I'm sorry, you're coming across a little faint, but I think what you said is you'd like to hear -- you'd like to see the written verbiage before you approve it?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Absolutely.
CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. And I saw some nods on that.

Okay. So does that -- okay. So can I get some reaction? Can I get a thumbs up to us making the change, or adding a line on fiscal prudence and then bringing it back for approval? And we'll bring it back, along with the per diem and the travel policy, and we'll approve all those together? Can I see some -- okay.

Yes, Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: And Commissioner Kennedy's -- Commissioner Kennedy's amendment as well.


MS. JOHNSTON: And you need to ask if Commissioner Vasquez is willing to withdraw her motion.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Are you willing to withdraw your motion, Commissioner Vasquez, at this point?

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Sure. I assumed that no seconded it, so it didn't --

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: For sure.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Okay. Well, very good. Then we'll make those changes and bring it back. I'm -- we had a jam-packed agenda for next time, but we'll probably bring it back to the following meeting, along
with at least a couple other proposed.

MS. JOHNSTON: (Indiscernible).

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Oh, yeah. Okay. This -- okay, we'll bring it back this meeting then. We'll leave that agenda item open. Okay. Very good. All right. Wow.

MS. JOHNSTON: Sorry. Just want to get it done.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Very efficient. I -- I'm a hundred percent with you. So, yes, thank you.

Okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Turner has something.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I'm just wondering how detailed it needed to be, or if we could just -- I just wanted language instead of voting on something that's a blank. And could we add something that just -- would it cover for Commissioner Yee and the other Commissioners just to say, "Every Commissioner shall act with fiscal prudence when conducting Commission business", or you know, just something simple like that and broad to have it in there. Or are you -- are we working towards something more detailed and towards a certain path? Because if it's straight up forward, we can add it in and then just vote and not have to postpone it.

MS. ANDERSON: Could she say that one more time?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Can you say that one more time,
Commissioner Turner, please?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Uh-huh. Yeah. So it's already there, every Commissioner shall act with fiscal prudence when conducting Commission business.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Is that --

Commissioner Yee, can I check in? Does that catch your --

COMMISSIONER YEE: I like that. I think it needs to be a little stronger, though. So I like the fiduciary idea, but it's not a word I've commonly used, so I'm trying to think of the correct -- or a good phrasing for that. Act in full fiduciary responsibility to the people of California? Would that be a proper phrasing? Act in full fiduciary responsibility?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Turner, and then Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes, that would be fine. I'm wondering if when we swore in, was there words already that said that we were going to act fiscally responsible or we're going to be accountable to the people of California or any of those words. Was the question, you know, I want to send off for a long research or what have you. And short of that, if that -- if you suggested words are successful, I'm good with -- or as acceptable, I'm good with those as well.
CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just did a quick -- okay.

So every Commissioner shall be cognizant and aware of the Commission's fiduciary responsibility when expending the funds that have been appropriated for the Commission's mission.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Is that new language, or is that the language that already exists?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: That's new.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Oh, sounds good.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Does that sound okay?

Commissioner Anderson.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sorry. Just one thing. One, could you repeat it again? But also, two, Marian, could you just jump in? Fiduciary duty is pretty self-explanatory standard. Do you need to say for full fiduciary? Is that almost like a double entendre, or I mean not -- it's almost like double --

MS. JOHNSTON: I don't think it's necessary, but it emphasizes it, if you wish to include it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, but fiduciary. Could you just give us a quick, you know, for people who aren't really, you know, familiar, fiduciary duty has a legal definition, correct? If you just --
MS. JOHNSTON: Yes. It means you're not thinking of
yourself, you're thinking of whoever it is you're acting
on behalf of.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Okay. And that's --
and that's -- in terms of like people who run trusts,
things like that, that's the standard, you know, legal
sort of terminology. They are -- basically, they
essentially are the person of interest. So in terms of
that sort of a standard, I don't think we need -- think
we need that full.

But could you please repeat the -- your wording,
Felicia -- Alicia.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Be cognizant and aware of
the Commission's fiduciary responsibility when expending
the funds that have been appropriated for the
Commission's mission. Again, we're trying to write this
for anyone, so that anyone that reviews it will know what
it means and doesn't have to do a Google search on what
fiduciary responsibility is legally.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Does that satisfy your question,
Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sure.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I'm thinking cognizant and aware
is good. But I mean, the point is to apply it, right, so
we're not just saying will apply. I mean, you can be
cognizant and aware but still make a different decision.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioners Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I don't want to go too far into
this, but we do say up above, we're going to conduct
ourselves in a manner which reflects positively on the
Commission, their colleagues, and themselves. Maybe we
also put "which reflects positively on the State of
California, the Commission, their colleagues, and
themselves." But, I mean, I think throughout this, we
are told -- we are saying we're going to have integrity
and what that means -- fiscal responsibility, that means
respect, that means civil rights -- looking at civil
rights. I mean, it means a lot of those different
things.

So -- my experience has been, when you have a
document that's this long, people are going to pick and
choose which ones they're going to remember and which
ones they're not. It's better to have less, so people
remember versus more. So I don't think we have to get
too stuck on the words, because there is a lot here
that's already saying we're going to be fiscally
responsible.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. So do you -- did you --
Commissioner Fernandez, did you -- I noticed you were
thinking and writing, so did you --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I was just looking at the other ones to make sure they covered it. I mean, I think -- was it Commissioner Turner? I can't remember. It might have been Commissioner Turner mentioned the oath. I mean, we did take an oath, and whether or not we put fiduciary responsibility in there, that -- ultimately, that is our responsibility. That's what we took an oath for. So we could not have the language. So it's just whichever one you prefer, you -- after a while, you could have probably 50 bullets. But at the end of the day, it's the oath we all took.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I wasn't saying not to put fiscal. I see that there is a want to have that piece in there, but not to get too caught up on the verb or that piece. But --

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Well, were you -- Commissioner Fernandez, did you -- were you able to adopt Commissioner Yee's suggestion in there?

Commissioner Yee, can you restate your thought?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I was just thinking to be a little stronger than cognizant and aware, to replace that with something like apply, or you know, an active commitment to actually do it, not just think about it.
CHAIR FORNACIARI: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: In that case, I actually -- I prefer Commissioner Turner's language when it was just simple, "Act with fiscal prudence when conducting Commission business." I think that covers it. I'm trying to see how we can put act and apply with fiduciary responsibility. And I think short and concise is usually better than more.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah, I guess the longer this conversation goes on, the more perplexed I'm becoming about it, honestly. I concur with Commissioners Fernandez and Turner, in terms of simple language to reinforce that. But I'd go back to the oath. I think that's part and parcel to the oath, so I don't know why we are, again, investing all of this time in something like this, when I don't even know what the concern really is. So if that's not our intent and our being here -- I'm perplexed.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: How about we include -- propose to include Commissioner Turner's proposed language and approve the policy? Okay.

So would -- Commissioner Vasquez, would you like to make a motion?

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Thank you, Chair. Sure. I'd
like to -- well, I -- well, sorry. Commissioner Kennedy had an amendment. Do we need language for that?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah, she --

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Oh, did we --

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Fernandez captured the amendment.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Great. I wanted to make sure it was captured. Thank you. So yes, I'd like to make a motion to adopt the policies with the discussed -- the discussed amendments.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Second.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Was that Commissioner Le Mons?

Okay. So who's managing the voting now? Is that --

MS. JOHNSTON: Public comment.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: We have to -- oh, I'm sorry. We have to take public comment.

Katy?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Chair, forgive me, what are we taking public comment on?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Taking public comment on the motion to adopt The Code of Conduct.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Okay.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Code of Conduct.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the
Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. The telephone number is 877-853-5247. When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed. It is 93489457215 for this week's meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID number, simply press the pound key.

Once you've dialed in, you'll be placed in a queue from which a moderator will begin unmuting callers to submit their comment. You will also hear an automatic message to press star 9. Please do this to raise your hand, indicating you wish to comment. When it is your turn to speak, the moderator will unmute you, and you will hear an automatic message that says, "The host would like you to talk and to press star 6 to speak."

Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your call. Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when it is your turn to speak. And again, please turn down the livestream volume.

These instructions are located on the website. The Commission is taking public comment on a motion to adopt a --

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Code of Conduct.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- Commissioner Code of
Conduct -- I should have written that down. And there is currently no one in the queue.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Well, we will give it a minute to catch up. Huh, I'm not showing a livestream.

I'm not --

Kristian, I'm not seeing the livestream on my computer. Is that just me?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Chair, while we're waiting, could I just say something?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yes. Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: (Unintelligible) it does concern the oath actually says, "I," and your name, "do solemnly swear or affirm that I will support and defend the Constitutions of the United States and the State of California against all enemies, foreign and domestic. And I will bear true faith and allegiance to the Constitutions of the United States and the State of California. That I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties upon which I'm about to enter." So it doesn't really say specifically what types of duties, and I think it's okay to put this extra line in. And I really like that Commissioner Turner came up with nice, small, concise wording. Thank you.
CHAIR FORNACIARI:  Thank you. Yes.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR:  The stream is up.

CHAIR FORNACIARI:  I've got the -- I refreshed my computer. I see the live feed, and it finished up just a minute or so ago, so we'll wait another 30 seconds or so to see if someone else calls in.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR:  Okay.

CHAIR FORNACIARI:  Okay. So I don't see that anyone is in the queue at this point, so we will go ahead and call the vote.

MS. JOHNSTON:  Okay. Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD:  Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON:  Commissioner Akutagawa?

CHAIR FORNACIARI:  I don't see Commissioner Akutagawa. She may have had to step out.

MS. JOHNSTON:  Okay. Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN:  Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON:  Okay. Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ:  Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON:  Commissioner Fornaciari?

CHAIR FORNACIARI:  Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON:  Commissioner Kennedy?

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY:  Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON:  Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS:  Yes.
MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Sadhwani?
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.
MS. JOHNSTON: Did she say yes?
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.
MS. JOHNSTON: Okay. Commissioner Sinay?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.
MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Taylor?
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.
MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Toledo?
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.
MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Turner?
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.
MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Vazquez?
COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Yes.
MS. JOHNSTON: And Commissioner Lee -- Yee. Excuse me.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.
MS. JOHNSTON: Thank you. Commissioner Akutagawa?
Motion passes. Thank you.
CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Thank you.
MS. JOHNSTON: You're welcome.
CHAIR FORNACIARI: And then Commissioner --
Thank you.
Commissioner Fernandez will make the changes to the other two policies, and we'll bring those back on Friday
probably.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: You're welcome.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. At this point, we'll move on to F, the Gantt Report.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. We have distributed, I believe, a new version of the Gantt chart, which takes into account the executive director's procurement timelines, as distributed in the previous meeting. Also takes into account the 15th of August, 2021 Constitutional (audio interference) line. And so we (audio interference) continue to be a living document.

The Executive Director has asked us to continue to maintain and update this, which we will continue to do, as we get more information. I've also added in things like the timeline on the development of the Community of Interest Input Tool as well as the month that would be required by the statewide database to build the redistricting database from the census redistricting data that it will receive.

So you know, as we move forward, this is becoming more and more detailed, more and more accurate, and hopefully, will continue to serve as a useful tool for all of us to understand what all is going on, or what needs to be going on simultaneously in order to get us to our objectives in time.
Commissioner Taylor, do you have anything to add?
And otherwise we're happy to take any questions.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: No, Joe, I concur. I agree
it's meant to be a living document bolstered by the input
from all the other commissioners. And the more we get,
the better. And as we -- and again, as we continue it's
more and more accurate. Thank you.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Thank you for that. It
looks great. I appreciate the updates.

Do we have any other comments or questions from
other Commissioners on that?

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just for the public, as they're
looking at this. The information that's under Collect
Communities of Interest Input, right now, those are
placeholders, and we will have a specific plan so that
the community doesn't feel like they've missed something.
But the dates are in about the right range of when we
need it.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Thank you for that.
Any other comments? Okay. Well, thank you.
We'll go on to G, the Line drawer's RFP. And that's
Commissioners Sadhwani and Anderson.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: You know, on this one, I
would love to say that, you know, well, pull up that
document. And I apologize. I did not get the draft in
our -- in everyone's hands, basically, because there have
been many -- this has been the one that hits what kind of
contracts there are and the crossover of scope of work
from the Voting Rights Act and the COI tool, the
collecting of information.

And so first what I want to talk about is just in
types of the contracting part. And the reason why I'm
going to talk about this is because, as I mentioned
earlier, is that I sort of viewed this RFP as kind of the
guinea pig for the rest of our RFPs. And I think
that's -- that will really help us as an entire
Commission bring all those into focus and really move
them forward.

I spend a lot of time looking at the State
contracting manual and pulling all of our scopes of work
together from what the 2010 Commission did. They did an
IFB, which is an Invitation for Bid, and then modified
it.

And again, things did change, in terms of what the
procedures are and contract type of things are about
2000 -- well, 2005, then they sort of shifted again a
little bit. So it doesn't really pertain. And then I've
also compared what the State auditor put out, and that's
a little different too. And I've been -- we're looking
at -- Commissioner Sadhwani and I have been talking to other line drawing professionals, and we've -- they've been sharing examples of different RFPs that they have actually worked with, in terms, which is really been helpful. But it's been a lot of condensing and putting things together.

And first, we definitely have to do a competitive bid. And our three methods that we sort of were talking about, and we might be sort of familiar with, is the Invitation for Bid -- the -- and then RFP, Request for Proposal. And you probably realize that there's a -- there's RFP1, RFP2. And those are actually considered primary and secondary. And those are essentially the three big ways that we'll do this contracting.

