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COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Good morning, California, and welcome to day 4 of our Lessons Learned exercise. I will call this meeting back to order and ask Director Hernandez to call the roll, please.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair.

Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Presente.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Turner. I see you.

You look -- there -- can you repeat that?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. I am here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I'm here, finally.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Welcome back.
Before we get started, I have a few discussions about the run of show, but I want to open it up to any of the commissioners for any update.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair.

A couple things. I forgot to mention that when Commissioner Yee and I met with (indiscernible) voters, they did let us know that they have received funding to do an analysis on the 2020 Redistricting Commission and the proc -- the redistricting process. It'll be similar to the report that was done last time; so they will have someone else write it -- you know, they'll hire someone
to do the research, do the interviews. It's going to be a year-long process, where they'll meet with commissioners, groups, and others, and so I just want to give you all the heads up because we knew -- you know, we received the great comments from the collaborative -- you know, everybody thought really -- you know, their quick thoughts on the collaborative, but that's not their analysis; there will be analysis coming, and they'll, you know, as they move forward on that, they'll -- it's -- they'll tell us more. Right now they just wanted us to know that piece.

Second, we have worked really diligently on the PowerPoints since people needed it for Tuesday; so we have been working during breaks and afterwards and all that type of stuff. But one question I had -- I know that last -- okay. So one thing we learned by doing the PowerPoint is that you do forget details. There was really some silly mistakes that you would think that -- okay, I'll take it, it's me -- I would remember everything, but there's -- so we do want to give you all cheat -- a cheat sheet so that -- you know, with bullets. My question is, I always took -- when we had the separate script from the PowerPoint, to me, I didn't like having the two. I always cut and paste and put everything into the notes section of the PowerPoint. And
when you run PowerPoint, it actually does split it out, and it works really nice once you get to use it -- once you understand how to use it, it's really simple. But I wanted to check with you all if you'd prefer a script or you prefer the notes? I would like to say both, but again, please remember that most of this work is being done by your colleagues, that we can't use staff to help us, and so updating it and all that is going to be a lot of work so it'd be better to just have it in one -- you know, just have either the script or the notes. Thanks.

Thoughts on scripted --

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I'd like to thank you for doing either; they both work, but my preference would be the notes.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sorry, I got to ask: what notes? I only saw a script.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, when you do PowerPoint, there's a notes section that you can put the whole script in there, and so then when you're --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- going through the PowerPoint virtually, the notes section will pop up, or you can print it up so it has it -- and we can show you how to do
all of that -- but it's one document versus having two
documents.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, okay. I didn't do it
that way. I must admit, I also rearranged -- I didn't --
I never felt -- followed the way it exactly was; I kind
of rearranged the slides and modified stuff, so. I would
have to do -- I would have to change my own anyway, so
either is -- but thank you very much for doing all that.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah, you have to -- the notes go
with the slide, so if you change the order of the slides,
the notes will be with the slides.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Actually, I put my hand up
and then I was going to take it down, but you called on
me too fast. I don't have a preference either way. I
liked having both only because oftentimes I did not use
the PowerPoint, so then I could just take the script with
me. So either way, I'm good. And thank you so much for
doing that for us.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah, I would just recommend
having both; like, include the notes and then have the
script as a separate -- same content, right, just
packaged differently.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Sinay.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: And one just last request. If you have any pictures of us in action, can you send them to Martin? Oh, actually, forget it. Don't send them to Martin; send them to me. And we're trying to use live pictures of all of us engaged within the PowerPoint. So if you took pictures during the meetings and stuff, please send them in. It's hard -- you know, in -- if it wasn't for COVID, we would have tons of pictures of groups talking and all that stuff, and we, you know -- a picture of a -- a screenshot of a Zoom call is not that exciting. So if you have any, please send them to me today; so it gives you something to do. Thank you so much.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: All right. One last thing. Actually, yes, we do need the script as well, because I realized one time there was a whole glitch, and I did not get to use slides at all. So if all the notes are on the slides and there's a glitch, then I don't have anything to work with, so having the script as well would be quite handy. Thank you.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Well, you've gotten various feedback, so I hope that helps. Either way for me is fine.

Okay. Just a note for the public. The last three
days we've taken public comment at 4 o'clock. Today we are ahead of schedule. I don't know where -- we don't know when we'll end, but we'll take public comment when we're finished today; so it will likely be before 4 o'clock, but we don't know exactly what time. So I just want to give you all -- the public a heads up for that.

And with that, unless there are any other announcements, I will turn it over to Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. And thank you to all the colleagues for your active participation in this exercise. As Commissioner Yee said yesterday, we're really happy with the level of participation, engagement, input, thought. People are, you know, pulling together threads that might not otherwise be pulled together. I think we've come up with some really exciting ideas through this process and really looking forward to next week when we go into cross-cutting issues and reviewing recommendations.

Today we're starting out with Data Management, and obviously, that is an incredibly important part of the work of the Commission. So I'm looking forward to a robust conversation on this. In the prompts, we have the partnership with the Statewide Database use of Airtable -- and I might add to that, you know, how we
came to find Airtable, how we -- the process that we had
to go through to procure the software, the staff role in
receiving, processing, uploading, analyzing, coding --
all of that, the range and nature of public
submissions -- the various formats, the various channels,
what worked, what didn't work, what could work better.
And I would also add the topic of the long-term
management of the data. You know, what does our Airtable
license -- how long is that for, what does it allow, are
there alternatives for maintaining the data? We've said
on a number of occasions that, you know, it's important
that the people in general and researchers in particular,
who have an interest in this topic, have continuing
access to all of the documentation from the 2020
redistricting cycle, and that would include access to
the -- all of the input that we received through these
various channels.

So that is -- that's what we have as far as prompts
on this first topic for today. And I don't know, maybe
the Data Manage --

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Or if you want to go with
the Data Management Subcommittee first, that would be
great, too.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I might have to go with you
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, then.

Yesterday, Renee Westa-Lusk -- I'm just going to start, you know, quoting her; but I did agree with her, it would be very beneficial to make this one of the priorities. It would have been great if we would have started earlier. Our subcommittee did a wonderful job. I'm just, you know, very amazed at what they were able to do. But being able to, one, be forward-thinking in terms of what you just brought up, Commissioner Kennedy, picking something that will have long-term -- you can support it long-term, and taking all of that into consideration when you pick whatever system it is that you're going to pick, or the consultant -- one, doing it earlier.

Two, in terms of staffing, I would recommend highly that you hire the students or the entry or whoever's going to do the tagging and the posting, hire that earlier, because from what I gathered is we were actually doing some of the clean-up tagging after we drew the maps, which is not a good thing. So more staffing up front to keep up with it, to keep up with all of the input so there isn't a lag in terms of the input being added to our database as soon as possible.

For me, it was the sorting was a little difficult
for me. I even -- bless Toni -- awesome, wonderful --
and she even -- I had some one-on-one, and I still would
get stuck with the sorting. So just realize that maybe
not all of us are as tech savvy as some others, and
easier sorting functions would be great. Let me see.
And include additional sorting fields in terms of -- I
put "note which districts"; I'm thinking maybe which
counties or which districts that they belong to. I'm not
sure. I'll have to come back to see what I'm talking
about there.

It would have been helpful also if there was some
way to overly -- overlay the communities of interest into
our maps so that -- into our draft map -- so that we
could see -- you can instantly pop up, oh, there's some
communities of interest in this specific proposed
district; what does it say? Or if we're breaking up
communities of interest, we could readily bring that up
instead of having to go into our Airtable to find some of
the community of interest that were in that area.

I think what would have been helpful with the
Statewide Database, and even with our database, is if
there would have been a box that would say, how did you
hear about our -- the community of interest tool?
Because I think that would help for outreach and
education not only for the 2030, but for future in terms
of some the outreach efforts to see what were -- maybe
were more successful than others. And I think that's all
I had.

And in terms of with the Statewide Database and the
COI tool, it was pretty much done by the time we came on.
We were able to provide some feedback. But I don't know,
maybe that's something that the 20 -- our Commission can
be more involved in the building of that with the
Statewide Database to provide more feedback instead of
providing kind of feedback when it's done. But I think
that's all I have for now. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner
Fernandez.

Yeah, I'll take the opportunity to say it was -- I
remember at one point being surprised to find out
suddenly that Statewide Database was developing something
that they had gotten funding for from the legislature.
And we didn't know that they had gotten funding from the
legislature for that, and we didn't know that they were
that far along in developing it. So yeah, having a
fuller understanding of the role of Statewide Database in
this process, any previous arrangements that had been
made that, you know, aren't part of the Redistricting
Commission directly would certainly be helpful.

Commissioner Sinay.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: I -- I'm -- I believe that we need the database -- whatever we call it -- you know, the data -- where we put everything up ASAP. And that the -- a critical audience for it is really the commissioners. I understand that things might have been ready to go up earlier, but we were waiting on hiring the line drawers, but I think it's really critical to have it up early.

There's some messages that we -- that there -- we received information from the community that the early comments weren't in the database, and I don't think that that's accurate. I think we did put everything in there from the very beginning, including the hundred-plus videos and -- I think it was a hundred-plus videos and such -- that we received. So everything is in there, and it was an amazing tool; it could be tough to use, but once you got the hang of it, it was good. But just having it really early would have really been helpful.

And I think that might have helped us also during the COI input phase if people -- all the way through, if people could see their COI as quickly as -- you know, that they submitted a COI and they could see it the next day that it was in the database, I think that that would have increase the excitement about submitting and engaging, so. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner
Can I call on the -- thank you, Commissioner Ahmad. I was going to call on the Data Management Subcommittee. So Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair.

I have thoughts, but I'll try to narrow it down specifically regarding the process of the flow of the data. So since we, the Commission, did not own the COI tool, you can imagine someone from the public submitting their comment to the COI tool, where then we, the Commission, had to get that information from the COI tool. So there is this intermediary between ourselves and the members of the public to get that input.

I think we are in a space now from a technological lens, where such a tool can be open source, can be fully publicly available, and we don't necessarily need to rely on proprietary information from a research institution, such as UC Berkeley, to, you know, own that piece, particularly because the funding did come from the legislature. So I personally had some questions about that piece in and of itself, so I would hope that, come 2030, such a tool, which was amazing, would exist, probably be significantly better because of the advancements in technology, and be fully open source so members of the public can see exactly how their comments
are being translated to the Commission. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

First of all, I can't say enough good about USDR. So we're really grateful for your early recommendation there. They were phenomenal in every aspect from the beginning interview of trying to pull out of us what exactly we needed when we really were still trying to figure out what all did we need and what does this need to look like. We, of course, spoke with multiple entities, multiple organizations, and what have you, trying to determine what -- you know, it's almost like how do you eat an elephant? One bite a time. It was huge; it was bigger than a bread basket. But once we landed there with all of their expertise, they asked enough questions that allowed us to kind of bring some shape to what it was we wanted to have happen. USDR is like, the best kept secret, I think. They were amazing: every analyst, every person that they assigned to it that gave it its fullest attention. So I wanted to name that.