And we are actually, as I'm going to propose for both the line drawing and -- I don't -- I apologize for not saying this committee right, but is it the data mining or the taking in information or whatever the name of that --

CHAIR FORNACIARI: It's --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Data Management. Data Management.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Data Management.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Data management group is a secondary RFP method. And the reason is, is I
was just going to quickly comparing them. The Invitation
to Bid is basically for -- obtain a simple, common
routine services that may require personal or mechanical
skills. You know, little direction used for performing
this work. That's clearly not what we're talking about.
The primary RFP or RFP1 is to obtain complex services,
which professional expertise is needed and may vary --
that's certainly true -- where different methods and
approaches may be applied during performance. You know,
and that sounds -- and that's where we've been sort of
going. However, the RFP2 is, the purpose, to obtain very
complex and/or unique services, in which professional
expertise and methods may vary greatly. Creative or
innovative approaches are needed. And that's exactly
what we're doing.

Basically, what we're trying to do for line drawing
purposes, you know, we're adding in a COI tool, we're
putting in other different pieces, and we're trying to
put it together. We want people to come up with this is
the best way to do it, because we know all the trouble
that we ran into in 2010, and we've heard other
commissions and other issues bring about this. So we
want to get people to come up with ideas that we can then
approve. And I know that the data management group,
they're talking about something completely new. So I
strongly recommend the RFP2 format as a -- considered a method.

I gave that information to Raul and asked for, if you could quickly basically put together essentially the table of contents, you know, what that would involve. And he almost immediately sent back a nice format, which will help us enormously, because the place where you put scope of work is typically broken down into three different areas, and you have some up here and some over there, and it was very, very scattered. Now I can work with this in a much more concise manner. And -- which will really flow things along.

Now back to the scope of work. What I'd like to talk about briefly here is, and get the Commission's input on, I've mentioned that there's crossover in the line drawing and the VRA, working with that, and also with the collecting information. Now, it's very simple in our proposal, in terms of how we work with the VRA. You just -- you can just say -- and we'll work with them. What we're thinking of with the data management, I would like the Commission to talk about, because last time the "line drawer" did all of that. They took all that information, and they created that information. They actually educated the attorneys about the VRA, worked with the VRA, and then did the drawing as well. So --
and it seems to me now that we're breaking part of that out, and I'm really not quite sure what the intent of the Commission is, which I need to understand a bit more, in terms of putting our RFPs together. And I think that will also help the other groups putting their RFPs together, if we could have a discussion about this. So with that in mind, I -- well, I don't know. Should I -- do you want -- do we want --

Commissioner Sadhwani, do you want to add to this before we just ask general questions or? I think that would probably be the best.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. I mean, I think -- the reality is that, yes, we do want a competitive bid for the line drawer. The reality is there's not very many of them. The 2010 line drawer was the firm, Q2, which is headed by Karen McDonald, who also heads the statewide database. The statewide database developed the COI tool. They know it inside and out.

We will have a need to have some management system to take in all of that data and information from the COI tool, and then have -- in such a way that we all can utilize it, understand it, search it when we need to. But that also our line drawer can access it, right, and can use it, in terms of like a GIS and mapping platform.

I think we want a very transparent process for sure,
right. But I think at the end of the day, what we're looking at is, like, there's -- there are folks -- you know, the statewide database folks are kind of -- they know what they're doing with the COI tool. And I think the question is, who's our line drawer going to be, and how is -- how is all of this going to work? We want a transparent process, but at the end of the day, right, like, who's our line drawer realistically going to be? I don't know. I can't answer that question, but I think that we just need to think through all of those pieces, because if it ends up being Q2 again, maybe or maybe not, we need -- do we need the, you know, a separate management system? I'm not sure. But I think that I --

And Commissioner Anderson, please feel free to jump in here.

But that's kind of how my view of this process is, is that we want to have competitive bids. We want it to be transparent. But at the same time, we should also be realistic about what -- where we may end up landing.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, yeah, yeah. The point that I'm coming at is, is the idea of incorporating how the line drawer uses the COI tool is very, essentially, obvious. But that is not the only method as we're collecting information. And we're collecting verbal information. We're collecting, you know, hand drawings.
We're collecting general discussions. Many of the things that our Outreach Committee has been talking to us about. And we want to use all of those ideas. And they're working on these different tools.

The idea though, is, is the -- that -- all that information still needs to get translated into drawings. And how that interaction happens, you know, i.e. how much involvement do we need the line drawer -- basically, okay, my belief is the more the line drawer it -- is able to participate or to help out, that the two can work sympathetically. But that depends. And how we write that is very tricky, because they're not necessarily the ones who run it, but they need to have it and make sure it's all compatible. Like, you know, I've created a list of essentially file types that the line drawers need to be able to accept. Because I've been bouncing around looking at the different types of products that different tools put out, thinking -- trying to come -- put -- make sure it's all, because a little bit more information is sometimes required, specifically, if we're trying to look at this competitively.

And so, that's why we need a little bit more information to make sure that we're not delineating where we don't -- where we don't want to be. And we don't want to be overstepping at the same time. So that's, yeah.
And I see Commissioner Sinay is properly raising her hand, so.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you for acknowledging that the Community of Interest tool is one tool of many. I'm also -- so one -- I learned a new word this week, and I'm going to share it, because it's such a cool word. But as much as we can think of -- buying -- yeah, there might be some technology that is technology agnostic, which means it can take data from different sources. And that's -- the reason we kind of split up the two is that I'm not convinced that -- well, first of all, I'm confused because Q2 is a separate entity than the data -- the statewide database, and we're talking about them as if they're the same entity. And I think we need to be very clear about keeping them separate, because that was part of the confusion last time.

And last time, what we heard was Q2 had too much to do and that the piece of -- looking at the data was too much. And so this -- we're ten years forward, where there's a lot more civic technology that we can use. And that is not the strength of the statewide database or Karen. I mean, when talking to them about the COI tool, I'm not getting them -- getting the feeling that they're -- that they understand civic technology, the
bigger piece.

I believe that the more experts we get that help us move forward, the better it will be. And obviously, they're all going to have to work with each other. And if the line drawer can stay focused on the line drawing and you know -- I definitely feel that we -- that that was why I thought that we were really splitting up the two different contracts was to make sure that we're keeping focused.

I'm still trying to understand how a person can have a full-time job and go after this bid, which is more than a full-time job. And so I just would like us -- I think that having two bids -- I mean, two different -- I'm going back to what you all said about the council and how much we want to try different ways, so that we can get the best product and the best opportunities for us, the best people. And this is product and people and all that. And so that's why I continue to be a strong advocate of making sure we keep them separate. And someone can bid for both, but it'll give us an opportunity to get some of those other people out there that weren't around in 2010.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So Commissioner Sadhwani, and then Andersen. All right.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Just very briefly. I want
to say -- I actually am in complete agreement with you, Commissioner Sinay. It's not that I'm in disagreement with you. I -- my only piece is that I think that, as we move forward, one, how we write the RFP then matters, right, in terms of really honing in on -- there's going to be all these other people that you got to work with, right. And ensuring that that's kind of a part of the scope of the work, and I think, for us, as the Commission, as well as our staff, we're going to have to work pretty hard to make sure that all of these different pieces are actually working together well, right? I think that we can't assume that, right, like -- and I don't -- I'm not suggesting that you were saying this. I think I'm reiterating what you're saying -- is that, like, there's going to be a lot of components to really make sure that all of these different pieces and people are talking with one another and actually working in coordination together. And I just don't want to miss that. And I think that the scope of work then has to reflect that that is our desire, right. So that -- I think that's my thought.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right. If I can just go ahead and add. That's exactly what we're talking about. In terms of, yes, there's going to be -- and quite frankly, you know, the line drawing people, they're not
just collecting all this information. They would rather 
it be kind of organized and that they can then tap into 
it. And that's what -- what I want to know is, though, 
is where we don't want to get stuck is who is managing 
information, where is that system, who accesses it -- 
that, and that's where that -- this is the type of stuff 
that is about the RFP.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So I have Commissioner Sinay, and 
then Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: You've tapped into a question 
that I actually had two meetings ago that I never asked, 
but now I'm going -- and I think it kind of comes up when 
you look at the staff chart. What we -- I was kind of 
surprised when Commissioner Kennedy shared that staff had 
asked us to continue to manage the Gannt Chart, because, 
to me, that's project management, and that's where we 
need staff to be. And so I think one of the key 
questions is when you're looking at the staff, is the 
project management of all these different contractors and 
consultants, is it falling under the deputy executive 
director, even though I know some of it will be somewhere 
else?

But the Gantt chart, to me -- you know, my husband's 
a project manager, so I see him with all his charts and 
stuff. That really is where we need staff to be with us
and understand and those relationships and constantly
that's who they would go to to ask, you know, those
steps.

I think that's different than what you were saying,
Commissioner Anderson. Yes, we are going to tell them
what to do as a Commission, but the day-to-day managing
of is everybody getting done has to be done by someone
who's the project manager.

You were saying where is all this going to be
placed? And I think that is -- goes back into when we
put the RFP out for the civic technology and the data
manager, they will let -- they will come to us with some
of those solutions and some of the options we have for
cloud-based and whatnot. I don't think we need to know
all the answers yet.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. If it would
be helpful, I think this is a perfect segue way into
Commissioner Turner and I's update. And it's great
hearing from Commissioner Anderson and Sadhwani from what
they've been working on. This is the first time we're
hearing it, and now I'm seeing how the pieces fit
together.

So if you would allow that Chair, I would love to
start --
CHAIR FORNACIARI: Please.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: -- providing that insight.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah, please.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah, okay. So Commissioner Turner and I have met several times to figure out what is the charge of the data management subcommittee. And what we have come up with, from the understanding of the conversations we've had, is that we are tasked with going out and searching the field. This term, "civic technologies" has been used. I personally don't know what that even means. And so we're charged with going out and finding recommendations for the whole Commission in terms of how we can manage the influx of data that we will be receiving.

So I'm interested in what Commissioner Anderson has written down on her list. But just briefly, we talked about shape files from the Communities of Interest tool, audio recordings from public comment that come through a phone, written public comment, in-person public comment, if that comes at some point. And there may be other avenues that we have yet to see. And where can we find a tool or a firm or an organization, some entity to help us make sense of what we hope will be 40 million pieces of information, because everyone in California will participate. And what we can -- how we can use that
resource to translate all of that information into our maps.

Now, the conversation Commissioner Turner and I had with Marcy Harris, from PopVox, went really well. She gave us some insights into what currently exists on the field. She's connected us with some of -- some folks in her networks, which we are scheduling meetings with for some time next week. And I would just highlight the biggest thing that I got from the conversation -- and I'll turn it to Commissioner Turner for her thoughts as well -- was the balance that we, as a Commission, have to strike between the resources we have to manage our data and the scrutiny that we will receive.

So we talked about some very opensource type of data collection tools, like, for example, not suggesting it, but for example, we could theoretically have a Google form of some sort to collect data. That scrutiny that is tied to that type of tool might include that it's not secure enough. It's not X, Y, Z enough.

On the flip side, it did cross my mind we could use Natural Language Processing, an AI tool to read through all of the comments that will come in, to pullout patterns, key words, et cetera. But the scrutiny that could be tied to that is you, as a Commission, did not read all of our comments. You relied on an AI tool to
translate that information, and what does that look like in our maps and how does that reflect in our maps?

So Commissioner Turner and I are really jumping into this exploration phase and trying to get in contact with folks in the field who would have recommendations one way or another. But ultimately, I think what we will be bringing forth to us to discuss is how can we strike that balance between whichever tool we land on and the scrutiny that we will ultimately receive.

Given that information and the tie that this has to the line drawing RFP, it's become so much, exponentially clearer to me that the role of this external body that will manage the data would be in assistance to the line drawers, so that they can access that information readily. That to say, it would be nice if we, as commissioners, can have some sort of tool that, hey, I remember a comment from Redding, California; let me just search it up. That would be awesome, too. And figuring out if that tool exists, if we need to build from scratch, what the price points are for various avenues, is something that Commissioner Turner and I are gathering to bring back to the full Commission for recommendations and discussion.

So Commissioner Turner, I don't know if you have anything else to add.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Not much at all. We are thoroughly enjoying the conversations and getting excited about what is possible. When you look at the massive data input, the tools that are available, where we will be able to parse out comments, pull out things, look at word clouds, charts, all those different kinds of things. So I think, collectively, Commissioner Ahmad and myself, it's like, okay, we're excited now. Just listening one way or the other.

What I still want to gain clarity, even in this conversation, is where the line of delineation is between -- on this Commission to ensure that we're on the same page. I'm believing that we're out doing the research, looking for individual, an organization, a firm that'll be able to say, yes, we're going to take -- we will have the ability to receive information from all of the various sources, and this is what we'll be able to provide. So that's what we're doing.

I'm not sure about the line drawers. I want them to utilize what we find and be able to just draw lines from it, not have them also try and come up with another tool and another process to, you know, kind of sieve the information through. And so that's the confirmation that I'd like. And we can continue researching to determine who is the best person, the best organization, and make a
recommendation from there.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So I have Commissioner Kennedy,
then Commissioner Akutagawa. And then --

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: -- Andersen.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.

I had put into the hopper through staff at some
point, and I'll just put this out there now. I -- in my
election-related reading, came across mention of an
organization called US Digital Response, and their web
page says, "US Digital Response connects experienced
volunteer technologists with public servants and
organizations responding to crisis. We're fast, and
we're free." Now, they also do have an election branch,
if you will, or group within the organization. So it's
not necessarily, you know, COVID crisis or natural
disaster crisis. I think they'd be willing to speak to
us.

The page goes on to say, "Founded by former U.S.
deputy chief technology officers and seasoned tech
industry veterans who led federal open data policies and
digital government strategy. USDR is a non-partisan
effort that connects expert volunteer technology teams to
public servants responding to crisis." So I'm just
suggesting that the -- maybe the digital -- the knowledge
management team, as I will call them, might be interested
in connecting with them and seeing, you know, what, if
anything, they could offer, and particularly, you know,
looking at the -- looking favorably at the free volunteer
technologists element, you know.