There were difficulties for sure. There was an ambiguous relationship between the legislators and
Statewide Database, and as Commissioner Ahmad mentioned, as far as who owned the data. And there got to be a couple of sticky points early on as we were trying to provide enough information to USDRI so that they were able to provide us with the tool that we need, and as far as what was proprietary and what -- it got strange for a minute, for me, as far as, wait, do -- is this is doing this or someone else is doing it? And if we're only receiving information that's fed to us from someone else, is it -- you know, is it manipulated data? Is it good data? You know, so I think going into 2030, those are right questions to ask, and to ensure that there are tools and systems available to the Commission that doesn't feel handled before we get it, perhaps. And maybe that's a little too strong, but it was wonky; it got a little strange in that relationship.

And yes, I think as part of our -- it's coming up for me now under data management, but maybe even part of training is to understand what is that relationship between Statewide Database and legislators as far as what happens before we ever come on the scene? I'm never really clear with the full relationship, the reporting authority in that process.

Now, having said that, Airtable, the ultimate tool that came out, I think -- I think what's more time that
was needed with it. I think it did exactly what we intended for it to do. The information that it was able to hold and the fact that we were able -- I can't imagine doing what 2010 did trying to find it in Excel -- or spreadsheet -- I don't even know that that looks like, because it was a challenge with Airtable and everything was there at our fingertips. So that was, I think, a huge win for this Commission in being able to get the information.

The team -- Marcy’s team, Alvaro’s team -- the team that came and then actually started working with Airtable, I think, again, did an excellent job in being able to tag; it just came a little bit later in the game than what, I think, we initially would have liked. There was something else I wanted to say about that. The data, the flow. Oh, shoot, don't lose it.

Oh, yeah. This Commission, it was really important for us to pay attention to every public comment, every COI testimony that was received. And I remember us having conversation about its not the volume, and we wanted to treat the same input whether it was received by one or two people or from a whole bunch of people. I think that was naïve. I think it was naïve at best. Because at the end, when you're looking at volumes of data, I did try and weed through and re -- pay careful
attention to just one comment in a particular area, one
community of interest that did -- was not -- you know,
that didn't come with hundreds of others, and I tried to
remember that place, that city, that interest, whatever
it was, but it was very difficult when you had volumes of
prepared information that came from other sources, or
whether it was prepared or whether there just was a lot
of interest in any particular city, to balance that with
what one person said.

And we had a whole conversation that that was going
to be treated equally, but should it be treated equally?
I don't know. Maybe equally wasn't the right word. But
we had this conversation struggling through what that was
going to look like. I think the reality of it is -- and
maybe I'm not at odds with it -- if it's one person's
community of interest, it is extremely important and we
want to give it air, we want to be able to hear it and
see it, but perhaps one shouldn't be balanced against
what another hundred people said about the same area.

But anyway, I just name that because in reality, once the
tool came out and you're reading a whole bunch, I don't
know, realistically, that we really had a way to give
equal weight to one comment as opposed to bunches of
comments.

But anyway, the tool in itself, from a data
management standpoint, had it all out there for us to see: we were able to put in by geography, we were able to put in by interest of water. Everything that we thought we wanted the tool to do, I believe that it did that. And if anything, we needed more time to collectively talk through what was in the tool as opposed to having the tool and now needing to make quick decisions and do line drawing. So we need to be able to just sit with the community of interest with the data that was received, and then kind of decipher what it meant for us, and then be able to draw lines. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I'm going to give some little background on all this because it all sort of blurs together who did what and why. And the -- in terms, you know, our charge is, of course, to draw the lines. The legislature was charged with getting public access to us; and that's where, in 2010, they, you know, how did that actually happen? The line drawers. Of all these -- you know, the community of interest, that the line drawers were wildly doing all this stuff: they had notes, they came up with a -- essentially, like, a little, you know, mini database of their own because --
and they were -- when commissioners would say, hey, well, didn't we hear something about this area? And they'd flip through their stuff, and say, yeah, it was at -- when we went over to, you know, Dixon, that's when we heard about, you know, the areas, you know, around the delta there, and you know, that's -- they did that. And so they went and said, okay, legislature, this is -- because they were also, you know -- and Q2 was also Statewide Database -- and the legislature went, okay, that really didn't work, and said, why don't we contract from the Statewide Database, who has all the data, to provide public access? That was the beginning of the COI tool.

And it was also then, which, I think -- which is what Commissioner Kennedy was referring to is public access to draw their own maps, which is how we got the access centers. Those -- all that happened -- I don't know if the 2010 Commission knew about that -- you know, the -- how that was going -- but that was being really worked out by the time we got together. And then we did have pretty good input on, you know, what labels do we want, how do we want to write the COI -- all those questions. That was up to us. Although, I don't think any of us at the point really realized quite -- we did our best about, okay, we need to find out this, this, and
this, but we didn't quite understand it until it was functioning.

And then -- and because again, the mappers, you know, the -- our actual line drawers -- in the Statewide Database there was a connection that we happened to have. That is not true, necessarily, and probably never will be again; and those two have to work hand in hand. And Sarah and I went to -- Commissioner Sadhwani and I -- went to great lengths to include the working with the database, working with the other tools, and the line drawers in the contract. Because otherwise, there would have been no reason why our line drawers -- they would have said, well, I don't know, whatever you're doing, but you know, give us the data; and that would really destroy the -- another Commission, which is -- I think I'm really going to make sure we have that in -- this is -- it's a crossover, so right now between data management and mapping.

But in terms of -- we did have the line drawers on board before we had the database lined up and it -- and that -- actually, it helped in terms of there was a go-between in terms of, okay, this isn't working out. There were issues and it helped -- USDR was absolutely fantastic; like, I cannot agree with Commissioner Turner more on that. They really helped us in terms of when
there's this, there's that, you don't have to -- at one point, I remember we thought we would have to devise it all ourselves, and they said, no, there's an open source. I was like, oh, thank God, okay.

But in open source, there's also sometimes security issues, which are not the same level as -- Statewide Database has very, very high security requirements because you know, they give information to all the counties and cities, as well as us, and those were not compatible. And that was where the glitch was -- it was kind of a little bit, pointing, you know, you and you, no, no, no, until basically, I think, the nontechnical people backed out of it, got the technical people from both sides working together, and then they worked out it wasn't that big a deal. But it sounded like a big deal and -- because we didn't quite know exactly who was talking about it.

And that's how then, oh, okay, and all the -- and Statewide Database would give downloads and would come directly into the Airtable. But getting that to happen, there was a huge glitch in there, because all of a sudden it's like, we can't give you that information; and it had to do with security. It wasn't as secure as it needed to be just for a Statewide Database, because it almost gave them a back door into Statewide Database.
And once USR -- USDR -- understood what they were talking about, that we got the two technical people together, they went, oh, not a problem, we'll do it this way and this way, and so that's how -- and then it all clicked. And I think that's where there was some confusion going on.

And then, the other thing -- and again, this came back to, you know, our tags -- or how we wanted to sort it -- we were asked, you know, what about a list? The mappers gave a list of things that they knew they would need, and we tried to add to that as well because Airtable allowed us to do that to make further modifications, which Toni was working on at great lengths for how -- she'd make another change and made it easier and easier for us to use, which was the beauty of Airtable. I think that's what the subcommittee certainly brought forward. And it's -- it was growing pains is really what slowed us down, and timing of it all. And it literally was -- I would put -- I would reco -- make a recommendation that the mapping and data management -- like, subcommittees, if they have to have a larger subcommittee, they need to be able to work together to make sure that there aren't any total miscommunications on this. And because we had the benefit of having our mappers and our -- and the Statewide Database having very
close relationship, where that won't be true, I don't believe, for 2030 and then moving forward. Now, also, technology will be very different, so it might not be an issue.

And but who owns that right now, my -- I don't know. My understanding is -- now the data (indiscernible) is us. But that tool, that was actually paid for by the legislature, so I don't know in terms of who actually technically owns it, and that's something we should really find out. And that also includes -- remember they created the mapping -- their mapping tool as well. That's another -- there were two distinctly different tools that Statewide Database built on contract from the legislature, and I don't know if those then become -- they go to us or not. I don't know that. We should find something -- find that out.

But then -- oh, and then the one thing that Commissioner Fernandez said is, you know, wouldn't it be great to have our COIs overlap with the maps -- you know, our draft maps? And the only -- we did have that; the problem is time; because it's another layer. And each COI had its own layer, and so -- and they tried -- state -- the mappers put some of those together that didn't interfere so they could pull up a full layer, but it literally would have taken -- remember how sometimes
we look at the map, it would take a long time and a long
time? Well, if you try to pull up all the COIs on there
as well, you know, you might as well take a coffee break,
and then come back. And so that's why we didn't have
those as often as we wanted.

Now, again, technology -- you know, would I
recommend that same program for the 2030 Commission? No.
And I don't believe -- and the mappers would also not.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Which program are you
referring to?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: The -- oh, shoot. The GIS
that we accessed -- the line drawers actually used. Oh,
God, I can't remember the name, but.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Maptitude.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Maptitude. Thank you.

Maptitude.

They -- the company -- you know, that was a great
product, but the company did not support them at all.
When they had -- they needed requirements and changes,
the company said, well, you know, get in line, you
know -- or take a number, step aside, essentially. It
did not evolve like some of the other software. And as
2030 comes around, the software that the line drawers
would actually be using, I would have a serious look at,
and have that included in as we eval -- as they evaluate
what mappers they actually use.

So I'm going to stop on that because I brought up a lot of things which I'm sure people have some issues with, or. And there's a lot of different things about the interaction and it's -- it'll -- it's going to get easier and easier from here on out, I do believe. We're just the first time we tried it, and a lot of great tools were developed, a lot of things that -- we ended up in a really good place; it was rough getting there, but I think it's going to be smoother and smoother as the Commissions move on and technology improves, so. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you.

So I had -- you know, a question for us to think about or discuss is, how do we feel about the fact that the Statewide Database has such a close relationship with the legislature? And if there is something that we -- you know, is that something that we need to include in our piece? I know I always felt a little uncomfortable about that relationship. And as Commissioner Turner was speaking, it became more evident. And also Commissioner Ahmad brought up some great points. Because if they have
that relationship with the legislature -- and this is not what they said -- but the question of who owns that data and if that's that an entity of the legislature, is there -- you know, does that go -- anyway. I think you all know what I'm trying to say.

The other piece, it kind of came up -- you know, we talked about the access centers. I never thought the access centers were a good idea in COVID or not COVID just because it would come to me versus come to us. And what I -- what would be good, I think, in the future, is if they do have that same funding, to hire individuals, you know, so there is that distance from us -- and so this goes counter to what I just said about the legislature, but maybe the Statewide Database just has to be separate from everybody -- but that there is someone who can go to the community groups and do the workshops, because hopefully, next time it will be in libraries with multiple computers and stuff like that, and so they could be a trainer that's in there and actually working with people. They're going to the people versus people having to go to them. And you could set up office hours at certain places, but really -- yeah, I mean, I just didn't like it because it was only in some places, it was always in downtown areas, it -- well, ours wasn't in downtown, but close enough. So those are just two thoughts. But
the main important one is this whole idea of how close
the relationship is between the state legislature and the
Statewide Database.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner
Sinay.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. Thank you.

And thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

I had raised my hand because I wanted to make sure
that I was really clear. If we were doing the old-
fashioned (indiscernible), I actually see this as a
threat area, potentially. So I think there for sure
should be caution or wariness about any tool that is
owned by Statewide Database that receives direction from
legislators that is proprietary and not accessible to
commissioners; and there was that element. And so to me,
it is a potential -- I assume everyone did exactly what
they should this go round, but I don't think it -- I
think it's something that requires additional oversight
or looking into, and I don't think it should be the
common way to go.

I think if we're truly going to believe we have an
independent redistricting Commission in mind to going to
ultimately be drawn based on information that's received
by the commissioners, I believe that commissioners should
have access. We've signed away everything and our first
born to become commissioners, and then to get to a place
and say that's proprietary, and you as a Commissioner
can't know it, see it, or have access to it, and all of
it was not truly open sourced. And so I just want to
make sure that I'm clear.

I think that that is a weakness area or if not, a
threat, and that beyond handing off to whoever in the
Statewide Database to technical people that we did not
have access to because we could not -- they should have
explained it to us so that we can understand what's going
on so that we can have oversight, vetted, say, yes, this
is exactly what was received from the people of
California and it translated -- it resulted in these
particular districts that we drew. And so I understand
the whys of what happened this go round; I don't think
that we need to continue keeping any portion of it
proprietary and away from commissioners. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner
Turner.

Commissioner Fornaciari.

CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah, a couple things. I think
what everyone is saying is we moved it -- we -- need to
take some time to clarify roles, responsibilities, and
expectations between us, the Statewide Database, and the
legislature and how those handoffs are going to be managed.

I think the other thing -- you know, a lot of what I was going to say has already been said, and I think it's been inferred, but I just want to be clear, we got a figure out a way to get faster turnaround on data getting in the database. You know, it got to a point where, you know, it was as fast as we could get it but was still days to -- between the time of the day it got and the time we were able to see it. And especially while we're mapping, you know, we don't -- we can't be -- take that long. So I just want to add that.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you for that, Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. And thanks for this conversation.

I guess, I'll just -- I just wrote down some notes and some of it, I guess, I'll just -- might end up restating some of the things, and I just wanted to maybe do that more to just uplift some certain things. I'll start with just the database. And I think it's been said that having the database early would be helpful, and I want to just lift this up because I realize that there's both the public input and also the comments -- the early
comments that we got, you know, just in terms of, you know, various comments that those who are following the process were sending us -- and what I noticed is that there were times when -- you know, the comments were not that numerous, so it was easy to just post up onto the website. But I noticed that there were some that got added after our meeting because of the timing that it came in, and unless you went back and looked at the previous meeting handouts, you may have missed some of those comments. When it got put into the database, everything was visible, but that was not until several months later.

And so this leads to one of my suggestions that, perhaps, as both the Lessons Learned, but also a suggestion for the future, which is, I think not only do we need to establish the database early, I think we should also seriously recommend that we hire, or the Commission hire as part of their staffing, a database manager and analyst. I think that the technology is such that we can't just kind of try to leave it to the commissioners. And I absolutely appreciate what Commissioner Turner and Ahmad did, and clearly, they learned quickly and knew, you know, what needed to be done, but I think that it would be better if we have someone who could be focused on it, working with the
commissioners, but somebody who understands this work. And I think that as the technology evolves, it's just going to continue to require that this is going to be one of those standard roles that we'll have to have. So I just wanted to just suggest that.

And in fact, not that I want to put more work on us, but you know, I'm realizing that there are certain things that do take longer and require a longer runway to get established and put in place so that it becomes useful, and that just the thought is that, again, along with some of the other things we talked about maybe trying to do in '28 and '29 -- 2028/'29 -- you know, maybe this is part of one of those things that we start to look at, is what does the technology look at in that time frame, and are there things that we can do to help establish some of these things so that something is in place.

Because I understand absolutely with what Commissioner Turner said. I guess at the same time, is a several-month delay going to be worth it versus us trying to also, as an independent body, you know, can we set this up so that they walk in -- the next Commission walks in -- and has a useable database that, yes, is not going to be used -- you know, is not going to be fully populated right away, but at least then there's something there and they can, you know, at least not -- one less
thing to have to worry about that, I think, kind of falls under an administrative thing that is going to be important, but also one that maybe doesn't make sense for them to take their focus away. So I thought I'd just share that.

I did find, and I know this was also said, that the search function was hard no matter what; it should just be simple. We should just be able to put in a keyword and find it and it was just not quite as simple as that. Although, I do really, really appreciate having it, and I finally figured out how to make it work, but it -- it took a moment.

I also want to just note, this is just another thing. I think because we were rushing to put things in instead of trying to do it early and keep up with it, there were -- some of the tags were incorrect, I noticed. I tried to send those that were incorrect over to Toni, but you know, in the scheme of things, I got overwhelmed, and I'm sure that the team was overwhelmed. It just made the search a little bit more challenging.

And I think, too, what Commissioner Turner had said about one versus the many, there were several that, I mean, they were just cut and paste of the same thing, so you know. I understand that that's about volume. I also did try to look for those single ones that, you know,
what is it that they're saying? Trying to write down
those notes that, towards the end, it's like, okay, let's
just at least raise this and lift it and just try to
address it; but it did get overwhelming, and if there's a
better way to try to sort, that would be good.

I'm also -- maybe this is hopeful thinking, but
maybe by the time 2030 comes around, there will be other
functions that could integrate all of the website and all
these other things -- you know, the documents and
everything. Who knows, that's maybe a little wishful
thinking there.

I really liked what Commissioner Ahmad said about an
open source COI tool. The only thing on the COI tool
that I want to just remind everybody is that we did have
it available in multiple languages, so whatever is going
to be done, I want to make sure that that's also going to
be available as well, too.

I think, again, on the access centers, you know, it
depends -- I think there's going to be -- it depends on
what the tech is going to be in 2030. I do like the idea
of maybe going to the individual organizations to do the
teaching. I think the value of having the access centers
was that sometimes it's just easier to just have somebody
there to walk you through it, but the -- but you know, it
was limited in scope because there can only be so many
places, but. Even just trying to do it on the phone can
sometimes be a little hard no matter what the positive
intents may be, so. You know, I don't know if there's
really a solution to it. And then by the time 2030 comes
around, I mean, we're going to have native -- digital
natives, I think -- digital natives that we're going to
be much more tech savvy, so you know, the use of the
access centers may not be as necessary.

Last thing I just want to note, I also want to
appreciate USDR and all the work that they did on our
behalf as well, too. And you know, again, just thanking
Commissioner Turner and Commissioner Ahmad for all the
work that they did, and I'm sure, you know, in addition
to everything else that they were doing trying to learn
all the technology, so. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner
Akutagawa.

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. You know, I want to
clarify a few things, and also that I've got a really
good thought. But the data was always ours in the COI
tool and all this stuff. All the data was ours. And the
Statewide Database, they created the tool. Never -- you
know, they probably have a backup -- I'm hoping they have
a backup of it -- but no, it was never theirs.
The tool itself -- they were the contractor from the legislature. I -- you know, the idea -- I mean, they could have been -- they could have contracted with anybody, except Statewide Database made the most sense because they are very independent, you know, they have all the election data. They have -- you know, that's -- they're kind of -- you know, it's like called -- you know, going to the library -- something, as opposed to a -- you know -- they don't have a particular -- you know, that's kind of what they do is they do data, so it sort of made sense for them -- for the legislature to ask them -- or to contract with them. But no, it was always going to be: and we're handing the data over to you; what you guys do with it, you know, whatever; if you want to throw it away, great. It was never, like, their data or anything even remotely like that.

And the access center -- and actually, it's because these ideas -- you know, as I said, the legislature was charged with this -- and I don't know if they talked with the 2010 -- but they kind of came up with, well, hey, here's an idea to do it, why don't we try contacting these guys? And like, the access centers, I know, came about, again, because you know, 2010 -- it was all done there, and then once the Commission moved on, it's like, well, how do people get their information to the
Commission? And they said, well, you know, we found having little areas where people -- where they could go and submit their information worked, and that's my understanding is where the access centers came from.

But an idea I have -- and these are all things we'd like, and we're mentioning all these ideas -- it's not our charge; it's the legislature's charge. So we should actually say, hey, legislature, you know, there -- they have to pay for that. That's not out of -- that's like a separate -- an addition -- money -- additional money from our budget. If we take on that -- you know, hey, why don't we have it this way, this way, and this way, we either have to give our ideas to the legislature or get -- ask the legislature to allow us to fund it, and do these things, like, say, in '28, '29, really put these things together for the 2030 Commission. Because that's -- again, that's not our charge to draw the lines and to work with the people, but providing access to us is actually charge of the legislature.

So you know, I know -- and that's, you know, and maybe that's something we want to change in our -- you know, in the -- I don't know if that's in -- I think that's in government code as opposed to the Constitution, but I'd have to look that up. But that is something where -- because you know, maybe we don't have to pay to
update the tool. Maybe, you know, the COI tool or however it looks in the next ten years -- eight to ten years -- when we look at it in 2028 and '29, you know, maybe that's not funding that has to come out of our budget, is an idea.

And then on the -- oh, and the other -- in the downloading -- that data into our Airtable from the COI tool from the state legis -- from the Statewide Database came directly in; it was Bing, it was there. The parts that took more time were the ones that, from our -- anything that we ha -- that our office staff had to code -- had to separately code, that's what took time, and that's what we didn't see right away. So you know, and that's why all of a sudden you get a -- you know, every time Toni would update, there'd be an enormous amount of info, and then others would trickle in. Any public comment, that had to be totally done by the staff.

And we might actually get even Alvaro to -- or Marcy or somebody to tell us -- walk us through what the staff actually ended up doing, because you know, we're making a lot of going, well, this, that, and the other. And you know, I know -- I only followed some of it when there were glitches, so I don't know the full amount, but I think that would really help us in evaluating this analysis input.
Oh, and then the analysis of the input. That was something that we thought about and would really kind of liked to have done, and we -- it was -- things got so rushed towards the end, we didn't have the luxury of really doing that very much. And I think if we started the data management -- you know, getting all that earlier, we would have had time to -- like, the analyzing in -- you know, analyzing the input, which might have helped with the issue of this comment came at us a hundred times; this comment came at us once. You know, in terms of our trying to search through it and have it like that, it might -- we might have been able to have our analyst really help us do that, which I think would have saved commissioners quite a bit of time in reviewing it all, so. That's just the nature of the range of the public submissions. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Good Saturday morning to everyone. I think I, without being redundant, sort of agree with what Commissioner Andersen just said. I think having a dedicated data analyst would benefit -- would have been benefited us and definitely benefit the next Commission. Perhaps having a daily briefing that lets us
know what came in overnight, what's coming in, the
current status of the data that's in the tables would
have been helpful.

And again, I also think it's imperative that the
data component is set up early, because it almost
feels -- even though we know that was put in there, it
almost feels like some of those earlier comments are
lost. We know that they're put into the tables, but it
almost feels lost with the abundance of the information
that comes in latter (sic). So I would stress that we
have to get it in early and that a data analyst is
imperative, perhaps with a daily briefing with what's in
the tables. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner
Taylor.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

And I might be repetitive.