Maybe they'll be able to help us with this, and
maybe it won't cost us anything. Maybe they can't.
Maybe it would cost us something, but I would encourage
you to reach out to them and see what's possible.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Absolutely.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Anderson?

No, I'm sorry, Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Chair. So I
want to just sum up what I'm hearing. So I think there
are some different pockets of technology that I think
we're having to consider. So one is what I would call,
like, the overarching kind of mechanism by which we're
going to take in all of this information, sort through it
and figure out how we're going to be able to utilize the
data, the information that we're going to get from
various other technological tools. The COI tool that the
statewide database is creating, the civic technology
tools that Commissioner Sinay has talked about. And I
did just some quick research on it, and you know, it
could be as simple as -- and a lot of people are probably
familiar with Next -- the Nextdoor app, that that is a
form of a civic technology kind of app. So it's a
collector of information.

I think what Commissioner Kennedy was also talking
about is a similar collector of information that will be,
you know, funneled into the larger database -- or we're
using the word database, but the larger repository of how
all this information is being collected.

So I think, what I'm hearing is that I think what
Commissioner Ahmad and Commissioner Turner are working on
is the broader, like, repository. And then the civic
technology tools, which -- of which the COI tool is --
has its own separate subcommittee. And I don't know
whether it makes sense for that to then be brought in
under --

I'm not trying to make more work for us,
Commissioner Kennedy, but I --

I'm just thinking, I wonder if the civic technology
tools then should fit under or fall under the COI tool,
so that then, given that it's a -- you know, it's a
similar kind of, you know, channel, I'll call it a
channel, for which we're collecting information, that's
technology or digitally based, maybe that might make
sense.

With that said, I think I would just, and I'm not
saying that we would have to do this, but I think,
Commissioner Turner, I really appreciated what you were
saying. One thought. When I was doing kind of like my
little research on what -- you know, what this all means
when I was chairing the meetings, you know, companies,
like IBM, came up for, you know, in my research, you
know, big technology companies who have a variety of
tools. I'm not saying that we have to use IBM. But I am
thinking that it may be worthwhile, kind of along the
lines of what -- maybe taking what Commissioner Kennedy
just said, maybe talking to a company, like IBM, and to
say, hey, is this something you might be interested in
helping us with under their kind of public service
mandate that they might want to have; that it's a way
for, you know, us to get something that would be robust,
customized, but yet not break the bank. And so I thought
I would just throw that out there, you know, for
consideration.

I'm sure there are other companies that may also be
interested in doing so as well to, maybe. I don't know
if they're listening right now, so.

The other last thing that I want to mention, and I
think we're going to have a conversation around
cybersecurity later on today, I think we also need to
really think about how the security of the data that
we're receiving is going to be thought through. Because
I just recently heard about, you know, hospitals having
their data taken for ransom, and you know, people have
actually died, because they couldn't do certain kind of
things. So I immediately started thinking about, well,
who's going to want to hack us? But then again, what
we're doing can really disrupt democracy in a sense that
if we have our data taken for ransom, and then we can't
draw the proper line, then we're going to be kind of up a
creek a little bit, right. And so it got me thinking
about that security, that cybersecurity around the data
and the input that we're receiving is also going to be
important in ensuring that we'll be able to do what our,
you know, legally-mandated charge is, which is to submit
the maps by August 15. So I thought I'd just throw all
those out there.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Anderson.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you, Chair. I
have a few things about everything's going on here. I --
we are trying to be creative and innovative and get
what's out there, you know, the latest, because we don't
want to be locked in, but we're not creating a whole new
thing. And this is --- I -- I'm -- I don't want us to be
like, oh, my God, there's so much data, and we're going
to be overwhelmed. I mean, the 2010 wasn't, you know.
There's lots and lots and lots of information. We're
just trying to put together the -- it's -- okay, I always
come back to it's contracting, right, and actually
contractors. You know, it's the -- who is in what role?
Who is the general? Who are all the subcontractors?
That's kind of how I'm seeing this. And basically, so
who is responsible for what and how they fit together.
That's a little bit more how I'm seeing it.

And in terms of -- it's a question of are, you know,
are we -- so you know, subbing this out to someone, or
we're bringing it in-house? And we are, ultimately, the
ones responsible for drawing the lines. And so like, I'm
coming down to, okay, we're going out to the meetings.
We have our people, our subcontractor with us who is the
data management type, to collect, you know, the verbal,
the -- you know, all this information. You know, like
the audio, like maybe taking pictures, however they're
bringing that in. They also have the COI tool.

Now, the COI tool's a tool. Who's actually using
it? Are we using it, you know, or is our line drawer
using it? And collect that information. Then -- and
that's what I'm talking about, in terms of, you know, I
see potentially the line drawer is that general who's
just making sure that everything we get ultimately puts
together so we can use it, or we are the general bringing that stuff in. But we have to have the people connected and understand it all the way along, because we can't end up with -- like the line drawer is not just a draftsman. Okay. They're not just a person who's, you know, who's just pushed around on the computer, because, you know, we're going to say, okay, now, can you work with us? You know, we've seen -- in our training, we've seen how that works.

They need to know a little bit more about what we're doing to make sure that the information is going to be consistent, but to tell us the pros and cons of it. This is not they're doing it. They're just a really good consultant. And we need to have -- you know, unless we want to do -- you know, basically I keep on coming down to are we using the COI tool, or who's using the COI tool. You know, because this is another tool. When we go to these meetings, who -- I mean, you know, are -- are we just staffing it separately? These are the kind of things I'm seeing. I mean, there are different ways to do this, but we have to include that in our RFPs or not.

You know, in terms of, you know -- basically, the reason I'm coming down to is because often the way you put it together, how do we get people to -- so you can compare dollars? Because -- I'm sorry. One thing on the
secondary RFP is it's not the way you -- it's a scoring system. You actually have to create a scoring evaluation system. And it's not necessarily -- price is part of the score, but it's experience, the plan, that sort of thing are higher -- they're higher percentages of the score.

It's different than -- a regular RFP is, essentially, if, assuming that they're all responsive bidders, who's the lowest? And for what we're doing on the creativity side, we really need the -- the secondary. But we do have to come up with a scoring criteria, so.

And in the evaluating cost, you need to have some sort of mechanism that will work. And what has been recommended, what they did previously is -- like it says, okay, what's a cost per meeting? But we have completely different types of meetings now. And we -- I don't think we've completely gone through what that means for different meetings. And that's kind of where I want us to, like, think a little bit more about, you know, who is doing what, how we're putting it together.

I mean, we can -- we can kind of rough this out and then we'll bring it back, but I want -- I'm -- reason I'm bringing this up is so people can actually go, oh, I see. Well, so we just -- we, yeah. As long as they're working together, and we put that statement in, that's enough. We work that out in their -- in what they propose to us,
which is kind of where I'm going. Because I think the
consultants are going to have a better idea at how they
best can help us than we can come up with, because it's
their field, it's not our field. And then we can come
back with it, as it gets slightly modified. But these
are the ideas that I think we need to talk about. And
that's, you know --

This is sort of a bigger -- well, I meant to
condense this discussion, not expand it. And I think
I'm, hopefully, bringing you enough information that
people can get a much better idea and be more concise
about how they -- how they're going to fit this together.
I better stop there.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. I saw Commissioner Sinay.
Then I have a question, then Commissioner Fernandez, then
Yee. And Turner. Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Turner was before Yee.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. So I'm more
confused than I was at the beginning, so I want to
clarify a few things.

Commissioner Akutagawa, what you said was exactly
the question that I was posing when we created the data
management subcommittee, is I wanted to understand --
I've kind of done a drawing -- there's going to be all
these inputs, you know, if we're going to use the old
word. You know, we're going to go back, Commissioner
Toledo, to that theory of change. So our inputs are
going to be a wide number of inputs. I always thought
that the COI tool, the Community of Interest tool, was a
tool that was going to be out in the public and everybody
was going to use it; it's not just ours. And so that's
just one way, but a lot of people aren't going to be
comfortable with that.

Also, we keep saying, you know, we kind of have to
blow up the old -- what happened last time and get away
from thinking of just hearings -- that there's going to
be public hearings -- but that we need to think about how
we're having different meetings to get the communities of
interest.

I do understand that for looking at the maps as we
draft them, we may need a different model. But to
actually get as much input as possible, we're going to
have to be more creative because of COVID. Even without
COVID, we would've needed a different way of doing it
than it was done last time.

So there's that input piece, which is what I refer
to as civic technology, because that's what other -- you
know, it's how do you use technology to engage
individuals? And technology can be -- computer
technology but can be other ways. But even if someone sends us a drawing, we need to be able to translate that drawing into useable data, and that's where the technology piece comes in.

So last time I had asked, is the data management team also looking at this input piece? Is that one contract, or is that two separate pieces? I liked Commissioner Akutagawa's idea of, hey, let's expand the COI tool subcommittee to be kind of civic technology and just think through how do we -- how do we do all these inputs and what's that going to cost?

But I think we all need to be kind of on the same page because last time I left with the expectation that the data management group was also doing the civic technology piece, so meaning the input, the collecting all of it, analyzing it, and making it so we can all use it for the line drawing. So I think that piece needs to be really well thought out.

I would rather see staff kind of be the project manager versus making the line drawer the project manager, because then it's very difficult to manage a consultant who's managing other people. And I thought that was part of the reason why we hired the deputy executive director, was kind of to help with that aspect of it.
So my big -- one of my big areas that I think we need to clarify is, one, that the COI tool is actually a tool that's going to be out there for the public to use; that was the whole purpose of it. The second piece that I feel needs to be is the civic technology, the input, is that falling under the data management group or not? You know, should it go somewhere else? And third is the project manager for this going to be staff or some other entity?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So Commissioner Sinay, let me ask you a question, because I think you and I use the term project manager differently. So I want to know what you mean by project manager in the context of what you just described as -- you know, we have -- you know, the way you described it is we have data input folks, we have data management folks, and maybe that's two separate organizations, and somehow they work with the line drawers in some way we define. And so are you defining data management is the person that coordinates and oversees these three entities and makes sure they're all working together and defines what they're doing? Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No. So I was looking at the project -- okay, there's three entity -- well, three -- I don't want to call them entities. Well, they may be three entities, but there's --
CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- three pieces. The input of data, the different ways to collect the data.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Where that data store -- translated, stored, analyzed, and then put in a form that we can look for and all that.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And then the line drawing.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: To me there are three different types of contracts, but maybe they're not. Or if we -- the project manager is the one that says, hey, by August 15th we need this done, so this is what needs to happen. Here's who's responsible, and is constantly looking at the Gantt chart and making sure that all the moving pieces are moving forward.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Okay. That's the way I look at it, too. I thought you were looking at it a little differently. Okay. That's fine. We'll carry on. I believe Fernandez was next.

And I got your hand, Commissioner Andersen.

Turner, were you -- I thought you were after Fernandez, but are you before?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I thought so, but --
CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Go ahead, then,
Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I was wanting to respond back
when Commissioner Andersen was speaking to make sure --
in my mind the work that we're trying to do is not to
have the line drawers pull information from the COI tool
separately. I feel that there's a problem in that in
that there would be a rating or ranking -- a higher
degree of preference or what have you. I believe whether
we use USDR, if we explore IBM or if we use one of the
individuals like Massive Data Technology -- any of the
groups -- wherever we land, I'm hopeful that they will
take -- be it handwritten drawings, verbal testimony,
something that was emailed in, sent in, written on a
napkin, and the COI tool -- they'll take all of that
information and through data mining -- through whatever
they want to use, I'm hopeful that they will then spit
the information out on the other end or make it
accessible for our line drawer then to say, we've
compiled all of this information. All of it is
important, all of it is necessary, and then begin to draw
lines. We have access to it; they have access to it.

Not that (indiscernible) they'll draw the lines, but
whatever, but the information is not that a line drawer
is going to just interact with the COI tool and now it'll
get separate information. I thought the intent of data management and the subcommittee that we're working on is for us to find an entity -- an organization -- that will be able to pull in all of this information, understand the value that it brings, and then have it in an accessible format for us so that we'll then be able to pull from it just as the line drawers and be able to go back and say give me information from Redding, give me information from. And we can then identify, yes, I got this from Redding, as a matter of fact, this came in written or this came in because of the COI tool or whatever the case may be. So I just wanted to state that out loud because that is the -- that's what I'm operating from.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. So I have Fernandez, Yee, Andersen, and Kennedy, and then Le Mons. You're going to pass? Okay. Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. So I'm looking at the four-page memo that former Commissioner Ancheta sent out, and he addresses, you know, this exactly, and you know what happened in 2010. And there's recommendations for us. One thing that he makes clear is the difference between public inputs and then nontestimonial inputs. So the public inputs, you know, for us will be COI tool info, testimony that comes whether through Zoom or in person or
whatever, public comments, so on, public inputs. And the problem in 2010 was that came in -- that was all considered, but the tabulation and analysis fell short.

And so my understanding is that the subcommittee -- the data management subcommittee, primarily looking at how do we do a better job this time of analyzing public inputs, right. Including COI tool, public testimony and so forth, and then presenting that to us in some form that we can discuss and use to direct the line drawer, right. To create options.

The nontestimonial input fell short in 2010. You know, that's the kind of research we do, you know, talking to local governments and looking at maps ourselves and researching what would have been historically considered neighborhoods and things like that.

Actually, I have a question for Director Claypool. I'm wondering -- you know, so we do research, but inputs have to be presented in a public setting, correct? So if I go home and I research, okay, well, what is considered, you know, the Tenderloin in San Francisco and has that changed over time, and you know what are the boundaries, but I can't -- I can't use that info unless I've presented it and it's been discussed in public -- you know, in a public forum here. Is that how it works then?
I mean, is that one of the problems that that kind of research fell short in 2010 because, I mean, that just takes time and scheduled meetings. Okay, this meeting we're going to discuss San Francisco and do your homework and then we're going to discuss that in public. Is that how it should work?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah. Go.

MR. CLAYPOOL: In the previous iteration you would've gone back into a public meeting and asked your line drawer, who would've been there, what is this district? Is this the Tenderloin? What is considered the Tenderloin? And there it would've been introduced into the public conversation. That was how the different commissioners came back and made those types of statements so that the public could consider it.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. So but that would not be -- that would not be fodder for the data management contractor to work with. I mean, that would just be part of our ongoing process.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Why not? Because you've entered it in at a public comment. Your data manager is going to be bringing -- you know, your comments -- the things that you say to one another are equally as important as what the -- you're digesting the public statements and now you're giving your thoughts on it. Those thoughts should
be incorporated into that public record, it seems to me.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. Well, I should restate it. So I guess that is the question we're discussing. What inputs do we want our data manager to take? Clearly, the public comments, the COI tool info, you know, that and so forth, but you know, what about nontestimonial inputs and so forth? I guess that's what we're discussing.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Well, to reiterate, though. You'll be in a meeting and you're going to go back and forth with the iterations on maps and you're going to say, can you add -- what if we add this or what if we add that? Each one of those iterations should be something that your data manager is capturing. And so at some point, you might want to say to the data manager, you know, how many times did we go over the Tenderloin in San Francisco; I mean, what were our thoughts? They should be able to bring that back up for you so that you can examine what your thoughts were and then compare them to the public testimony you're getting.

I just think that anything that's said in public, whether you say it or the public says it, should be something that enters into the conversation when you draw the lines.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I see. Thank you.
CHAIR FORNACIARI: So let's see. I have Commissioner Andersen, then Kennedy, then Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, all the Commissioners. This is really good information, because I really see where everyone's going with this.

And Commissioner Turner, I totally agree with what you're saying. That's how I see this happening.

Commissioner Sinay, the idea of the -- you know, are there three pieces of the data management. I actually see it as two, because I believe I'm seeing this data management as they're collecting -- the tools would be to collect it all and house it all. Because, you know, like, you don't collect stuff and put it somewhere else, because you've basically -- once you create information, it then becomes (audio interference) that you sort through and (indiscernible). So I would assume -- they're not like, here's this, and we'll give it over to IBM or something. It's like that's sort of what they do. It's kind of like -- you know, well, like I say, we've been talking about the line drawers. You know, the maps that they're working on, that's in their purview or essentially it is on their servers. And ultimately, then, where do we take this that we all use it? You know, is it still with their server? Is it with actually -- do we have a large server, you know, CRC?
But that's something that they would propose to us.

But I see that as they are collecting all the information. And the COI tool -- I'm sorry if I miss -- that was misinterpreted. The COI tool is definitely out there for everyone to use. But at particular meetings, people will also come up, and if they want to then put it into -- use that format, we should have someone who could easily do that for them. Because then that's a way to capture it. You know, if they feel comfortable. Now, if they'd rather just talk, but if they, say, hey, well, do you want to draw your map? And they say, yeah, sort of a step accomplished.

Because ultimately, we want to go to get information that we can use it and sort through. But in terms of ranking these -- no, no, it's never my intention in terms of is one area -- is one more valid than another? That's our job. I don't see any consultant saying, you know, oh, we're going to pick some things out of this. No. They're going to present all of it to us, and then we are -- you know, as we draw the lines -- the consultant gives us the information, and we have the ability to rank it and decide what we want to use. Because when we come down to who draws what, that's us, you know. And that's not someone else doing that job. We want to have all the criteria because, you know, a lot of people they still
don't quite understand the criteria that's involved, particularly on the Voting Rights Act, and compactness, quite frankly.

   And so that's in our purview. That's, I feel, our responsibility. We just want to get all the information such that we can evaluate it. So I don't mean to have anyone, you know, one person charging the other. 

   And when I talked about management, I did not mean -- we ultimately, or our staff, is ultimately keeping us all on track. This is just in terms of coordination, you know, like, yes, so I can access -- the line drawer can access the information from the data management to be able to -- it's compatible is what I'm talking about in terms of managing, not ultimately who's in charge. And that's, I think, it's a much smoother connection than I might have been portraying, what I'm getting information from.

   I think I actually have a lot of information here to be able to put the RFP together for you know, bringing forward for the line drawer. And I'm hoping that this conversation has also helped all the other subcommittees, make it a little bit more clearer, and as you start putting things on paper, how do we -- I think this is a Marian question -- we just need to bring it to each other because we can't -- the subcommittees can't talk to each
other. So can we just submit -- if we have a real need
for information, can we -- I mean, can we just request
information about something to you and you can forward
it, or what -- how can we -- how do we do this?

MS. JOHNSTON:  You can do it in writing or orally at
a meeting, whichever you prefer to do, and it would be
distributed to everybody if it's submitted in writing.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN:  Okay. All right. Okay.
Because if anyone as they're -- and any of the
subcommittees -- have issues of making sure it's
compatible or something, please, you know, forward that
to the line drawing and vice versa. So thank you.

CHAIR FORNACIARI:  I have Kennedy, then Le Mons,
then Akutagawa, then Director Claypool.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY:  Thank you, Chair. I'm going to
suggest -- I used earlier the phrasing knowledge
management. And I think that I would like to propose
that we rename the subcommittee either information
management or even knowledge management, because data
man -- I mean, data, you know, gather a lot of data to
generate information, you gather a lot of information to
generate knowledge, and I think we're trying to get, you
know, to the knowledge point, not just the data point.

If anyone's interested and has any time, there's a
phenomenal book on all of this. It's called Information
Ecology by Thomas Davenport, who's like the leading thinker in this whole field. The subtitle is "Mastering the Information and Knowledge Environment". But you know, I think we need to take a holistic approach to this and not focus so much on individual independent pieces without understanding how they all fit together and get us to our ultimate purpose. Thank you.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thank you. Just a reminder. We have, I believe, five minutes until we're scheduled to take our lunch break, or our hour-and-a-half is up.

So Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I want to thank everyone for the discussion. I think it's moved us closer to being on the same page around a lot of these pieces that we've discussed in different ways. I was actually going to ask a question of the subcommittee, both Commissioners Andersen and Sadhwani, but I believe Commissioner Andersen answered it. And that was if they had enough information based on this conversation to move forward with drafting the scope of work or RFP, or if there were outstanding elements that they still felt existed; if they could focus us, or focus the remainder of the discussion to make sure that we walk away from this discussion with them being equipped with the things that they need to move it forward.
CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was just going to make a suggestion that -- to the data management committee that perhaps part of the -- as you think about and look at the contractors that you might consider, that you also include them housing the cybersecurity responsibility for the data as well, too. Because I think that that's most likely something that they would be able to do.

Something someone said just got me thinking about that, but I think that could be part of the cybersecurity discussion later.

One other thing that I just wanted to comment on in terms of what Commissioner Kennedy said, I would encourage -- between information management and knowledge management, I would encourage more information management. Because I think knowledge management has its own implications and its own field. And I would not want to have anybody confused by using a term that, if they're lacking some of the context of the conversation that we had, they may think that it has a different kind of role. But I think if you use a more expansive term like information management, I think that that would still serve the purpose of you know, using the kind of the technology, but it's not just limited to technology, and
it may be a little bit more clearer for some folks. So just wanted to add that.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Thank you. I like that suggestion, too.

Director Claypool.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Just a couple of points to respond to something that Commissioner Andersen has said about if somebody came in and they wanted to use the COI tool during a public meeting. I had the expectation that your line drawer would be always at your meetings. That they would be the person that's kind of the director of -- if I'm standing there and trying to tell you where my neighborhood is, that your line drawer would be there, as they did in 2010, and show a screen and say, okay. And they would outline it and they would capture that iteration for your management people. So we need to make sure the line drawer knows that they have that full spectrum of responsibilities to not only be there for your line drawing, but to be there for your public meetings and to assist the public there.

And then the second one is ownership of the data. We need to make sure everybody understands that the Commission owns everything that comes out of this process. And so if you've got that in there already, then we're set. Thank you very much.
CHAIR FORNACIARI: So I just want to go back to Commissioner Sinay's comment earlier and then -- because I mean, I'm a visual kind of learner and thinker. And I'm hoping I could ask Commissioner Sinay to draw a picture of what she's thinking. Could she? Okay. Beautiful.

Do you think you could draw a picture and share it with us so that we can all kind of visually see what you're thinking? Because I feel like that's the visual -- or the idea that I had in my mind, but I'd like to see it, then I think that would help us all get on the same page on all of the pieces of this.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Shall I do that at lunchtime?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Well, if you can. But you know, if you could -- if you can, that would be awesome. But you know if you could get back to us in the next day or so, that would be great.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Hopefully, it makes sense, but yes. I guess I'm a visual learner too.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Well, I really appreciate that. Thank you. Thank you so much.

Okay, with that, I think we'll break for lunch. It's 12:40 -- am I -- yeah, that's right, it's lunchtime. Okay. 12:45. So we'll be back at 1:45.

Thank you, all.
(Whereupon, a recess was held from 12:45 p.m.
until 1:45 p.m.)

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Well, thank you. Welcome back to
the Citizens Redistricting Commission meeting. At this
point, we are going to open it up for public comment.
So Katy, if you could read the directions for us
again?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: In order to maximize
transparency and public participation in our process, the
Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To
call in, dial the telephone number provided on the
livestream feed. The telephone number is 877-853-5247.
When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on
the livestream feed. It is 93489457215 for this week's
meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply
press pound.

Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a
queue from which a moderator will begin unmuting callers
to submit their comment. You will also hear an automatic
message to press star 9. Please, do this to raise your
hand, indicating you wish to comment.

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

These instructions are also located on the website.

The Commission is taking public comment on general topics at this time.

There is no one currently in the queue.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thanks, Katy. Just looking to see when the directions finish up.

(Pause)

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We do have someone in the queue.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Great.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: If you would please state and spell your name for the court reporter and then share your comment.

MS. PONCE DE LEON: Hi. Good afternoon. My name is Alejandra Ponce de Leon. A-L-E-J-A-N-D-R-A P-O-N-C-E D-E L-E-O-N. I'm calling with Advancement Project California, and I'm calling on behalf of the Redistricting Alliance. First, we'd like to commend you all on the work and time you have dedicated to engaging and learning from a variety of stakeholders to inform
your community outreach plans. We look forward to
learning along with you about the particular challenges
to and best practices for engaging African refugee
communities, Pacific Islander communities and people with
disabilities this week.

We urge you to continue prioritizing your direct
engagement in your meetings with other panelists that can
provide you with a richer understanding of the nuances,
challenges, and recommendations to better engage diverse
communities. In particular, we urge you to create time
in your upcoming meetings to directly hear from the
California Black Census and Redistricting Hub and the
California Native Vote Project to reach a deeper
understanding of their needs, barriers to their
participation, and best practices for engagement to fully
incorporate it in your outreach and engagement plans.

Both of these communities hold sizeable portions of
our state's population, and also in particular regions.
And have historically faced and continue to face grave
disparities when it comes to health, policing, household
income, education and participation in our democracy,
among other areas.

We recognize that there are other urgent matters
that need to be addressed and you are trying your best to
balance everything, given the time limitations and
bureaucratic processes you need to navigate. And we also understand where Commissioner Sadhwani is coming from and offering a suggestion to use the training videos. However, the process and time you invest now to engage with a variety of committee stakeholders during your meetings will only strengthen and maximize your efforts for outreach and engagement moving forward and make the biggest difference in reaching your goals for public participation and regional representation. Take the time and you will go farther in your efforts. Thank you for your time. Have a good day.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thank so much for your feedback and your continued support for the Commission. We appreciate that. Thank you.

MS. PONCE DE LEON: Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: That was the only person in our queue at this time.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. So it's been about three minutes since the instructions finished. So I think that folks have had adequate time to join in if they were going to. So at this point, we're going to move to close session.

And let's see. It's 10 to 2. I guess, that clocks off. I'm going to say we'll be back at 3:30. So I think that should be adequate time. So we'll head off to close
session now and return at 3:30. So thank you all.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 1:50 p.m. until 3:30 p.m.)

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Well, welcome back to this session of our Citizen Redistricting Commission meeting. Just brief report out from our closed session. We had discussions on the issues in the agenda and just conversations about those issues. And we did decide to join the Attorney General for their amicus brief. So we are working to draft a letter to send to the Attorney General to join that brief in the Trump v. New York case.

So back to our agenda. We left off with Item G. I think we finished with that item. I just want to make sure that Commissioner Andersen, Commissioner Sadhwani, you've got what you need to move forward? Okay. Thank you. Okay.

So then we're on to letter H, VRA Compliance.

Commissioners Sadhwani and Yee.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. You know, we've already discussed, you know, the VRA request for multiple RFPs. So there's not a whole lot more to update. Commissioner Yee and I continue to work on identifying and having conversations around training and putting together a training and a briefing book for Commissioners that is still in progress. We're actually going to meet
and discuss more about that tomorrow.

So I don't know if, Commissioner Yee, if you have additional things to mention.

I should note, I believe that it was placed in the meeting handouts. MALDEF had provided us with a number of documents that they had put together in coalition, I believe with Common Cause and one other organization, I believe. And I will get you the name of that. It should be printed on those handouts.