Jane, I tried to keep up with everything that you
were saying, but I ran out of ink. But anyway. I'm just
kidding.

I think Commissioner Turner and Commissioner Ahmad
and maybe Anthony, I think there might have been an -- I
know --

Commissioner Andersen, I know what you're saying is
the data is ours, but there also had to be, like, some contract or some agreement in terms of the ability to bring in the data from the Statewide Database to ours, and that was kind of like, towards the end, and like, really, now you tell us about it, that there's some sort of agreement that we have to research or agree to? And so I just wanted to flag that so that the 2030 Commission has it on their list; like, this is something else that needs to happen in order to import the data from the Statewide Database, there's this agreement that had to be signed by us -- by the Commission. And in terms of the relationship between the Statewide Database and the legislature, I guess part of me is I'm glad someone else is taking care of that, and has that tool, and is upkeeping the tool, and having to do that. I think at the end of the day, out of the 30,000-plus input, the majority was directly to us, I believe. Maybe I'm incorrect in that, but -- so most of it was ours, which is great.

I'm not sure if Commissioner Akutagawa said this or not, but as we know the statewide database was in multiple languages, I believe fourteen. I would also like ours to be in multiple languages, so that individuals can -- and I really love the feature that the public could review the data that was coming in, which is
great. But I would like ours to also have that
capability.

And Commissioner Taylor and Commissioner Andersen, I
believe, talked about this, but -- and I had talked about
it, I believe, maybe the first day, but definitely need
help sorting and analyzing the data. Yes, the intention
was for us to, you know, take a breather, like, the first
whatever, hour of the day, to review the data, but as we
all know, our meetings were long and they were daily, and
we just had to keep moving.

And in terms of Statewide Database, the team, for me
personally, I think they were great; I think they were
responsive whenever we had a question, so I did want to
make sure that I did a shout out to them, thanking them
for their response, their responsiveness and willing to
help us out in different issues and different questions
that we had throughout our year-and-a-half. And I'm not
sure if Commissioner Kennedy was going to do this, and
Commissioner Yee, if we were going to receive feedback
from the Statewide Database, in terms of how it went on
their side, but maybe that's not even in our scope.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner
Fernandez.

Commissioner Taylor, I'm guessing your hand is just
still up, rather than raised again? Okay, thanks.

Director Kaplan? We're not hearing you.

MS. KAPLAN: Sorry, I was at a basketball game this morning; I forgot my hat was still on till just now.

I just wanted to highlight what Commissioner Fernandez just said. I think it would be helpful, whether it's at a pending Commission meeting or off-line to go over some of these concerns with Statewide Database, to see what could be improved for 2030 as well, particularly some of the data processing also, the prisoner reallocation, other efforts that went on, to see what, you know, what worked, didn't work, and the other work that Statewide Database does throughout the years leading up to 2030 to support with that effort, it may be helpful to have them come back to share more about that as well.

And then, I don't know if you wanted -- I know Commissioner Andersen had asked about what staff were doing in terms of tagging, if that's helpful for me to go over.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes, yes.

MS. KAPLAN: So from an outreach staff perspective, I can get into a bit more detail on that. So starting from the COI input meetings, staff were taking notes on the input that the public were providing during those
meetings, kind of like more of a summary analysis, and that's what ended up going into the database.

As we continued with public input, we were using the closed captioning text, and then just going through and reviewing that, so that saved staff a bit of time.

And then later in the fall, we were shared -- I think that's when we were given the tags for data that, I'm not sure at what point those were finalized, and so staff were -- as they were inputting public comment that was happening during input meetings or Commission meetings, they were tagging for additional -- tagging the data with those additional codes also.

And also tagging location, tagging whether there was non-English input, so then outreach team was also then supporting at the end with other data that came in -- other input that came in, written input, to tag those also. So additionally tagging when there was non-English input.

I think Alvaro can go into more detail in terms of the data team -- data team's role in some of that tagging or other support with that, but I know that one -- another key piece that was happening was the review of input for any personal identifying information, so we tried to set up the feedback form so that people wouldn't be putting their personal information in there, but the
data team eventually was set up every few hours to go in and review and then release the input that was submitted, so that it could be seen on the public page.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Director Kaplan.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I thought I just -- I realized it's like, I don't want to leave out the Statewide Database, in terms of a -- just some accolades for them as well, too.

I do want to just note that a couple things: one, I know that the Statewide Database staff were very careful when we were talking about different things, whether it was related to the COI tool, or other things, to make sure that they were not making the decisions; they always deferred to us and asked us or ensured that we were making the decisions. So I do want to just acknowledge that, that they, you know, they were not making decisions on their own; it was really in deference to us and what, as the Commission, that we wanted, especially when we were working with them on the COI tool.

I also -- I know I said this yesterday, but I thought I'd say it again. The QGI -- the Access Center staff were playing multiple roles, so they were oftentimes the people, when a phone call was made to their help line, they are the ones that were answering.
They were very responsive in answering questions. When it came time to use of the QGIS, they were also very helpful, and spent a lot of time -- spent quite a bit of time on the phone with me in helping me to walk through and troubleshoot, and to really figure out what the issues were, to the point where then I know for me, I was able to do it, and for anybody else who wanted it, they were willing -- you know, I know that they were doing that as well, too.

I will note that the -- it would be good, maybe in the future, and I don't know, again, this goes to the -- what the technology in the future will allow, but if there is going to be a COI tool, whether it's open source or not, having an open source kind of mapping tool would also be helpful.

And I'm saying this in the context of the database, so that we can include that. I know that we're going to talk about mapping a little bit later, but I thought I'd preempt that by making that, you know -- that note about having something that is all integrated together, so that then again, as we continue to get input, the public will be able to still go to a single website to provide input, and then later on, when it transitions to doing mapping, being able to then submit maps and not having to go to a completely different site, because I think the Statewide
Database, they also incorporated a mapping tool as well, too, along with the COI tool, but I think it was a different website, so it -- it would probably just make things simpler if it could all be one website, so.

And then again, anything else that would be possible so that it is direct to the Commission, if it can, so then that way, then, you know, we'll have access to that same data. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, thank you. I was looking something up on the website there for a minute.

One thing, oh, I wanted to say is, you know, I really do like the idea of getting a review from Statewide Database in terms of hey, you know, what do you think, you know, what would you propose to the 2030 Commission.

And also, though, if we could get, and I don't know if we'd have to contract with her, or if it is in a report, but say Toni, who was our data manager, if we could get her to come in and give us a report about, you know, what she thinks went well, and how she would really make recommendations for, you know, it would've been easier if we did this, and this, and this. I think that
would actually really help us, as far as, you know, Lessons Learned, just in terms of we would learn, I believe there, is things that we didn't even know happened, and that were problems for us, which she just handled, and you know, good and bad things, again, strengths and weaknesses. I think Marcy wouldn't be saying there is a bit of a report, which there probably is a full report.

And the other idea was -- the database, the -- oh, in terms of, you know, I really like -- thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa, for bringing up the point of the COI tool and their -- the, you know, the 3 GIS -- 2QGIS mapping tool that the Statewide Database, you know, put together for us. That is an open source.

I didn't realize that it was two different websites, and I was trying to find that. Right now, I don't see either on our website, though I couldn't find that. And I was just wondering.

I'm going to turn it over to Marcy right now. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Director Kaplan?

MS. KAPLAN: Yeah, I just wanted to jump on to say that there was the -- they did create an open source
mapping software, and all three of those, so the Draw My CA Community tool, the COI tool, the Draw My CA Districts tool, and then the Draw My CA, which was the open source GIS platform, QGIS; they were all on the website, and they still are DrawMyCalifornia.org. Those are all on our website. Also on the participate page, we just updated the text on their recently, just to -- it's more past tense. These were tools that were available during the redistricting cycle.

But that was the training that staff did all fall, was going through all three of these tools, and that was always included in how to participate, so there was a centralized location for all of that as well.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Director Kaplan.

A few things on my part at this point. I'm wondering if Commissioner Turner and/or Commissioner Ahmad could remind us, how many folks they ended up interacting with from USDR, just wondering what USDR's overall level of effort was.

I certainly agree with the need for some data analysts or research staff, however we want to call it, someone who can go through, you know, thousands of pieces of input coming in each day that aren't -- whose attention is not demanded by mapping because certainly once we got into mapping, I tried to go through as many
inputs as I could, but you know, with sitting in the meetings, there was only so much data review that could go on outside of those.

And finally, I'm wondering, maybe from Director Kaplan, or from Director Hernandez, just wanting to have a better understanding of how much training staff received in their -- in the various tasks that they were assigned in the data management stream. Thank you.

Director Kaplan, is your hand still up, or is it a new? Okay. No, it's Commissioner Andersen's.

MS. KAPLAN: It was still up, but I can answer that question, if you want.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Oh, okay, go ahead.

MS. KAPLAN: So we did do a bunch of training because staff were also using Airtable to track outreach efforts, so there was training on that.

We did have Vanessa on our team, one of the field support staff, that really got into the database quite a bit more, and she was kind of like the support for staff around, if there were issues around that.

On the other side, in terms of data tagging, there were several trainings that Toni held with the outreach team to begin some of the data tagging, and then ongoing questions around it.

And then, in the last month when they were focused
specifically on doing a lot of the tagging, Toni had
daily, just like her -- the data team had their daily
meeting that was open to anyone, and outreach if there
were questions.

So Toni and her team were extremely accessible,
particularly for me and Fredy, in coordination, if there
were, you know, documents we couldn't find or needed to
get uploaded, or you know, she was really supportive with
the final report, to ensure that we were getting the
accurate data for -- to include in the final report as
well.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Great, thank you for that.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Actually, thank you,
Commissioner Kennedy and thank you, Director Kaplan,
because that training that the staff got, I'd really like
to recommend that the commissioners also get that, even
if it's just Reader's Digest version, because -- and
that, you know, the -- then we would be well aware of
what goes into the data, how it gets sorted, and in terms
of if we find that there's other information that we
really need, it would be a smoother transition to getting
that corrected.

And the other part is, just as Commissioner Kennedy
might not realize how he was sort of fumbling with, is it
data manager, is it data analyst; it turns out we went
around quite a bit in discussions about that, more from
the technical perspective, because it turns out that
those titles in tech -- in the world of tech, have huge
difference meanings. And what we kind of ended up with,
I never was quite sure exactly what -- we ended up
getting the right people, but not necessarily in the
right categories as we thought them.