Those are very helpful documents that they shared with us. So we wanted to make sure that all the Commissioners had access to them, as well as the public. They have informed us that they're actually going to be putting together specific documents that are very specific to California redistricting process and would be happy to share those with us in the future.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So for our listeners, MALDEF means?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh, the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund, I believe. But don't quote me on it.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That's what I believe.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: All right, very good. Thank you. Commissioner Yee.
COMMISSIONER YEE: And the third organization was State Voices. I'm kind of curious, you know, with the VRA training, I don't know if Commissioner Sadhwani and I have a strong sense of how much Commissioners want. Like, you know, are we starting from zero? And you know, of course, we've had some training in our early meetings. But you know, there's quite a lot of materials out there, you know. Do we need to go through jingles again from scratch, you know, or -- I don't know. We don't have a firm sense of that. I wonder if there's any -- if anyone has any thoughts about that?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I'll just also throw out there. I reached out to several commissioners, given advice from council. I did not go over contacting eight commissioners. But you know, I think what we're thinking about thus far is, you know, a training that would include, first, a training that would help us think more so about what do we need to know in terms of hiring a VRA council and outside litigation. So what is it about the litigation process that we need to know more about.

And then based on -- and I shared this I think previously, the briefing book ideas, kind of to take -- there is as, Commissioner Yee, you said, there's a lot of information out there. There's books that have been written about the VRA and the decades that it has been
around. It's a lot of material for everybody to consume. So what we're trying to do is work with Justin Levitt, who has provided some of this training previously to identify a list of both like political scientists, as well as legal scholars, who can put together one to two page briefs on various topics related to the VRA that we feel like are essential knowledge. And that could kind of be a starting point.

And then, we can add on to that with additional trainings, particularly looking around -- looking at, how do we think about VRA compliance? So when we go out to do our line drawing, what are the on the ground scenario kinds of things that we need to be thinking about?

And so I think to Commissioner Yee's point, if you have additional thoughts or a sense of how much training, or actually, I don't feel like I need that much, that would be would helpful feedback for us.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: I think Commissioner Sinay had her hand up.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: You answered my question. And one of my -- I guess the other piece to me on VRA is, are we looking at VRA and the other piece, the voter -- okay. I'll find the right terminology and get back to you.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Racially Polarized Voting?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Basic clause --
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes, thank you. Are we looking at both of those pieces because, you know, they're different. And so we need to be -- first of all, we need to be able to say it quickly. But second of all, you know, I think it's important to get trained on both.

MS. JOHNSTON: Well, Racially Polarized Voting is part of the Voting Rights Act, section 2. And the reason to monitor for that is that, if you don't take into account, Racially Polarized Voting, you might be setting yourself up for a VRA lawsuit.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, exactly. And so the -- yes. To answer your question, we are most certainly thinking about trainings on Racially Polarized Voting. Some of that might also -- we might also hold back on that. So my thought is, we can do the briefing book, kind of one or two-pagers on Racially Polarized Voting of what it is and how is it used in both in redistricting, as well as in litigation around the VRA.

And then, I think as we actually hire a VRA -- excuse me -- an RPV, a Racially Polarized Voting analyst, they can also help do additional training for us -- or I mean, I can do it too. But I think whoever we hire could provide additional support in terms of that training. So yes, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And I guess for me, part of
that training is understanding unity mapping and
understanding how to look at coalition, you know. How do
we -- a quote came up the other day and I've been keeping
it close because I feel like it keeps coming up. It's
kind of who and what is credible? And I feel like we
bring -- we say that often in different ways. But we
need -- at some point, I think we also need some
training. And I don't think it necessarily falls under
VRA. But as we're being -- going out into the public,
and really getting some understanding on, you know, who
is -- you know, how to know when someone is being
authentic and not, and what information -- you know, the
who and the what.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: If I could respond. You
know, one of the suggestions of Justin Levitt -- and I
think that some of this will come down to time and
availability of various scholars and such things. But
one of his thoughts was to get multiple people to submit
briefs of some our topics. Different scholars might take
different approaches to various segments of the VRA.
And so to the extent possible, I think that -- and I
don't want to speak for Commissioner Yee -- but I think
we are very open to the idea of having multiple. And I
think we're just trying to balance -- like, we want this
to be useful, right, and helpful, and fairly short
nuggets, right, so that it's digestible. And yet at the
same time, if there's disagreements about what one
scholar might interpret, you know, some aspect of the
law, then it might be helpful to get more than one voice.
So we're trying to balance all of those things. But I
think that's definitely a point well taken for the VRA
training but also more broadly for other aspects.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: You know, for me personally, I
definitely like the kind of idea of, you know, what does
it look like to take the VRA into consideration when
we're actually drawing lines and kind of walk us through
that consideration.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I want to respond when
people talk, so I apologize. But I agree with you. And
I think there's like region level, right. So okay, when
we're going to the central valley, what do we need to
think about? But also at a planning level, as we prepare
ourselves to go out and begin our process, in what way do
we want the VRA to -- VRA compliance to influence our
plan, right? Are there certain regions that we want to
visit first in light of the VRA, okay? And that will be
different from 2010 because the VRA is different since
2010.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Well, do you think we should
consider -- is it section 5 that was removed? Or I mean,
do you think that we should still kind of take that into
account in case it comes back, kind of thing? Or I
mean -- anyway.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I mean, yes. I personally
do. But I think that that's where it would helpful to
get, you know, some additional advice from others who
have been thinking about these kinds of issues far longer
than I have. But --

COMMISSIONER YEE: And it hangs in the balance with
the election results still out, you know.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah, yeah.

I have Andersen and Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Mine is a little
bit more -- not quite on this point. Although, I think
the intent -- you go with the intent of section 5,
regardless of the wording. Because that actually, I
think is a better way to look at it. But that's the
other thing.

What I wanted to say is the idea of -- well, two
items. The idea of how do we apply it. We've
contemplating (sic) in these briefings then, maybe doing
quick workshop or something to give us a taste of that.
Is that part of the training?

Okay. I see a nod. Okay, cool.
And then, the other one that I actually want to go back to is, I didn't know what the MALDEF, the handouts that were going to the public were coming from and when that was being talked about. And I really appreciate all that information. However, there are a few things that are confusing in there, which weren't quite correct, specifically about compact. And we've been trained on how different people have different ideas about what the term, you know, compact literally means as far as redistricting. And it is slightly different in different states.

And unfortunately, what is written there is not quite correct the interpretation. You know, where -- you know, you want to be. It is a nice shape. The reason I'm saying this is for just the general public. It's not just a nice shape. That doesn't not mean compact. It's, where are the populations and where are you going to get the populations?

And I'm just going to leave it at that because we'll get into the specifics. But I want to say, compact does not mean a little square or a box. That's not the definition of compact. Thank you.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thanks.

Commissioner Kennedy.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair.
Just as far as a suggestion, I think it would be interesting and something different for us. If you found, for example, a video of a Moot court case, dealing with the VRA that we could watch. And I went through a Moot court exercise when I did an international disability law course in Ireland several years ago. And the Moot court part of it was an amazing experience. And I'm not saying we have to do one. But if we at least had the opportunity to see one and see how it was argued, not just the outcome but the actual argument, that that might be an interesting exercise for us.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Other thoughts, questions?

Commissioner Vasquez.

COMMISSIONER VASQUEZ: Yes. Thank you, Chair.

I also like that I know we're going to -- well, I guess I'm not sure if we're going to review them later or not. But the MALDEF handouts were helpful in putting stuff together that I don't -- that I think we've had like pits a piece of training on. But it's nice to have like in one place.

And Commissioner Andersen, we can maybe talk offline about it. But I felt like their remarks on compactness were accurate, because they talk about basically, that compactness is the default unless we have exceptions to those; that we can't just draw like lines willy-nilly
without justifications, particularly around VRA or other considerations.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: If I could just respond.

Yes, I need to look more close here exactly at the piece that was raised around compactness. But they did stress that these are meant for kind of a national audience. And they are creating ones more specifically to California and would be happy to share them with us when they're ready. It might be somewhat different.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay, very good. Thank you.

Okay. If there's nothing else, we'll move on then to Outreach and Engagement.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Nothing new to report.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. So we talked about it this morning, though, just to carry on with our interactions with the teams. Okay, very good.

COI tool, Kennedy and Akutagawa.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: To be honest, I do not have anything to report. I believe that the next deadline that we have for the COI tool will actually take place on the November 16th to the 18th meeting. And so we are free. However, I do want to warn you that, I believe that the statewide database folks will be joining us for the next time. Because they will be -- similar to the
last meeting, they will want to hear directly from all of us on the language choices that we will be making in terms of what translations we'll be hoping to see in terms of the communities of interest tool that the statewide database is creating.

Commissioner Kennedy, is there anything else you might want to add on top of that?

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: The only thing that I would say is, if we want to take five minutes and just get a sense of where folks are on the language issue. I've scheduled a certain amount of time for discussion on the 16th, but it would certainly would be helpful to know whether we are going to need more time or less time to reach a consensus on what languages we would like to see the Communities of Interest tool available in.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think it's hard for me personally to respond to that without knowing what your recommendation is. I know that you've spent time and have -- and will be presenting recommendations. And so my not saying -- well, I guess I am saying something. But the quiet you're hearing is not because we don't think it's important. But I think we're looking for guidance from the -- from you all and from the language access group to move forward.
VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: And really, that would be another item, which is, you know, inviting the language access subcommittee to join us in facilitating that discussion. I mean, I think there's -- my sense is there is certainly support for going with, quote/unquote, the base twelve languages required by state law, plus American Sign Language, plus audio instructions for the blind.

We may want to go farther than that, particularly after hearing presentations from some of our stakeholders over the last couple of weeks. So Commissioner Akutagawa and I will continue to discuss this.

And then, once we get to the 16th, we hope that the language access committee has also continued to discuss this among the two of them. And we can -- well, I guess, Commissioner Akutagawa can make sure that happens. And then, we facilitate that discussion on the 16th with statewide database colleagues present.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: If I can also perhaps ask if we could move the discussion on the 16th, that's our first day, to either the 17th or 18th. Commissioner Fernandez and I do have plans to bring in one more panel, if we can. And not necessarily in light of but it was already planned. I think the comments -- the public
comments that we've gotten has reinforced what we were already intending. But our hope is that we would have speakers from the Native American and African American community. We're also considering others. But at this point, I don't necessarily want to say which ones.

But perhaps if we could have a conversation after that last panel. And we could try to have that one on the -- perhaps on the 16th. Then, we could have the statewide database conversation and the languages for the Communities of Interest tool either on the 17th or 18th.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: I'll see what I can do.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. And it's good that your dogs have chimed in. We appreciate that.

Any other thoughts or comments on this topic?

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to reiterate, it'd be great if you all came with, actually, recommendations or a straw, you know, instead of the -- you know, starting from nothing. But based on your research, you present something, and then, we work on that -- off of that.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah. I think that's a great suggestion. Helpful if we have a place to start. Okay. Very good.

Troubleshooting, Commissioner Le Mons and Andersen.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, we have something to report. I must confess that I sort of missed that we -- since it's two weeks, I forgot that we had put this on the agenda. I sort of thought it already happened. This is about computers.

And what had happened on the computers is, we came up with a -- which we presented actually on the 5th, that October 5th to 7th meeting, about the criteria that we needed in our laptops to be able to fully access the GIS systems and the computers of the redistricting software. And that came from both Raul, and the statewide database. And Chair Fornaciari actually helped trace all that down.

We gave that to Raul. And he came up with -- also with a list of the time frame involved getting this. And that's part of the procurement. He came up with two very tedious, very small print, long lists, of possibly computers that were already put together and the state had deals with. I had gone through those and picked a laptop, which was the best price, and covered what we have.

It sort of more than covered what we have. But because we need to have a good graphics card, this was the best. It was the cheapest way to do this. And I forwarded that information to Raul. I don't know the time frame or how this goes. I do have this information.
It's actually a Dell. It's from the state lists. And rather than give you all the particulars but I can certainly post this later, I don't know if these items are actually still available.

So this is the criteria. This is the one we picked that covers everything. It basically does have -- it's an i7. It does have the -- it has 32 gigabytes. We only needed the 16, but again, that wasn't the option. It does have the 512 gigabyte per hard drive.

And it has an NADIVIA Quarto Pro, a 4 gigabyte graphics card. It is the 15.6 inch. It does have a webcam included. Turns out, it also is lightweight. It's 4.16 pounds. 20-hour battery life, which you know, is important.

My only concern is that, it is 1,300 dollars -- 1,358. And I was (indiscernible) going, you know, can we get it cheaper? Not really, no. And so this is the one that I would recommend. And as I said, I'd like -- if we could say, let's go with this, barring that it isn't there, we'd have to make a slight modification, that's why I would like to make that proposal, that we could as an action item.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Well, I think you had many of the Commissioners as its lightweight. I saw you smiling. I saw Commissioner Turner and Vasquez support that idea
very much.

I mean, we want to get these new computers. We kind of have an idea of what we want. I mean, what action do we need to take? Do we have to make a vote or do we just ask you buy them for us?

MR. CLAYPOOL: This is procurement. I think you can just direct us to buy it for us -- for you and then, we should go.

And as far as the additional amount, Commissioner Andersen, it's commendable that we would worry about the extra cost. But right now, we just need to get those computers. So if that's what you want us to do, thumbs up and we're there.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So thumbs up or where are we at here? Do we want to take a vote or we good?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Want more discussion, questions, anything?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: More discussion? I think for the most part, we're getting thumbs up. I think more yes than not. Okay, nods, more thumbs. Okay, thumbs, thumbs everywhere. All right. I think then -- yeah.

We'd like to have you all go ahead and get those computers.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Commissioner Andersen, would you just send that across the exact thing that you want to both
Raul and I and then, we'll get -- we'll move it.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. I actually did send
that to Raul. I believe you were included on it but I'm
not sure. I'll check.

MR. CLAYPOOL: I saw the list. Was there only that
model on there or were there more?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I did send another email
that had the model number and then the little blurb about
it, and what it actually was.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay. So as long as we're not --
there's only one.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. No, no, no, no. I
picked only one.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay. Then we're good.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I will make sure that you're
included on that one.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Thank you very much.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: You gave us an update on the
phones but now I don't know where we were on our phones.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Oh, yeah. That was on my list.

Do you know where we're at with the phones?

MR. CLAYPOOL: I know that during the break, we
have -- during the break next week, we have AT&T in here
wiring. But I don't know about the personal phones.
I'll have to get back to you on that. And I can go and check with Raul and send out an email to all of you in about fifteen minutes.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay, well --

MR. CLAYPOOL: So -- yeah.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thank you. All right. Okay.

Anything else from the troubleshooting committee? Nope? Okay.

All right. We'll move on to the Lessons Learned committee.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I have nothing new to report.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thank you.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: And as always, just keep ideas flowing into us, please.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah. Okay, thank you.

So we have three additional subcommittees who aren't on the list here; the language and access subcommittee? Where are we? Do you all have a -- yeah, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Actually we have the presentations on Friday at 1:45. And then Commissioner Akutagawa already talked about what we're planning for the next meeting. And then I think that will be it for us. I don't know if Commissioner Akutagawa has something too.
CHAIR FORNACIARI: Right. And just to be clear, it's at 1:30.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Is it 1:30? Yes.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: And then we have another presentation at 3 so.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Akutagawa? Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: That was it.


And then is there anything more from the information management team?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: We have a couple of -- Commissioner Ahmad and I have a couple of meetings scheduled next week as well. And so I don't know if you want to talk about it here or in the discussion of future agenda items, but we'll have more to report out on probably the week of the 16th if not -- yeah, maybe that week because of the RFP part we'll want to be able to share something then.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Very good.

Commissioner Sinay had a question.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to check. Do we have clarity if we're looking at the civic tool piece as part of the information management, or you'll come back to us when you're looking at the RFP to know if that's
falling under the Information Management subcommittee or
the COI tool, if we're going to expand the COI tool to be
civic technology.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I am okay with it.

Commissioner Kennedy?

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: I'm sorry. I was looking at
something else about the next agenda. I don't have
strong feelings one way or another on that.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So Commissioner Ahmad, then
Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I just want to ask clarifying
questions, Chair, of Commissioner Sinay.

When you're saying -- do you mean Data Management
subcommittee or is there another committee that --
subcommittee that you're referring to?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes. I thought that Data
Management subcommittee was changed to Information
subcommittee, so I apologize.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: That was the suggestion earlier
today. And that's actually what I called you guys. So I
should have just stuck with data management. So --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: -- that's kind of -- let me kind
of chime in.

That's kind of why I was talking about the picture
earlier today, Commissioner Sinay, because I think the way you described it, if I can use -- wave my hands to draw a picture, is that there's one like bubble here that's input to the --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I did draw that picture if you want me to share.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Well, I -- let me --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: -- well, let me explain what I was thinking. There was one bubble that's input, right. So the COI tool is input. There's other -- all kinds of other inputs, right. So it's one bubble.

Then there's another bubble that's data management.

So that's how do we manage so the -- so the input comes into the input bubble, it goes to the data management bubble, and that bubble manages the data. And then there's -- somehow it's a -- there's a connection with the line drawer in some 3D, two-dimensional, three Venn diagram kind of space.

And so I think -- so in that context, I think what you're asking is are all the input pieces going to be managed by one subcommittee and then all the -- the data management piece is going to be managed by another subcommittee; is that the essence of your question?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: The essence of my question is I
just don't want to lose the civic technology piece because it's easy to say we're going to accept videos and we're going to separate written and we're going to accept this, but if we don't have the tools that can actually accept all of that and can translate it -- and I do see -- it's not just data management or a holding piece, but it's a data translation too.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Right.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So on the outside, it -- the data becomes accessible on the other -- and outside the middle. So I just -- I guess my fear is if no one owns it, it's -- we're going to be scrambling at the last minute to get this input -- collect this input.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So -- and I just want to make sure I understand. When you say "civic technology", you're talking about different modalities to input information to us?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So that that's the kind of catchall for all the different ways that information can be input to the Commission.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Exactly.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. And Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Correct me if I'm wrong, Commissioner Turner, but I thought that's what we were
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Exactly. That's what I was waiting to see. That's what -- so yes, I think you're not wrong. At least you and I are on the same page. And when it was just described now as almost two different holding places is not at all what I see. I -- the civic technology piece, if that's what you want to call it, the center hub, spoke, the center for the spokes, whichever way you want to look at it, we're looking at technology, an organization that would understand that we're going to receive information a lot of different ways, including the COI tool.

And what they will do in turn is to be able to house that information and then have it available to us so that we're able to massage it in whatever way we need to to get the information out of it.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. So I had a different model, but I understand where we're at now. It sounds like you're all on the same page. And I will get on that page.

And Commissioner Akutagawa, and then Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I think I'm in a little bit of a different place. And so I just quickly drew something. So I don't know if you all can see this.
So what I'm envisioning here is that the data -- the -- this information data management piece is the repository. The line drawer will access the information, so they're off to the side here.

We will have oversight. And whoever we delegate to actually do that, that actual day-to-day oversight, we could determine that with Director Claypool, perhaps.

But to me, the COI tool, the civic technology and all the other various forms of public input are just that, they're inputs into the -- into this kind of repository. And I'm fine if the -- if Commissioner Turner and Ahmad want to take on the civic tech. That's totally fine with me.

I think I was just -- this morning when I was describing what I was envisioning, this is what I was envisioning in terms of how I saw civic technology is another form of input into the commission. It's a -- it's another tool. The COI tool is just one tool, but the civic technology provides another tool. And then our public inputs, like the hearings and things like that, is another input mechanism.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Chair, can we stay here a minute? Because I want to understand what Commissioner Akutagawa's doing with your diagram. I think part of the confusion for me is that when we say "civic technology", 
I'm not looking that -- I'm -- I'm look -- what -- and you used the terminology "the repository", I'm seeing civic technology as the repository.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, but all of that information that goes in via the civic technology still has to go into another place to make sense of it, unless you're using -- because the -- what I read about civic technology is that is a tool. And so the question is, how is the information from the COI tool, the civic technology tool, and also the public inputs, and the various forms, whether it's handwritten, maps, and other public testimony, how is that all going to be captured and put into one place.

So even the technology -- the civic technology information has to go somewhere. We can't -- unless it's -- unless it's going to be the repository of all these other pieces.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: That's what we'll have to do more research concerning. Civic technology is a field of -- I'm understanding it as a field of study, a body of work and not a separate one tool.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So Commissioner Sinay, then Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: There was others before me --

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- Commissioner Sadhwani and a bunch of others.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Oh, I'm sorry. Yeah, okay. I'm sorry. Okay.

I got Commissioner Sadhwani. I have Commissioner Yee, Le Mons, Achmad (sic). Okay.

Go ahead, Commissioner Sadhwani. Sorry. And then Kennedy. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No problem. On my end, everything's actually frozen, so I'm having a hard time seeing everyone as well.

But I was just going to add two points. First, when I was thinking originally about civic technology, I saw it actually as two sides to it. One is that repository sort of backhand, how do we gather and hold everything and the host of issues that go along with that, and being able to call it up from all of these different endpoint -- input points.

But also as an outreach strategy. So what are the ways in which we can utilize technology, particularly during COVID, to further outreach and engage communities, right. So maybe that's -- we're going to start text messaging people. Maybe that's like having a chat feature on our website.

Maybe -- I don't know what all of those things might
be, but I was thinking civic technology is those two
stages, one in which there's an outreach component of how
do we better engage with communities in 2010 -- 2020 in
comparison to 2010, and particularly during COVID. And
then the repository piece.

My second point -- and if that's not our
understanding, I'm okay to shut up and get out of
the picture and I'll leave it to both the outreach and
the data management or information management or whatever
we want to call it committee.

My second point, though, was that I think that we
may very soon need to address our model of meetings. So
right now we're using subcommittees of two. And that
makes sense in terms of getting work done because we can
actually talk to one another.

But what I'm hearing here, as well as in like the
VRA line drawing committee as well, is that there's --
that there's so much overlap that we might actually
want -- maybe we keep the subcommittees, but we have a
larger group that's kind of thinking both about the
outreach and this data management piece. And I get it,
that that's harder because we would have to meet in a
public session, which just has agenda-setting issues.

But I -- my understanding is I think that that is
actually what the 2010 Commission did. And that perhaps
we can just put some time towards that before we start a
meeting, right. The first half of our day is an outreach
meeting and a legal meeting and the -- and an admin
meeting or something like that. And then we all come
back to the full group.

Because I think that as we develop more and more
subcommittees, there's these overlaps. And I just feel
like we're -- I want to make sure that we're working
jointly and not working against one another or anything
like that.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. I think Commissioner Yee
was next.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, I have one point and two
questions.

One point, so Commissioner Akutagawa, thank you for
your diagram.

I think there's one more leg to add, which is the
non-testimony inputs. Yeah. So that was part of our
research.

Okay. Two questions. One question is, I mean,
civic technology, we've already deployed some of it,
haven't we? I mean, the website right now, creaky as it
is, that's civic technology. That's where our documents
are kept. That's where people are posting some public
comments and things. There's actually a mapping link
there, which is obsolete, but -- and we should take down
for now. But in theory, someone could submit a map right
now. So we've already -- and these Zoom meetings, of
course, are civic technology.

So beyond that seems to be a bucket for other
technologies we might employ. Who knows? We could use
Twitter or whatever. But we've already started using
some.

The other point is on your diagram, Commissioner
Akutagawa, you have the line drawer interacting with the
data management. Shouldn't that be -- I mean, the line
drawer should only work through us as the Commission,
right? The line drawer doesn't log -- draw lines
independent from us under any conditions, right. So I
would think that the line drawer should be higher in your
picture and with a back and forth arrows to us, not data
management I think, right?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was just thinking more
like they would just access to information, not
necessarily a reporting like org chart kind of way.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah. Okay. I had Commissioner
Le Mons, then Ahmad, Kennedy, and Sinay.

Did I get the order wrong here?

Okay. Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah. I just wanted to say
that I think we should try to maybe keep it high level.
The inputs -- I like -- the input concept makes sense.
And what I thought the subcommittee -- the Data
subcommittee was doing was looking for some kind of
organization, individual group that can manage all of the
data that we have coming in period. And so it doesn't
really matter ultimately the sources, other than the
diversity of the sources in terms of this organization's
ability to be equipped to manage all of that information,
which is -- seemed to me that this morning you guys had a
good grasp of that. And I don't think any of this
conversation changes what your charge is. And I think
we're getting caught up in semantics of what's called
what.

I think at the same time, we also still have our
communications director and our outreach staff that need
to be a part of some of these things. And I just don't
really understand why we're trying to get so far ahead of
that whole responsibility of these people that we're
hiring to put to work with putting not only executing an
outreach plan, but being a big part of the development,
because we're also hiring expertise.

So I just want to put that out there, remind us. I
don't think that there is any confusion about what the
subcommittee is doing. I think we're getting -- tripping
I just said I --

I want to give you solace, Commissioners Sinay, that civic engagement and civic technology is not going to get left out. So that's the wire that got tripped to send us spinning off into this whole long conversation that just doesn't feel like it's necessary right now. It won't -- it's been raised. We'll make sure that we keep an eye to it. But that doesn't change what that subcommittee is charged to do and they're going to continue doing and going to bring that information back. So I just wanted to put that I think we're good.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. I see Commissioner Sinay. I had Ahmad and Kennedy first.

Did you -- did you -- okay.

And then Turner.

Okay. Ahmad, Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Mine is super quick. And I'll just pose this to the whole group and whoever wants to answer it can answer it. As I said earlier this morning, I have no idea what civic technology means. And I would like for someone to define it and us to come to an agreement on what that means. Because to me, I am thinking it means something very different than what the conversation has been leading to. So I'll just leave it at that. Thank you.
CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Commissioner Kennedy, and then Commissioner Sinay.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. And I don't want to prolong things, but I'm hoping that this can contribute to everybody converging.

If we call this, "repository and knowledge base", because we need to redistrict on the basis of not just the statewide database, but a knowledge base. And so there are going to be various channels of input into the redistricting knowledge base. There are going to be various uses made of the redistricting knowledge base. But the repository itself, I think, could usefully be conceived of as a redistricting knowledge base.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I didn't mean to send us on a rabbit hole, but based on the research that I've done on civic technology, we cannot think about this later and then try to back into it. It is something we need to be very intentional about.

Civic technology is not a database. And that's where a lot of things get lost. I'm working right now on community information exchanges in Orange County and San Diego, and everyone gets caught up on the platform. It's how you use technology to engage people.

And as much as we're using Zoom, it is not the tool
that I will hope we continue to use. We need people to come and think with us that are from the technology field, that are innovative, and that can bring us further than the rest of the community on some of these.

So civic technology includes using social media in new ways. It includes creating apps. It includes creating the COI tool and other things. And there's different input we're getting.

But we can't back into this because it takes time and money to create these and to make sure all of that is feeding into this. That is why I keep coming back to does someone have this. Because at first, we had it on the outreach committee and then it was said, no, we got it over here. And Commissioner Sadhwani and I had backed off and shared all our information on civic technology. We had been going out and collecting some of this. And Commissioner Vazquez and I were thinking it all through.

I don't want us to come to even further along in November when it should have been written into this RFP that we're looking at November 16th. So I'm sorry if it felt like I was being tripped up and stuff. It's just knowing what civic technology is and how much thinking has to be done.

If you create tools unintentionally they will not be used and that was money wasted. And so that is why I am
sorry to take this time and to come back to it, because a lot of times we don't close the loop and the loop was not closed on this one.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So Commissioner Turner was next. And then I wanted to know if that answered Commissioner Ahmad's question.