And so I would really say, like, you know, when
Marcy -- you know, the data team, that's really what
you're needing, data team, because -- and I can't even
imagine how different this will look in 2030. So I
wouldn't necessarily, you know how we have -- we have
executive director, and we have exec -- you know, these
labels; what that ends up looking like for the data
management, I have no idea, and I don't think we can
anticipate that. So in '28 -- 2028, 2029, we should
revisit that with people in the field who understand it,
and then incorporate those titles in terms of what the
CRC is looking.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner
Andersen.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum, thank you. To answer
your question, as far as the number of USDR people that
were supporting the project, initially there was about --
on our initial consultation, there was the one -- and I
don't have my notes back, so I don't do -- I don't
remember the names exactly at this point -- my notes back
yet, that we had to turn in.
So there was initially three online, just to hear
what we need and kind of talk about it, and then they did
kind of an internal assessment and assigned the key
staff. Phil was the name that stands out for me right
now, Phil Zigoris, I think it was, but at any given time,
there were at least, I believe there was the one main
person assigned, and then two others that supported. So
I think consistently three people, a couple of in and out
throughout the process. But yeah, I'd say about three
consistently.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Great, thank you,
Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Commissioner Fornaciari?

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah, just listening to this
conversation just reminds me what a heavy, heavy, heavy
lift this was for everyone, and I just -- I want to
personally thank our data management subcommittee, our
data team, USDR, all the outreach staff, Marcy and team,
everyone in -- and Fredy and team, and everyone who
worked on this.

I mean, you know, we're talking about Lessons Learned and how we can improve it. What a phenomenal outcome and tool that we had, though I mean, the tool was relatively easy to use, easy to get in there. The data was there at our, you know, at our hands for us to use, and it just was great. It turned out great.

And I want to thank the Statewide Database, too. I mean, they did a ton of work in order to support us. Now, we need to clarify the relationship and the understanding between the organizations, but the work that the Statewide Database did was amazing.

You know, Commissioner Akutagawa reminded me, you know, how many -- how much time we spent on the phone with the guys from the access center, getting QGIS up and running, you know, they had to do updates on the installer for us to get that fixed. You know, we were doing some troubleshooting with them and helping them out, but you know, the tools that they ended up building for the public, I'm looking at the page again, you know, they had the, you know, the COI input tool, then a web-based mapping tool, then you could download a mapping tool. I mean, they did a lot of work, too, on our behalf and I just want to make sure that I personally, you know, thank them all.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I remembered that I also -- I don't believe I mentioned Alvaro -- Director Alvaro, that played a huge role in facilitating a lot of the conversations and supported with work of USDR as well. So I wanted to just thank him also.

And I don't know if we mentioned before that USDR also helped with all of the job descriptions as it related to data and what needed to be implemented, and which piece part, workflows, et cetera, so I wanted to name all of that, because it was truly phenomenal work that they did.

Thank you, and thank you, Alvaro.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Anyone else on this? Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, thank you for that, Commissioner Turner, because that triggered something.

For, you know, if it's us looking to '28/'29, looking at, you know, how do things go from now on, in terms of technology. If USDR is still around, we should definitely contact them, because they would be, you know, up to date on how things have evolved, and they would be
a source for us, in terms of writing our contracts, in
terms of getting our titles proper, if they still are
around. And if not -- I sort of assume they would be, or
someone like that, so let's put that in our notes for
later on, or to recommend to 2030. They were phenomenal.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Very good, Commissioner
Andersen.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I just wanted to mention, great
idea to reach out to Statewide Database and to Toni and
maybe USDR, and get their suggestions, you know, whether
they could still appear in person in the short couple of
days we have left in this process, or maybe just give us
some written feedback. We'll certainly reach out to
them.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah, I'm thinking that this
might be something that we schedule after the 18th. We
can figure that out with Director Hernandez, but yeah, I
see great value in it, I just don't want to take time
away from the other discussions that we already have
scheduled for next week.

Anything else at this point on data management?

Okay, Chair, I might suggest that we proceed to
break and come back at 11:15 on mapping.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah, sounds great. We'll
do that. We'll return at 11:15. Thanks, everyone.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 10:52 a.m.
until 11:15 a.m.)

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Welcome back, and we will
jump right into our next topic for Lessons Learned. I
believe Commissioner Yee is up?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, please. Thank you, Chair.

And so we move on to our final topic for today,
we'll see if we can finish this before lunch, is mapping.
So the whole mapping process, the mapping playbook we put
together, the way we approached things first with
visualizations, and then had one draft map, did not have
a second one. Then moved on to our final maps, work with
mappers, our effort with VRA districts, revisions, the
extreme workload at times for their mappers.

We've already talked about the Draw My tools; Draw
My California Community, Draw My California District, and
some -- a little bit about QGIS. I've already gotten
some feedback. You know, hopefully we can get a more
consistent naming convention going for draft districts
than just the whole final push at the end for adoption,
certification, and delivery.

So mapping is the topic for this segment. Your
thoughts? Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'll just get us started
To you, Commissioner Yee and Commissioner Turner, I absolutely love the playbook. It was so helpful, especially when, you know, that little light goes off that it's like, I really need to know how I can make this change, right, from one population to another population. So very super helpful, and thank you for all of that information.

I think most of us, if not all of us, have already stated the VRA districts need to be solidified early, early, early, early, before we do the rest, because it just felt like we would get some really good traction, and then we'd have to go back, and that was just frustrating. It just felt like there was so much do over.

Ideally, I would love to be able to do a second draft map, but I don't know if the timing actually allows for it, because once you have your first draft map, you can't touch it for two weeks. So I don't think that allows for a second draft map, unless you know, the deadline gets changed.

Less visualizations and more live line drawing. I think maybe one, the initial visualization, and then after that, I feel that -- and maybe it was a combination of the two because since we didn't have our VRA districts
and we were doing visualizations, it just really changed
too much -- too drastically from week to week.

   And I have -- I put some notes here, and it said --
oh, and one thing that we didn't do, and intentionally we
didn't do, you know, our sixth criteria is the nesting of
Assembly versus Senate, and I agree with the way we did
it, in terms of build each one separately, but it's just,
I guess, maybe a flag for the 2030. If nesting is
something you're going to want to do, then you have to
build your assemblies for that purpose as well. But I
actually prefer the way we did it.

   And I have a note here, and I have no idea what I
meant by it, so I'm just going to log off right now.
Thank you.

   COMMISSIONER YEE: Maybe you could say just a bit
more about how we did the nesting, from your perspective;
what was (indiscernible)?

   COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, we didn't do the
nesting. We -- so the --

   COMMISSIONER YEE: We didn't.

   COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So the sixth criteria is
to, you know, ideally nest ten Assembly into one Senate,
and --

   COMMISSIONER YEE: Two, two.

   COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I mean, two. Yes, I'm
sorry. Two and two, yeah. See, I've already forgotten.

But we -- what we did is we intentionally did each
one separately and as we -- I thought it was very
thoughtful of us, where if we couldn't -- oh, gosh, see,
I'm -- now my language is -- has left me. But if we
couldn't honor a COI or a community of interest in the
Assembly, we would try to do that in the Senate. And if
you look at it from a nesting point of view, that would
be -- that could've been difficult. So I did like how we
just -- we never really thought of nesting when we built
the Assembly, and I believe that's a good way to do it,
to keep them separate.

Did that make sense, Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, yeah.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, thank you.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to share some of
the thoughts that came from the community in the report
that they sent us that I thought it was worth our
conversation -- worth conversations.

The -- one of the things was CRC should allocate
mapping discussion time based on population or complexity
of the region. We kept saying we were going to do that,
and I don't think we -- we spent a lot of time in some
areas.

And then the other one was not to map late at night because you make mistakes or because not everybody's as engaged. That came up a few times in the report, and other people's comments.

And the final one that I thought was interesting, and I'm not sure how we could do it. So kind of how we have the report, we talk about each district, you know, what came -- you know, how we created those districts. I kind of agree that I -- it would've been great to have throughout the process to be able to go back to a district and remind ourselves what COIs we brought in there, what our thinking was on that. It might've just been some bullets.

But we kept moving things and changing things, and we would forget why we did things. And so I think it would've been nice to have summaries that were started from -- written summaries -- that were started from the very beginning, so when we pulled up a district, we could also look at, okay, this was our thinking the last time we looked at this district, because it's almost 200 districts, and it's a lot.

And especially when we have one set of thinking for Assembly versus a different set of thinking for Senate, and I think it would've helped in the long run on the
report, you know, we're drafting the report would've been more -- there was -- in reading it, it was accurate, but there was pieces that were missing because it just captured the last conversations we had; it didn't capture the earlier COIs that we took into consideration.

And I'll leave it at that. I'm sure I'll have more as we keep sharing. But I did want to -- yeah, those mid -- I actually -- those are some of my favorite memories are those midnight meetings, but I do understand, you know, it was true, it wasn't -- it was not the most productive time sometimes.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah, a few things. Just to go a little bit deeper into the feedback we got from the community groups with regard to -- they made some comments on RPV analysis, and they talked about the maps that the -- the maps that were produced, the RPV maps that we published. You know, those should be out earlier, and if there is -- if there are changes, we should be -- the Commission should be really explicit that things have changed, and update that information for the public.

They also commented that it's -- they said the CRC was more productive when one or two commissioners work
with mappers on potential proposals and presented the
proposals to the full CRC for discussion. I think that
was the -- I would agree with that. I thought, you know,
when there was -- you know, when we got to places where
things were getting sticky, and tricky, and difficult,
when we sent off one or two of the commissioners with the
mappers to work on them and came back, I thought that was
effective, and led us to some, I think, creative
outcomes.

Just want to reiterate and echo, the playbook was
super, super well done and helpful, so thank you for
that.

As far as visualizations go, yeah, I mean maybe one,
maybe two, but I think that we all need to be clear on
the -- it needs to very explicitly clear what the
directions are to the line drawers because it was
ambiguous at times, and there was conflicting direction.
And so, you know, with visualizations, I think it needs
to be very, very clear, and everyone know what the
direction to the line drawer was. And I'll just stop at
that point.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, I figured out
what my sloppy writing said.
Just from the point that we -- that's when I was Chair. The point where we felt okay, all the maps are done, we're good, these are the ones that we're going to vote on, I think -- I don't think -- there needs to be more time allowed for our line drawers to go back and ensure that all of the lines that are accurate, there aren't any missing areas, or whatever the case may be. I felt that it was -- we were rushing them too much. So you know, maybe build in an extra day to allow the line drawers a day to go back, and then bring forward any sort of clarifying direction. So I think that's very important.

The other piece of it, I don't know if Commissioner Yee was going to bring this up, this whole issue with the counties, in terms of whatever support they may need. That is not -- we can't just give -- apparently, the Secretary of State can't just give them whatever maps we have; they needed additional information. I'm not sure if it's for precinct level or whatever the case may be, but maybe nail that down a little bit more, in terms of what that need is, and who's responsible for providing that support to them.

I did, as Commissioner Fornaciari mentioned, the feedback that we received with having the commissioners work off-line with the mappers, one or two commissioners
at a time. I do think that was critically important, because we saw how long it can take to go on a journey, and Commissioner Turner and I think we spent a couple of really long sessions with Kennedy, our mapper, who was awesome, and one was likely a three-hour, another was a two-hour, and to do that and open, it wouldn't have been efficient use of our work.

And having the ability of the QGIS was wonderful. And again, the Statewide Database did a wonderful job supporting us, and supporting me specifically, because you know that I'm technically challenged. But did a wonderful job of calling me, making sure it was set up, and helping me navigate, and I think it was helpful, very helpful in terms of my being able to provide better feedback, and better input in terms of where to move the lines.

And in terms of the naming conventions, I know that was also one of the feedback from communities. Yeah, maybe more generic names would be better, so that when they do move -- when the lines do eventually get moved and it's not San Gabriel Valley, it's somewhere else, it won't throw us off as much, or throw off the public as much. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you. As long as we still -- always have a Santa Ana Ana, if that's a word.
I'll throw myself in line here. You know, with the parcel splits post-maps, so at this point, the plan is to include a recommendation in lessons -- a prominent recommendation in Lessons Learned that 2030 include in its line drawing, contract some provision for post-maps consulting counties, the fraction of counties that need help resolving parcel splits.

A couple other things that were mentioned, access to mappers. Yes, you know, actually when commissioners were able to work off-line with mappers, develop proposals; that just made things so much easier. Sometimes that was done on direction of the whole Commission. We were sent off to -- you know, Commissioner Ahmad and I were sent off to figure out San Jose one more time.

Other times, we just took initiative on our own, and my impression was that access to mappers was uneven, you know, it was in an on available basis, or it was kind of up to mappers whether or not they would say they had that time or accessibility. And that's not good, you know. I mean, all commissioners should've had equal access to mappers to develop proposals and maybe even be assigned mappers, you know. Of course, that was eight more mappers, and here, we had the biggest mapping team of any redistricting effort in the nation, so you know, to add even more mappers, I don't know. But that made a big
And some of us developed QGIS skills. I remember especially Commissioner Fornaciari burning the midnight oil to figure out how to move 17,000 folks from north to south, you know, which, you know, that untied the Gordian knot, right? And -- but just the fact that he had picked up those skills and put in the effort to do that.

Others didn't; you know, I never learned QGIS fluently, so not sure that's an issue, not sure if everyone had to have those skills, but access to some mapping skills, whether you learn on your own or whether it's from mappers that, you know -- that seemed key.

The workload on the mappers, you know, at times became extreme, and we just depended on their good will and their dedication, you know, to go above and beyond the call of duty. And you know, you can't always count on that, right? I mean, we benefitted from it, we were so grateful for it, but you can't depend on that always, so I'm not sure what can be done about that, how to make that a more manageable workload.

And then on the mapping playbook -- of course there were two documents, the mapping playbook, which kind of was our -- we hashed out all those different policies about how we would handle mapping decisions and documented it. Then there was the ready reference that
had all the populations and stuff.

The mapping playbook itself, I mean, we put a lot of time into making those decisions on our criteria, exactly how we would apply them, all of that. And in the end, I'm not sure we've really followed it that closely, you know. And in particular, I remember several times when we would make decisions based on other criteria and we had not agreed on. For instance, often looking at lower income communities of interest and giving them special consideration, feeling that they needed political representation at a level that higher income, more resource communities might not need. You know, that was not a documented criteria, and yet, we did apply it numerous times, I think.

So I mean, you know, you have to put something on paper, but actually applying it in real time while getting, you know, comment -- real-time public comments and you know, trying to apply those is quite the dance. And you know, I'm happy how things turned out in the end, but you know, that wasn't a completely consistent process.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes, thank you. Ooh, the mapping, okay.

So an easy one. The -- as the draft maps were -- as
we were working on them and we would see visualizations, 
sometimes maps had specific names that was included of 
cities that were included, and sometimes it was just an 
area. And so for consistency, I think that all of the 
visualizations, the drafts, whatever it is, I think this 
is not -- I'm not speaking about the naming convention, 
I'm talking about the actual shape, what was included 
within it. Sometimes it was not clearly defined 
specifically as it related to the Central Valley. And so 
anyone that was looking at that visualization from the 
public did not necessarily know what was included in 
those bordered lines, and so I wanted to name that that's 
important that there's consistency there, that there is 
always the same level of detail in each map that's shown.

For those mapping for the playbook, I thought, 
Commissioner Yee, perhaps maybe -- I kept thinking, maybe 
if we had a designated couple of spaces, we could -- it 
almost had, like, a war room approach, with stuff on the 
wall that can be pointed to and referred back to.

Commissioner Kennedy, you talked about something 
that you ordered and you had it up on the wall. I'm a 
visual person like that, too. I like whiteboard. I like 
things as reminders that as I'm trying to formulate my 
thought, I can look up and see what I said I was going to 
do. And so again, much like those banners running for
the public, I think rules, playbook rules, any of that on
the walls where we can keep referring back to it. Other
than that, it's easy in the heat of the moment to get
captured up into what you want right now, as opposed to
being disciplined about what we said we would do.

And with that, if there's a shift or a change, or
something we want to add to it, we can always throw that
into the rules, but in the meantime, we can just make
sure that we're following them.

On the naming conventions, I totally believe that it
should be Senate 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, or you know,
Assembly or letters, or whatever it is going to be,
regardless about the confusion later. There was
confusion in the game, as far as trying to move cities
out and was still calling something by the prior city.
So I think naming conventions should be -- we should
change how we do that.

I thought our mappers were wonderful, all of them.
I thought they were very valuable to the process, patient
with us, and or conflicting, sometime, direction that we
were giving, and their willingness to draw and redraw, as
far as the direction that was being given.

I was trying to think through, and I don't have this
fully formulated, but I recall that oftentimes, we would
give a lot of direction, one particular -- one
Commissioner give a lot of information, and not necessarily know where the person was going. And then later on, we'd come back and we'd change what that person worked really hard to do.

And so it feels like we have to figure out, is it just naming up front? Ultimately, what I'd like to do is to shift, you know, these people around here, and I want to take something out, and this is how I want to step through it and then give direction for the process. I think we tried that a couple of times as well. But for me, I still kind of walk away from the situation thinking sometimes there was an awful lot of thought and intent put into a map that then got switched, and depending on timing, maybe it got a chance to be corrected again, or fixed back, or I don't know, it felt like that moved around maybe at a level we were comfortable with, maybe not.

Also, the pairing of commissioners to work -- working with line drawers off-line. I thought that was excellent. I thought it helped move the process along, and also I think it important in doing that, that there are commissioners with perhaps maybe divergent thoughts of what should happen so that as you were -- I think we're a good team. We are, coming from all the backgrounds that we did, we wanted to hear each other; we
wanted to understand what it was you were trying to do. And even if it wasn't -- I don't know if I want to do that, but you want to do it and you're recalling something that you received from California. And so I thought that we did a stellar job at trying to hear, and honor, and respect each other in what we were trying to do.

But even with that, sometimes I think it was pretty clear that, you know, different ones of us wanted something different. And for me, it never made me want to attack the person that wanted me to understand them. And I think when you can have people with different thought processes having to work together off-line with line drawers, it gives you an opportunity to see, if I get this exactly the way I think it should be, and if it's contrary to what you think it should be, what is that going to cost you, and where can we, between the two of us, find a win-win in it for the constituents that we're trying to support and represent. So by the time we bring it back, even if we have to say we have a version 1 and a version 2, you know, at least we've worked through all of that and we don't have to have the frustration in the moment of line drawing, like I'm not being heard, or they didn't understand what I was trying to do.

I think that served us well, to be able to work
through some of that and know that some things, even if
we wanted to have it happen, based on the rules that we
have to follow, in the order that we have to follow them,
it's not that I was being denied something that I
personally wanted; it couldn't happen with our geography.
It couldn't happen with the public comment that we
received in the community of interest.

And I think it was important that off-line and
sometimes in this, too, with two commissioners working
together, you're able to see that play out in front of
you. So now you don't sit with the full Commission
feeling like, ah, I'm going to just say no to everything
he says, she said. It's like, no, we tried that, it just
doesn't work. So I think that was good. So I like the
pairing.

This says naming conventions, mapping rules; mappers
were excellent. I think that's it.

Oh, the QGIS. Yeah. Yikes. It was -- QGIS was
difficult. It was hard to follow, to -- I think I tried
it twice and I'm like, you know what, yeah, that's not --
it just didn't work for me.

There -- we talked about that when we were talk --
in the area of training, if we're going to use a QGIS or
anything similar, we have to not just receive the
training, we need the time to practice that and try it


on, and to ensure that we have comfort with it, because it was taking way too long and not yielding the results that we wanted it to.

So I think for some of us, it just got discarded in the end and we went to what was easier, as far as relying on some of our fellow commissioners, which, god bless you all that did learn how to do it. Thank you for that.

That's it, thanks.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I would agree with everything Commissioner Turner said, and just in terms of nomenclature and -- I think it would've been helpful for us to learn a lot of the GIS terminology and to -- so that we could all be speaking the same language; things like rotating populations, we all learned what that was, mostly by just doing it. But other terminology like that, and you learn it by doing, so yes, practicing and getting additional training and -- would've helped all of us a little bit more if we had gotten it earlier.

Just thinking about a process, I mean, I think we did make a good team. We are a good team, and certainly we used the collaborative, the general consensus approach, and most of what we had done traditionally has been through consensus to some sense -- in some regards.
But general consensus didn't seem to work for this group at that particular point in time, given the task, and given the amount of time, and given the circumstances we were in and the dynamics.

I think where it worked best is where we kind of took a step back and said these are -- what are our goals, overarching goals, and then -- which allowed us to ask certain groups to move forward with map drawing, and to create -- to help us through some of these troubled -- with some of the more difficult areas of the state.

I do think that the maps are so dynamic, and the way that they're being developed, and it's -- when map drawing is drawn on multiple maps and each line drawer has connected to one portion of the map and -- so which makes it difficult for us to -- it just -- it would've been, I think, a little bit -- I don't think I understood that until we were further along, and it did make it difficult because the line drawer assigned to that area was the line drawer you had to work with, right, and so -- and there's such a limited time frame, espec -- resource -- such limited resources especially when you're in the last couple of days of line drawing, that it just makes it difficult for us to -- for that resource to be made available to all of us.

Although if we had had a little bit more training,
we would've been -- all been able to do a little bit more on our own. It's just we'd be working on different -- we could potentially not be working on the latest map, which is what happened with some of the public, right; the public was reacting to old maps at some times, and that was problematic. I mean, I think we -- some of us were working on old maps sometimes, too, because it was the best map that we had and we -- and we were trying to figure out the dynamics, and how to structure situations.

I think ultimately it worked out, but it was a little bit frustrating, and it just has to do with how the software that we used and the process.

That being said, I think it was the right process for us. I think it may not be the right process for other Commissions, right. General consensus worked because we had built the trust, we had had the time, we had worked through some of these things. But initially, it was pretty frustrating and until we got a little bit, you know, further along, and kind of -- we ended up trusting each other more and more.

And then in terms of workload for the line drawers, the Chairs -- I know when I was Chair, I worked very closely with the line drawers to allocate time for the committees that were working off-line and my understanding is that that was continuing on after, so
that the line drawers had enough time. I mean, there is never enough time, but they were allocating enough time
to -- well, so that somebody was allocating time.

And I thought, you know, certainly some subcommittees had a little bit more access because of their role, line drawing and VRA certainly, but -- because of their situation, but we tried to make it as fair as possible. The whole Commission would set the goals and I think it worked out at the end -- in the end, but you know, it was -- we made it work by doing it, right. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Yeah, the consensus decision-making, I mean, in my mind, was rather extraordinary, you know, that not one line ever came down to a hard vote. I mean, that was always a possibility, if we really, really got stuck, but we never got there, and it's really quite amazing.