But Commissioner Turner. And then --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. The thing that I wanted to say, what was helpful to hear -- I was clear -- I thought I was clear earlier today. Got a little confused, muddied as far as the intent. And not even necessarily confused, just different than what I thought for a minute.

But what was helpful in hearing that right now is because as we're still researching and talking to different groups, we need to know what it is exactly we're asking them to do.

And so the piece, Commissioner Sadhwani, when you said there's two parts of the repository to hold everything.

And then Commissioner Kennedy, you're suggesting even calling it a knowledge basis instead of repository, whatever. That's one piece of it.

Plus a piece that says and also an outreach strategy to further engage. I was not -- I had not talked about
the piece that we were doing in the data management or
information management as far as also an outreach tool.
And so that, then, makes sense to me where we keep having
conversations about splitting it out. And so I get that
now, and just kind of will wait to see which direction we
go with it.

But I was still on a place where instead of us
having to look through a whole bunch of handwritten maps,
wade through a bunch of spoken verbal information
receipt, now look to the COI tool, I was thinking in
terms of responsible technology, civic technology is how
I was thinking of it. A place where people would --
where an organization -- an institution would already do
something similar to bring in massive amounts of
information and then make it available where others can
make sense of it and be able to use it. So that's --
that was the limits of what I was trying to research
about.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. I have Commissioner
Akutagawa, then Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: If I can, I'd like to just
read from an article that I think might be helpful in
creating some -- maybe some more clarity and might help
answer Commissioner Ahmad's question as well, too.

So I will say this is from within an article. I'll
send the link later so that it can also be posted to the website. It's from Citizens Lab. It does seem like a legitimate resource. And what they do cite is first, the definition -- the Wikipedia definition, which defines civic technology as a technology that enables engagement, participation, or enhances the relationship between the people and government by enhancing citizen communications and public decision. And it aims to develop engagement and to encourage citizens to act for the public good, which is what I think we are trying to do.

This particular website -- or this article from Citizens Lab, one of the things that I like about it is it talks about what's the difference between civic tech and government, gov tech. And civic tech they speak about it.

And Commissioner Sinay, I think this is in alignment with what you're saying. Civic tech shows citizens as the beneficiary. It's community centric. And it's about engagement. Versus government tech, or gov tech, is government is the customer. It's operation centric. And it's about efficiency.

So I think there's room for both in a sense of what we're talking about. I am perfectly fine if it -- the civic tech portion stays with the outreach committee because it is an engagement tool. But the engagement
tool is also an input tool is how I still see it.

And separate from that, there is this other larger, which is, I think, different than what civic technology is intended to do. I think we still need to look for a provider that can bring all these different reams of information that we're talking about into a place where it could be sorted, it could be analyzed, and it could be mined for the kind of information that I think we as the Commission are looking for in terms of the inputs that we need to draw the lines.

And I'll send the -- I'll send the link to --

Yeah, and I'll -- Commissioner Claypool, I'll send it over to you so that it could be shared with the rest of the commissioners and also on the website.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: I have Commissioner Le Mons, then Commissioner Vazquez, and then Commissioner Anderson.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thanks for that, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Yeah, I -- when I think of civic technologies, I think of it more conceptually. And I think I akin it to community participatory research is probably another model which shifts the focus of the -- which the efforts coming from the place of the beneficiary then the person seeking to get the information.

I still don't think that that changes what that --
the Data subcommittee's charge is. Our big challenge is no matter what -- so I'll start by saying I still feel like we don't have an outreach plan. And not that we should have one, but we're still in the process of developing that.

And the things that Commissioner Sinay is raising will be central to that. And I don't think there's anything that the subcommittee is doing -- the Data subcommittee that's doing that's going to be problematic for that. They are looking for, if I understand correctly, before there was a lot of information gathered, not in all the ways that we're even considering at all. I mean, we're being very, very innovative in how we want to collect information.

But even with the more narrow collection approach from the previous commission, one of the challenges was the ability to process all of the information that was coming in. So these various ways that we're going to collect information are going to be diverse. And what we're going to be left with is making sure that we're choosing, ultimately, tools and inputs that we're going to be able to actually process and have them be useful, even if something falls within the civic technology concept. If we can't translate that information to make it useful to our line drawing, we would -- I would
surmise that we would say, well, that particular thing we are not going to do.

So we want to make sure that the things that we ultimately choose to do in terms of the collection we can afford to do in terms of have it be useful, because we can translate that information into usable information toward our line drawing.

So what the subcommittee -- the Data subcommittee is doing is trying to find robust enough organizations that are used to managing, collecting, packaging large amounts of data that come from different places. And that could be social media. It could be text. It could be any of these things.

So I think what I was cautious that we didn't -- really didn't need to define those specific channels or even get caught up in the model itself. If we're holding space where that's going to be the model -- the civic -- the civic engagement model is going to be -- civic technology's model is going to be the model by which our outreach is informed, these are the community conversations we should be having with our staff and our experts that we are hiring to do this work. We're doing some of the groundwork, but I was cautioning that we should be doing all of the work.

Otherwise, all we need to hire are boots on the
ground. We don't need to pay big money for expertise if we're not going to utilize it. That's my concern. Talk about being fiscally responsible.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So I have Commissioner Vazquez, and then Anderson.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Most of my comments have already been made. I'll just say that I do think it's better to define this right now, because I do think we've failed to close the loop on some of these bigger if squishier concepts so that our subcommittees have some direction, if not to do the work of our staff, but to know what the scope of their charge is.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So when you say define "this"?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sorry. Define civic technology, at least to the extent that it is helpful for the subcommittee. So in this case, it's helpful for the Community Outreach Committee to know what exactly Commissioners Turner and Achmed (sic) are thinking through and what we need to continue to hold space for in the outreach committee.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So the -- I'll ask then the four of you, I mean, do you think it would -- it seems to me be valuable for the four of you to get together and spend some time ensuring that everyone's on the same page? I mean, six of six.
Commissioner Sinay, you said six? Who am I missing?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: The COI tool folks.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: The COI --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Because they're --

CHAIR FORNACIARI: -- tool folks, okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- they've been taking part in this --

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- too.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. So I mean, perhaps --

I mean, perhaps maybe we do need a -- maybe we do need to notice conversation for the six of us to hash this out in a couple of weeks, at least to the extent possible over a couple of hours. That way, at least the six of us with potential overlapping concepts and charges are swimming in the same direction.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. I have -- holy cow. Okay. I have Anderson. I have -- then I have Le Mons, then I have Marian, and then I have Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Thank you, Chair. Yeah, this is -- this is exactly why what I started earlier today. Because the confusion of who's doing what and what they all mean.

And now I understand when -- there are two
components of the data management, the civic technology. One is a total outreach tool. The other is what do you do with the information. And I believe what is going on here is they are not completely separate things.

Most of these groups that the data management or the information management group is going to come up against with is that people are trying to do this, i.e., get all this information from everyone out there in all the different ways knowing that they have to be able to use it at some point.

So it is not a, I'm just going to go out and this is the way to reach people. That's nice. What do you do with that information? Because that's the problem we all have. We've all done that. We got all this information and didn't know what to do with it.

Now there are better ways to get more contact and outreach. But then you still have to be able to do something with the data. But that's not two separate things. These are people who are doing this.

And in looking at the line drawing in the redistricting, there are people who are looking at how to get the information for line drawing. They're doing this as well. So -- and that's the overlap that I'm talking about in terms of the line drawing.

Because like I say, just for going back to our
example, all this information and how to try to reach --
not so much how to try to reach people, but -- because
that had been established -- but how do you get the
information, how do you collect it, what do you do with
it so we can all use it ended up being totally on the
line drawer. And they didn't really want to do that.
And it wasn't necessarily what they did. But there are
people who that is what they do. And it isn't --- and
then there are all these separate people.

It isn't like, okay, you just go out and reach
people. It's you reach people and get the information.
And I believe that is what from my -- this morning,
that's what I thought was it's clear as a bell, it's the
double part of what Commissioner Ahmad and Commissioner
Turner were doing.

And now I'm understanding, well, not really. They
weren't sure it was the -- really the outreach part. And
it's the crossover that I'm concerned about, because even
when you're talking about how let's have these six people
together, I see if you don't have the line drawer in
there, then it might not communicate. You might have all
this great information and you think it's okay, but our
line drawer is like, if you'd only done it like this,
then I could just go bang, collect it all and use it. So
you need to have this connection with -- so it's all
translatable.

And I believe that the technology people are much more aware of how this flows together. And because they're -- they are using these to try to outreach in technological ways. We're already -- and it's already in the back of their mind that they have to collect the information. So I think that as Commissioner Le Mons said, we need to define this.

But I think what we need to do in our RFPs is allow for the overlap of it. And when our communications person comes on, he is actually going to help us in terms of, ah, now can we just sort of rearrange this a little bit because this is going to be the outreach.

And I believe the more research that the data group does and looks at, they're going to come up with ideas that this will all be one thing. It won't be you're getting stuff from one area, you're getting stuff from one area, we put it all into a big management thing, and then we need this huge machine to collect it all and then we can all pull out of it. It's part and parcel of what the job is going to be.

And I think it's because that's the way technology works. Like you don't just create -- like when you're -- when you're -- the COI tool, for example, it isn't just a way to bring things in, it's -- and it has a result out.
And so I believe that that is what's going on with the civic technology.

And so I think we should essentially don't take it out of anyone's charge, but include it in everyone's charge, if that makes sense. It isn't like the sub -- the COI does this, the data management only do that. I think we need to say it's going to overlap. And then you'll realize as you -- as we get into it, that then you say, okay, now I can back off that.

But I don't think we should be backing off of anything, because as Commissioner Sinay was saying, things are going to get lost. And that's not what we want to do. But I think by if we try to divide it out now, we'll hurt ourselves. It's going to be not as efficient as when we contact people who are this is their field, they're going to be able to tell us, great, we can do all of this for you as a consultant.

Now that they're doing it for us, I should say, they're gathering -- they're helping us gather because the tools are there and the collection of it is there.

So I think if we just kind of keep on going, I don't think we need to define it right now except on every -- don't take it off on anyone's charge.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Thank you.

Commissioner Le Mons.
COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I just want to say, if that group gets together, I said before, I want to be a part of it, so it would be seven people. When I mentioned it before, I know people were like, oh, how are we going to do that, it's only two.

I've been waiting for our people who are really going to shepherd this and we're informing it, we're giving vision and all of that research, and we're prepping them and getting them ready. But please don't pull the trigger and not invite me to be a part of it.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Thank you.

Mariann.

MS. JOHNSTON: I just wanted to be sure you knew that since --

CHAIR FORNACIARI: I think your --

MS. JOHNSTON: -- you already --

CHAIR FORNACIARI: -- mic's off. Is your mic --

MS. JOHNSTON: It is?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Oh, oh --

MS. JOHNSTON: Thank you.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: I remember this time. You can always have subcommittee meetings during a regularly-noticed meeting without giving special notice for the subcommittee. So if you want to form this ad hoc meeting
of the different subcommittees even tomorrow, if you're
going to have extra time, that would be perfectly
appropriate and legal to do. Because since the
subcommittees are already noticed as part of the main
meeting, they also can meet during the meeting.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. And that was going to be
my question.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Two things. One is the only
reason that this has taken on some urgency was just
because, as we discussed last meeting, it was the RFP.
And we just want to make sure that it is in the different
RFPs and that we have that clarity that I think we have
now so that we get the right information. Because, yes,
the technology industry gets what we're trying to do, but
they need to know that that is part of what we want. If
not, we're stuck where we were last time where we're
asking people to do things that weren't in the original
RFP.

Commissioner Le Mons, I would like to hear a little
bit more why you feel -- you've inserted yourself kind of
into the outreach, which is great, but why when we first
started this and we had that space and nobody came in the
second, Angela stepped in -- I mean, sorry, Commissioner
Vasquez stepped in when we were looking for someone who
was from a different party, and now -- and it would have
been great to start from there. But now it feels like a
lot of thinking and a lot of work has come into this, and
now, not -- I can only use the word inserted. And I just
want to understand so that we can work really well
together.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: You know what, based on what
you just said, I withdraw my -- I made it very clear when
I said it the last time why I wanted to be involved. So
I don't understand what you're confused by. But it's
been very apparent to me that you and your colleague
aren't interested in my involvement. So to me, it's
neither here nor there why I didn't do it first. The
fact that I'm interested in contributing my expertise now
should be enough.

But I tell you what, I'm going to withdraw it.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm sorry that's how you felt.

I was just trying to understand how to better incorporate
all of us. We've all kind of conquered and divided at
this point. And I was just trying to better understand
how to use your expertise and how to move forward.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Well, that's not the
impression I've gotten.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. All right.

Well, let's see, at this point, I mean, so
Commissioner Sinay, you just said that you felt like -- you felt that folks kind of understood that this all needs to be part of the RFPs and that you're comfortable at this point that folks understand what we need, what needs to be in the RFPs.

I just want to check in with the folks from the other teams putting the RFPs together. If you all feel you're in a place of comfort at this point with what we've been talking about and ready to go ahead, or if you might want to see about getting together when we have some -- some -- a little bit of time during this meeting.

So I'll start with the data management team.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: At this point, I'm fine with just Commissioner Turner and I bouncing this conversation back between us. I don't think there's anything to discuss unless there's an RFP in front of us that we all want to rip apart and give our input for. So at this point, I am -- I'm good to go.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. And then I'll go with the COI tool team.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: I think I'm good.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Same here.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. So we'll be moving forward, then, with the teams putting RFPs together
with this definition of civil technologies in mind. And then as we review the RFPs, we'll keep in mind that we need to incorporate this piece going forward.

Okay. Let's see, there was one last subcommittee that we haven't -- that's on the list, but it's the cybersecurity subcommittee, and we've had a number of conversations about that already. So I don't think there's anything more to add on that note.