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

First of all, I finally remembered my second I forgot to mention from several days ago. So that I forgot to mention item is I think it would've been very useful for us to, in our series of briefings in the fall of 2020 or very early in 2021, to have had a briefing from some of the local election offices in relation to
the use to which they would eventually put the maps, and
obviously Commissioner Yee's mention of the -- of putting
post-map technical support to counties in the mapping
contract is what reminded me that yeah, I think it would
be very helpful for future Commissions to have local
election officials come in and explain, kind of step-by-
step, okay, we'll get your map and then this is what
we're going to do with it.

And you know, this relates to, you know, the point
that I made at several points in the process about the
importance of spheres of influence and those sorts of
things, so we can -- when I sort all of the input, this
will go back into the training topic.

On the visualizations, I found them useful. I don't
think I fully understood how determinative they would be.
I mean, if you look at the final maps and you look back
to the visualizations, yes, there are lots of
differences, but you know, in some cases, there are some
pretty fundamental similarities. So I think it's going
to be important for future Commissions to understand how
determinative a visualization can be in some ways.

Given that we weren't trying to meet population
targets with the visualizations, I really wonder if we
could've started the visualizations a good bit earlier.
You know, if we weren't caring what the populations were,
then we didn't really need to wait for census data, or we could've used ACS data or something to -- as a basis or as a resource when we were doing the visualizations.

I like -- I really liked Commissioner Turner's war room concept, and you know, we did have some maps up in the room, particularly in San Diego, I guess, less so in Sacramento, but in San Diego, we had some maps up. And the maps that I always thought would be helpful, and this, you know, grew out of Commissioner Fornaciari's alert to us about how many people need to be moved, I think that finding a way to project or post maps showing district by district deviations on the side would be very helpful. You know, we were focusing on smaller areas, and I think we often lost track of kind of the bigger picture, you know, as Commissioner Fornaciari said. We've got 17,000 people that we need to move from south to north, or north to south, or whatever it was. But you know, it was hard for us to keep track of all of the deviations and particularly how, you know -- we could easily have found ourselves in a huge corner with limited ways of getting out of that corner, and so I really do think that working with the mappers to find a way to have a separate computer projecting a statewide map of deviations by district for each of the map types would've been very useful to us. And finally -- and I just came
across my copy of the playbook, and maybe I missed a
later version of it, but in line drawing phases, there's
detail under preliminary direction. There's detail under
visualizations. But then -- at least, or maybe I printed
it out wrong, but I seem to be missing something. In my
mind, it never seemed like it was one hundred-percent
complete. But again, I may have missed something or
printed it out wrong. It was certainly, very, very
helpful, perhaps could've gone into some greater detail
about those later steps in the process. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.
That's correct. We never did finish that out. We just
moved on and never came back.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah. A few more things.
Let's see, Commissioner Kennedy, great idea regarding
helping the Commission understand how the maps are used.
I think that would be really helpful. And just a little
footnote for everyone; if you want to learn a lot about
LAFCO, special districts, spheres of influence, join your
local civil grand jury. You'll learn all about that
stuff.

Let's see. Oh, the letter that we've been referring
to from the groups is in the handouts for the public if
they don't know what we're speaking to, it's called
Common Cause Lessons Learned: Reflections and Recommendations. So that's the letter that we've been referring to.

Ready reference, great, outstanding, super, super, super helpful, especially when trying to trade off -- sort of in your mind trying to think, we need to move these three districts around and I've got to trade this many people. How do I do it? I think critical -- and just reiterate a few things -- critical learning is how to map. I think learning the tools is important, too, but probably not everyone will use the tools, but how to map and the tradeoffs, rotating people and all that.

Let's see. The map viewer was invaluable. That came around later and it was invaluable. And how it evolved was super helpful. And the flexibility in getting that up and running. And then we could -- you could hover over the district and see the deviation and see the information there. Super helpful. So capturing what that ended up looking like for the next Commission.

I love Commissioner Turner's open to hearing and honoring your colleagues -- super important that we all -- that the next Commission all be open to understanding what their colleagues have in mind. And I think that's what helped us be so effective.

Oh. And one more thing. When QGIS started out --
when we started out and we had the draft maps, I had QGIS upload the draft maps -- or I had the statewide database upload the draft maps into QGIS so they could be used. But as it went further and further down the road, the current maps were not available in QGIS. And the current maps need to be made available in the mapping tool if it's going to be effective.

And then I just reiterate, thank the mappers for all their hard work. It was crazy work for them.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. I especially remember that all-nighter that Jaime pulled one time to get us that L.A. Senate miracle map, right, that solved so many problems beyond what we thought was possible and got us past the point where we had gotten really stuck.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari, for saying what you said about the QGIS and updated maps because that was my first thing that I wrote down as one of the things I wanted to mention. It was a little frustrating realizing that it was not being updated as quickly as I thought it was and then thinking that I'm working off the QGIS and current maps and then realizing it's not. And then it was just -- it made frustration even more frustrating. So I think that that's really important. I think whatever the
line drawers are using -- if we're going to try to use QGIS or whatever mapping software we are to try to -- to try to work through the possibilities just to understand the options using QGIS, it has to -- it has to align with what is being used; otherwise, it's just a big old waste of time. Yeah.

And that was important, because it gets to my next point which is about -- I think it might've been -- I don't know if it was Commissioner Turner that said this or if it was someone else, but something about, like, not being sure where someone is going with their directions for the line drawing. And I think as one of those people that's -- I just oftentimes just have to talk out loud to just kind of get to the point of where I need to go, and so sometimes I found myself doing that and then being told, where are you going with this? And then having to be forced to try to think about, okay, what do I want to try to do, but sometimes maybe not being fully clear.

And then I know it's frustrating for others. It's frustrating for me, too, because I was trying to explain it, but once I was able to -- thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari -- figure out how to use QGIS, I was able to work through those things so that then I could -- before even coming forward with an idea, I knew whether or not it was even remotely in the realm of possible. And I
think that just saved me a lot of frustration, probably
saved all of you a lot of frustration, because some
things were clearly not going to be possible.

And then, I think this is where it gets challenging,
and I think this is maybe part of the tension is -- being
told no all the time but not being told why. And I think
that that is not helpful because then it feels like,
well, am I just being shut down because you just don't
want to do the work, or why is it not possible. And I
think if we're to be independent and we're to be -- to
try to explore all possibilities -- for the purposes of
the public -- other people in the public sphere may also
have similar ideas and questions.

And I think we have to be able to explain, okay, if
something is a no, either we have to explain why -- and
even with the explanations it might be hard -- but I
think if we can bring it up and say, here's what I tried
and here's why it didn't work. I think it will give more
confidence in why we made some of the choices that we
made. And so I think that that would be important.

Another one that I want to also just say, I think,
too, what Commissioner Yee said about the uneven usage
of -- or access to the line drawers. I mean, again,
another tension in the sense of we had a fairly large
team, but even then it was a little unclear whether or
not initially we could even do that. And then later on
it became clear, okay, let's just start assigning out. I
think if we know that ahead of time, then we can try to
figure out, okay, how do we work through our ideas
directly with the line drawers to save that time?

And I think what some of it resulted in is during
the live line drawing, as we're trying to work through
things -- and then we fell into a time crunch and we were
in that November time frame where, okay, we got to get
this done. It was late at night and then we can't do
anything for two weeks. And I feel like there were a
couple maps where it was just, like -- it was half done.
And it just created a lot of angst with the public in
that -- how can you do this? Why did you do this? But
it was because we ran out of time. It wasn't because it
was intentional that this is where we wanted to end up,
but we ran out of time, and we were just kind of stuck
with it until we could come back and make the fix.

So I think, again, being able to have been able to
have maybe worked with the line drawers and knowing that
we could've done that would've been a little bit more
helpful in terms of not leaving it in some of those kind
of places.

The other thing, too, around working with the line
drawers is that as changes get made -- and this got
brought up, too -- we should remember and try to review why we made some of those changes, how some of the new changes may impact previously intended changes, and then as we go forward in terms of, okay, what are the things we want to try? Again, trying to balance the previous changes and the rationale to what the potential new changes people might want to make.

I also just want to say, having counsel -- and I saw this in the Lessons Learned that was sent over by the different community groups -- I think having counsel available for all the time that we're together during the meetings is important. There were times when we had to rush because counsel had to leave, and so I think that that was difficult, I think, to sometimes -- then we have to wait until counsel's available again or try to get in touch with counsel. As a night owl, I'll say that I didn't mind the late nights, but I do understand that it may not be for everybody, just like early mornings are not super great for some of us who are night owls. So I thought I'd just kind of put that shoutout there for the night owls.

I also absolutely love and agree with what Commissioner Turner said about being able to utilize the separate time with the line drawers with two commissioners that may have two different kinds of points
of views to just explore together the thinking and being open to those different points of views. I think that helped us in our process in one in trusting each other but also, two, not getting to the point where it became so absolute of one against the other. I think we were all able to establish that kind of understanding and rationale. And I think we -- again, I think we all came into this with positive intent and really keeping that front of mind so that as we listened to different points of view we were able to think about, okay, I see what you're saying, and then to come to places where we were able to achieve consensus and end up with a unanimous vote on our maps. So thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa. Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, thank you, everybody. This is a really good discussion. And as you can imagine, I probably have a lot to say about mapping. And I'm going to try to keep it -- I want to be absolutely positive and kind of point out things that need to get changed. So I don't mean for this to be negative at all, and if it comes across that way, I'm really going to try not to let that happen. I'm also going to try and be efficient with the time here.

The number 1 is training. We -- all commissioners
need to be trained on software that the mappers are
actually going to use or if not that, a very similar
which are compatible. And I don't mean just training
like we had. I actually mean a full on blown, fake --
we'll do a redistricting -- so we learn how to give
direction, we learn what's involved in it. We learn
how -- the terminology we can use. Because I think
Commissioner Turner said it a long time ago -- it's one
thing to be lectured at, it's a whole other to try and do
it. And I am also a person who, once you do things, you
go, ah, now, I understand. And I think that would've
helped us in so many of the items that we've been
discussing all the way down. So a full working session
whether -- totally fake -- and whether how long -- that
could take ten days or something. It needs to be a full
on real thing, not just a short amount of time. And it
could be any time. It doesn't have to be, we have data
in. Because, make it safe data.

I still want to do the live sessions. There was an
indication about, well, just do that and then present
things because it was more efficient. Doing that live
gives a process. People say, oh, so that's what's going
on. Oh. Oh, I had no idea. And it really removes that
behind closed doors, which we really want to be open and
transparent about.
Then several different -- well, okay, then the VRA districts. Absolutely, we needed more information on that and they shifted. And part of that is, get the VRA attorney and the RPV analysis on early. And have that done ahead of the census data. Because there will be modifications as modified districts, which require reanalysis -- in that contract. We need to be specific about how we're planning on using it to make sure the RPV data -- the analysis, is done in a manner that they can quickly go precinct by precinct to gather it to read. Because as we redraw a district, the precincts that are in it change, and so the numbers change.