So we'll see. So what do we have left on our agenda at this point? We've got item 13 that's going to take place at 1:30 on Friday. We've got our item 14 that's a discussion and agreement on ground rules for working together and procedures for meeting management. And then the discussion of future agenda dates and public comment.

I feel like we can be pretty focused on that and just take this all up beginning Friday morning.

So I'll let -- and we'll bring back the TEC and per diem on Friday morning.

I was hoping item 14 could -- we could focus on that in about an hour. But I think we have plenty of time Friday morning to work through the things that we need to work through and then in the afternoon with the speakers.

Does that sound like an okay plan, we'll take tomorrow off? Can I get some thumbs up?

Commissioner Kennedy has a comment.
VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Just before we break for the
day, if any of the subcommittees needs more -- or
anticipates that you may need more than five minutes in
the next meeting, if you could let me know so that I can
adjust my planned timings, I would appreciate it. Thank
you.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Anderson?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: How do we let you know?

Just tell you now or email?

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Now is good.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSON: Well, if we're bringing the
RFP to discussion, then certainly in line drawing needs a
bit more time than five minutes.

COMMISSIONER Yee: The RA will have four RFPs so
that's going to be more than five minutes.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I think at some point we do
need to schedule the meeting that I suggested in our
previous meeting that we need to schedule. I was
completely put off by Commissioner Sinay's comments today
about me inserting myself in something that I think is
the work of all of us. And to have me raise my hand to
support something and have it questioned is unacceptable
as far as I'm concerned.

And a lot of the other comments that were made in
the previous meeting about men in gender and all of this stuff, there's a subtext going on here that I'm completely uncomfortable with. And I'm not going to pretend like it doesn't exist. And I think we need to get to the bottom of it before we get too far down the road, because it's going to be disruptive and unproductive.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: That was going to be a social hour. Do you have a proposals when you'd like -- when we'd like to have that? Would you like to try to -- I mean, do you want to try to have it tomorrow or do we want to kind of let things settle a little bit, Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: No, I don't want to do it tomorrow. I just don't think it should go on the back burner. And if there's other people that -- maybe I'm the only one feeling this, so if there are other commissioners that -- because it's not on me. I raised it. We come up with something we're going to do. Commissioner Sinay, as a matter of fact, thought it wasn't something we could do in the series of that meeting; that it couldn't be done that week.

So now we're into the next week. It's not brought up. We'll be gone for two weeks. So she was the one that actually asked to move it to a different time. So I
don't think it should be put on me to be determining when
it should happen.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: I just want to check in to see
what -- when you thought.

Okay. Well, I'm the chair right now. So I will
take it upon myself to see about scheduling something for
us next week when we have an open week. Would we like to
do something maybe in an evening? Couple of hours in the
evening?

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I was just going to offer
that I think there's certainly a lot of intergroup
dynamics in this -- on this commission. I'm certainly
open to having a more social hour or moment in which we
can have some conversations. But of course, that
conversation needs to not include any conversation about
the business or work of the Commission.

I might just -- I don't have any one or any group in
mind, but I do think that there are folks out there who
offer facilitated conversations and trainings, because I
think that these are tough conversations to have. And I
mean, I think that the level of hostility here is
palpable. I mean, I think it's -- we're at that level,
and I think having a facilitated conversation might help
us work together.
We're not -- I don't think there are only gender considerations here. We're all very different people. These are -- as we were asked in the -- in our interviews, these are hyper partisan times. There's -- I think -- I don't know what all the issues may or may not be, but I think having someone help facilitate that conversation might be helpful.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Do you have someone in mind that you could -- you -- that you know that could help?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I don't. I could look around for that. I don't know if other Commissioners have -- know of folks that do this kind of work.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: So I have Commissioner Sinay. Did you want to say something? And then Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. It might be some may -- Commissioner Le Mons may consider it biased if I bring it forward, but I do -- I can say that Commissioner Di -- former Commissioner Di, this is the work she does. And she did offer a while back to come in and work with us if we were interested, especially since she understands the dynamics of the Commission's work.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: I have Commissioner Turner, and then Mary.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. You
mentioned next week. I was just going to offer Monday, Tuesday, or Thursday works good for me next week in the evening if that's what we want to do.

I think it's always beneficial to have a facilitator that comes in. But I also think just given the opportunity and the latitude to be able to just emphatically state this is the things that -- this is how I like to be engaged with. Just being able to talk, I think, will solve it.

So I don't -- I'm hoping that we don't prolong it. I think there is a danger in continuing an issue. Anything that has cropped up I think should be dealt with quicker instead of later. And even in the cooling off period and all of that, I'm not so much a fan of that all the time. It's like you know what, we all have a job to do, let's just express what we need. And I think we've agreed that we'll try to comply. But it's the understanding that we need to make sure we have.

I want to know who you are. I want to know what exactly it is you need. And I'll provide that to the extent that it doesn't cross a value that I have. And then that's what the conversation is all about. And then we'll understand where I'm coming from.

So I'm definitely for the social time to be able to just talk for sure. If indeed someone is readily
available sooner rather than later, for sure let them come in. I don't think we should 100 percent rely on them. Sometimes people coming in from the outside, they have to facilitate in such a way that's either so stringent or it doesn't necessarily touch on the issues that are -- that's before us right now. Sometimes that's good when there's not an issue, it kind of can serve as a road map.

But if there is an issue, let's not go to some other made up scenario that may or may not help. Let's deal with whatever issues that are here. And I hope everyone comes prepared to not be offended, but to be able to state and hear what the issues are and I think we'll serve each other well.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thank you, Commissioner Turner. Marian.

MS. JOHNSTON: There's a fine line between getting to know each other and getting to understand each other better and bringing in a facilitator to help you do your work as commissioners better. And I really would urge you to stay on the personal and getting to know each other side of it, if you're not going to be doing it in a regularly-noticed open meeting.

I think if you go to the extent of having a facilitator come in and making it that organized, it
probably does make it commission business.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Other thoughts? It seems like Monday, Tuesday, Thursday evening might work for at least Commissioner Turner. Other thoughts, feelings on this topic or when might be good?

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I agree that it -- the sooner the better. And I know Commissioner Le Mons doesn't want to do it tomorrow, but I was -- I would vote to do it tomorrow or -- just so that we can talk about it and --

But I understand if you don't want to.

Monday does not work for me personally.

Evening does not work.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. How about Tuesday or Thursday? Those okay? No?

Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Might I suggest Friday before our regularly scheduled time to meet? Lunchtime -- sorry, lunchtime. Sorry. Friday lunch. I was thinking about the presentation at 1:30, but Friday lunch? My schedule's flexible. I'll make time for whenever we need to do this.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I have a meeting already
scheduled for the lunch time.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Any other --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Just go ahead and have it.

I --

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- thought I'd just --

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Any other thoughts, times, ideas about moving -- getting together and talk?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Chair?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yes. Did -- Commissioner --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Are we intentionally avoiding Saturday?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: No. I'm not intentionally avoiding Saturday. I just thought next week we were open. And I also thought evenings might be good. But for me, I'm open.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. And I'm open as well. I think that everyone should be there. And if we're just looking at those five days, if possibly a Saturday evening, a Sunday afternoon, we can get everyone together. And sooner rather than later; I think it will serve us well. Thank you.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Any other thoughts or input?

Commissioner Yee.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Well, I guess this fine line that Marian has brought up. I mean, and it just -- I see her point and it makes me nervous to go ahead with an unnoticed, official meeting, which I can't imagine that we can avoid talking about commission business. That's what we have in common right now. So as much as it would be nice otherwise, it seems really problematic to me.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Well, I think one of the things that we haven't done at all is spent any time really getting to know each other in a semi-structured way, sharing our backgrounds, our experiences, our family information, any of those kinds of things that would be just absolutely kind of the norm for a group like us. When we got together at the beginning, the kind of conversations we would have had over lunch, over breaks, that kind of thing.

And those kinds of conversations are completely fair game to have outside of a noticed meeting. And I think that -- I mean to start there, I think would be fair.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. But I wanted to say two things. Number one, we have had our raised hand that was, what's the word, activated for us but I don't think it necessarily is working. I know Commissioner Vazquez and I have raised our hands on the system a couple of
times, and --

    CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

    COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- I think the court --
someone keeps just taking it off for us because it's not
being recognized. So I just want to bring back to the
rest of everyone's attention it is there, whether it's
going to be helpful or not.

    I think Marian's counsel was a good one, and it made
sense to me as it relates to bringing in an outside
facilitator. But I hold the line there. I think we can
have a conversation, and I still do support us having a
conversation that we can discuss and not have to point at
any permission, activity, or business, but one that would
allow us to be able to talk about where we're coming
from.

    I think there's probably a number of us that's led
sessions, been a part of sessions, et cetera, and we can
take turns in doing that, whatever that looks like. And
as far as we get, we can at least get as far and maybe to
the point of saying, oh man, we need somebody else,
let's do something different.

    Or we can just have the conversation and discover,
you know what, what we need is this conversation and
we're fine and it'll solve it. And to the extent that we
can get that scheduled, I think it will -- we'll benefit
from it greatly.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. I appreciate that.

Commissioner Turner. Thank you.

All right. I'm going to propose Tuesday evening. Can't? Can anyone -- I mean, how about Thursday evening? Does that work? Does Thursday evening, is it a killer for anybody else, Thursday evening or thumbs up?

Commissioner Vasquez. And it's frankly chairperson's error that your raised hands aren't working, because I thought they were raised from before.

I'm sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And I can't tell if it's activated, either. I was quick -- I was doing it and -- yeah, I don't know, we'll figure it out.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I just was curious, is it -- are you saying this Thursday as in tomorrow or next week?

CHAIR FORNACIARI: No. I was saying next Thursday.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Next Thursday. That's fine.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And that -- I understand that the Commission has a Zoom account now, so it would not be done with the video or -- or --

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Right.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- open, whatever. It would just be --
CHAIR FORNACIARI: Be done with the Commission's --
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- the other.
CHAIR FORNACIARI: -- Zoom account.
And then I think Commissioner Akutagawa had her hand
raised.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Commissioner Vasquez asked
the question I wanted to ask.
CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Okay. Yeah. So next --
next Thursday from 6 to 8. All right?
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Chair, would you like me to
set that Zoom up (audio interference)?
CHAIR FORNACIARI: If you would.
Commissioner Kennedy?
VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: I won't be with you until 6:30.
CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. But you'll be able to make
it. So that'll be good, all right. Otherwise.
Okay. So Director Claypool is going to set that up
for us. And we will have that conversation then. So I
appreciate all of your thoughts on this and your input.
And so with that, unless there's anything else, I'm
going to adjourn this meeting until 9:30 Friday. What?
Okay.
DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: I have the update for the cell
phones. We have twenty-one cell phones ordered. We're
expecting them next week and we're waiting on --
CHAIR FORNACIARI: Oh.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: -- confirmation for the delivery.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Sorry. Yeah.

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: That was in response to you, Commissioner Sinay.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. All right.

I'm sorry. Just one second. We need to do public comment before we adjourn -- before we recess.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I can help you with that Chair.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: In order to maximize transparency and public participation in the process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. The telephone number is 877-853-5247. When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed. The meeting number is 93489457215 for this meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID simply press pound.

Once you've dialed in, you'll be placed in a queue, from which a moderator will begin unmuting callers to submit their comment. You'll also hear an automatic message to press star 9. Please do this to raise your
hand indicating you wish to comment.

When it's your turn to speak, the moderator will unmute you, and you'll hear an automatic message that says, "The host would like you to talk". Press star 6 to speak. Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your call.

Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when it's your turn to speak. And again, please turn down the livestream volume.

These instructions are also located on the website.

The Commission is taking public comment on general items at this time.

There are currently no callers in the queue, Chair.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. The -- I'm looking at the livestream and it hasn't -- the instructions haven't finished.

I'm sorry, and I missed, Director Claypool, I was thinking of something else and I didn't quite hear what you had to say about the phone?

DIRECTOR CLAYPOOL: So there are twenty-one cell phones on order. They're expected next week. We're waiting for the confirmation of delivery. And so that's the update.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Thank you.
Okay. It just the public instruction just finished up. So I'm going to wait a minute and a half after that to ensure that the public has time to dial in.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: While we wait, Commissioner Kennedy, if I could request an hour to an hour fifteen for the panel.

And then we'll also need to allow for time for the statewide database to also come and join us and potentially have a conversation around the languages that we'll be using for the Communities of Interest tool as well, too. And I'm not sure how long that -- to be honest, I don't know how to estimate how long that conversation could be. I would be open to input. Maybe if we can keep it to thirty minutes? I don't know. Twenty?

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: When you mention -- when you are talking about the panel, you're talking about the panel under item 11, global access issues?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, that's correct.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. And you said how long for that?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think if we can estimate about an hour. And if it's possible to maybe fudge a little bit, just in case, hour and fifteen. But we'll
try to finish up within the hour.

VICE CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioners -- sorry.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Oh, I was just -- I was just going to answer Commissioner Akutagawa. I think if you have a recommendation for us, we -- you've done a lot of research and I'm sure it will -- it -- it -- can go by. Because it's language access for the COI, but as well we'll use that for the rest, correct?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, to a degree. It -- that's where the intersections do come into play. The obvious ones are the ones that are already mandated by the Secretary of State. But I think we were also trying to understand if we need to make other -- to take into account other languages that we may not have thought were obvious then.

So that's why these panels have been, I think, helpful. And Commissioner Fernandez and I will talk about that.

And then I believe what I'll need to do is then speak with Commissioner Kennedy around the COI -- the impact on the COI tool.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. So it's been more than
three minutes and we have no callers in the queue. So if there's nothing else at this point, we will recess until Friday morning at 9:30.

(Recessed)
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