Then, the map viewer. Absolutely crucial. It needs to be updated with the current maps all the time. The PDFs were not useful. The JPG was really useful. And the JPG was the one that you blow up and you can see everything. That again, in the contract, as we modify it with the new technology, '28/'29 -- we really need to work on this contract in terms of the draft contract that we would give to the 2030 with explanations of what these sections mean, what the importance is of them.

I think what also would've helped us is a splits report. And a splits report is how many numbers of counties that got split, number of cities that got split. Because we considered things and later we kind of went
back, you know -- Sacramento County was cut up five
times. Alameda County was cut up seven. Well, then they
reduced to four. But oh, some of the counties weren't
cut up at all. Things like that in terms of our
reevaluating items would be very important, and we can do
that along the way.

That's end of the year, A drafts. Two draft maps.
We were planning on doing two draft maps, but because our
deadline got shortened as opposed to just -- if we'd had
a few more days to that January 3rd, we could've
rearranged and done two draft maps. And I really think
that -- I would strongly recommend for the 2030 to do two
draft maps.

Did that one. Training. Closed doors. Oh, in the
report writing, Commissioner Sinay brought up about the
district -- descriptions of the districts. In the final
report that goes in -- and we need to put in the contract
for the mappers to help out with that and/or we need to
have -- if we want to do that along the way, we need to
indicate that and hire staffing to do that. To be
following it to that detail so we can have those
descriptions as we go.

The playbook. Oh, the reference document. Wow.

Thank you, Commissioner Yee. That was phenomenal. That
needs to be available -- if we have to put it up and
update it, absolutely do that. The playbook. It was
really, really good. I really like the idea of
Commissioner Turner -- the war room and the white board.
I think that's very helpful. But I don't want it to be
too prescriptive because -- remember there were areas
where we were actually specifically told by
communities -- I'll never forget when one of the cities
said -- we were thinking of keeping cities together --
one of the cities -- they all came in and said, don't
put -- divide us. We've always been separate districts
and keep us that way. And the whole city said that. And
I was very taken aback by that, because it didn't occur
to me that some cities really -- no, there's a big divide
in our city and we want to keep it that way. So that was
just an example of -- we need to make sure that we
stay -- put all the data in there, but don't it has to be
step 1, step 2, step 3 -- make that a little flexible.

Oh, as far -- well, that's a different description
of districts. Then also, you already said support for
counties. I didn't know that we needed to do that, and
that should definitely be in the contract. Oh, the
naming of the districts. That was funny because I was
actually pushing to just go with letters just because
that way I think that would've been easier. But what we
do not want to use is the numbers. Anything close to
what really exists -- too confusing.

Oh. The other thing is -- and the reason why I really want to put us all being trained in how to use the software and come up with different ideas -- it's not for the commissioners to draw full maps so there are competing maps. It is to clarify things. But I really loved -- and Commissioner Turner put it -- that we got people to work on from opposing ideas so you can figure out well, what are you really going for and come together. There were some areas all over the state where I know there are commissioners who had really different ideas but because they were in the same party, they weren't officially allowed to work together. And that was a little detrimental. I know in one area I'm thinking of -- no, we worked through all this, but these are areas where I think all of those issues would be resolved if we had the proper training up ahead.

Watch out for the hard decisions. Oh, we have to make hard decisions. I cannot tell how many times other people said, you got to worry about those hard decisions. I've always seen that -- and this is where -- as you're not being creative enough. You can come up with a solution which is how we did that in our consensus building. And so that is -- watch out. I always felt when people were saying that is they were trying to pit
us against each other. And we said, no, we're more
creative than that. We're going to come up with a
solution that is going to work, and we did. Fourteen
unanimous.

Oh, the visualizations. Whoever said that was
absolutely right. That first visualization has a huge
impact on what the maps ultimately look like. Now, I
know that these were based on COIs, and following all the
criteria. In terms of could we do those ahead of time
without data, there was a discussion at the subcommittee
level, and the reason why we did not do that is because
if you don't start it with plus or minus -- whatever the
percentage is -- it's really hard to get it that way.

Now, that also leads into the full maps with the
percentages. The large maps, we know how to shift
things. That was a really good point, because our line
drawers had that in mind the entire time. But that does
not mean the next line drawer would also have the same.
California is a -- it's the biggest state. It has the
most districts. And it is extremely complex. And most
other states are not. And so we have to make sure that
for the next Commission, if they don't have a team of
line drawers -- a couple of different groups working
together, that all of these ideas get across. Because we
were lucky in that we had the line drawing team from the
first time around, and team up with another team for the
second time around because of the difference that each of
them brought to the table. And the variety of ideas that
was brought to the table. And it could be -- as we went
along, I realized that that really helped us -- not in
every aspect, but we could've been seriously caught up
in, like, oh, we've lost people in the corner and we
don't know how to do anything about it. The line drawers
could go say, well, what do you want us to do? And throw
their hands up in the air because that wasn't something
that they had ever done before, because no other states
have the huge issue of oh, my God, we're way down here.
You're eight districts, things like that -- much, much
smaller.

Pictures. Hard decisions. I might stop on that. I
definitely want to say, though, to everybody involved in
this -- the amount of work the line drawers put in, the
amount of work that we all put into this -- it was really
phenomenal. And really the whole point of what we're
doing here is to improve it, make it easier for everyone
involved based on what we have learned, which is, I
think, is also another just great idea that we're
planning on doing. And yeah. I will stop there, but I
believe that the '28/'29 years -- we come back to these
issues specifically with the mapping and the data
management for updates and technology. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

And just a time check. We have a full half hour before
our lunch break still, so plenty of time.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thanks. I think the first
thing I want to say is -- I know we've done this a
million times, but wow. Congratulations, guys. We
really did it. As you're all talking, I'm sure different
feelings are coming through -- you're all being triggered
in different ways, and I just wanted to remind you --
remind us, remind me -- we did it and this was the team
that did. So thank you so much to everybody who was a
part of it.

I guess -- I read Twitter after the fact, and I
guess I was the grumpy one the Commission, according to
Twitter. So anyway, thank you for letting me be grumpy.
And I didn't feel grumpy, but obviously all the Twitter
world didn't know what I was going through during that
with my dad, and so I want to thank you all again for
your support during that time. I mean, it was -- that
first week -- that first and second week of December were
really -- I keep forgetting how awful it was just because
my dad keeps fighting. He's still alive, and I told
Russell that -- I'm sorry, I told Commissioner Yee the
other day he got annoyed with me and hung up on me. So he's okay.

So I really liked our week in San Diego, and not because it was in such a beautiful place -- that you all didn't get to see -- but I just liked the room, the atmosphere, the food, the camaraderie, that we were all in the same room. I had just envisioned that that's what the last couple of weeks would be like and it just felt -- it wasn't like that, so it felt a little off. I liked San Diego because we were in the room with the map drawers so we could tell when a colleague -- when two colleagues were working with the map drawers and such.

At first, when people started working with map drawers and we hadn't all been told we could do that, it felt a little like it was coming out of left field. And I was like, wait, why do some get this and others don't? This isn't necessarily fair to everybody, and it was just kind of -- it was a little bit tense. Not tense, but it was just -- it felt off, right? It didn't feel like we were -- because we didn't say it in public we could do it, and then all of a sudden people had done it, it felt like we weren't doing everything in public like we said we would be doing it. So it didn't feel transparent to me. I think that's -- and so that's why I'm still kind of torn on this -- should we work with line drawers when
we're not all together or not? It's that question of transparency.

Having said that, I did start doing that at the end and I would say, okay, this is what, ideally, would happen, according to what everybody wants. And then the line drawers would come back and say, okay, we tried all of your six wishes and only this one works and we would talk about it. I agree with Commissioner Akutagawa; it was hard when we weren't told why. And I have to say, most of the time when we were told that things couldn't -- we couldn't do something, it was by legal counsel. So I want to thank those in the public who were watching us at the time and would send us -- send notes -- especially there was one that said, Commissioner Sinay, you can create a VRA district in San Diego -- not under Senate, but others. And I was like, okay, I can? And it was just -- I don't know who sent it. I don't know anything else, but that gave me that extra confidence.

I liked the visualizations because it started giving us confidence. We had no clue what we were doing, but I think if we did a whole assimilation, we would get that confidence as well. Some were more confident than others.

And on the database, we all purposely chose one
source -- one place to get our information that was accessible to the whole public. And we were very clear on this is how you send information in to the Commission. We didn't follow that all the way through, and that was -- and I brought it up several times, and I'm going to -- so on Lessons Learned, there needs to be a fair, equitable way to -- that the public has to give us information. And it shouldn't be emails, it shouldn't be Twitters. It should be -- it should be straight.

And it's really important that data comes to us as quickly as possible because I know that's the frustration sometimes. And I have a -- I do believe in the one individual who submits something versus the organization. I think they should be weighed the same. There were times when the nonprofits -- that some groups sent us comments that weren't accurate. And now, some of the things are still coming up. As much as some of the groups said, hey, be careful, political -- I forgot what they called it in the letter -- it was happening on the other side. The organizations didn't take the politics out of it as well.

And so we have to be open and assess every piece of information coming in and not just react because one group sent it or another group sent it or one person sent it or another. I know we felt really pressured with
time, so we didn't take that time to reflect a lot of
times that we should've.

And to that, I did talk to Andrew from Haystaq and
just asked him some of his input, because I didn't know
who was being contacted before and all that. But since
we had worked closely with him in southern California, I
thought it would be good. And he strongly encouraged us
not to have necessarily a second draft map but to add a
week between the first draft map and the final draft map.

We were a little rushed and at the end of that last
week -- and there were things that we wanted to change
and fix that we couldn't fix. And maybe that's the same
idea as a draft map where we let it sit for a little bit
and we can come back and say, hey, let's look at this
place or that place.

The changes of chairs was really difficult for the
map drawers just getting the new beat -- the new mode.
And I think we did talk about that a little bit. We need
to think through or -- think through, like we're going to
do it again -- we need to think through for next time,
no -- but it is -- if you're having rotating chairs, we
need to do honest assessments about our skill sets --
what we bring to the table and what we don't bring to the
table. And have conversations about which are the best
chairs for certain parts of the work.
I wish we had done more facilitation versus just raise your hand just go bleh. I know, we didn't do that -- but if we would've said, hey, these are our areas that we're having a little bit of -- we need to think through. An example is when we talked about City Heights -- or I talked about City Heights -- and said, looking in San Diego, looking at City Heights, we've received different types of COI input, and we need to think through what we want to do with that. I didn't feel that we were getting that throughout the county, and that would've been helpful just to kind of understand where were the conflicting -- even though I had been reading them and following them, I didn't know them as well as some others, and so just being able to have some of those conversations. And that facilitation would've slowed us down and been able to say, okay, what is it that we're trying to do that other people were talking about?

The other thing that I thought was interesting that Andrew brought up that I hadn't thought about -- that there are different ways to set up staffing for mapping. One is the way we did by regions, and that staff is looking at all the different plans. And the plans were the Board of Equalization, State Senate and all that. The other is that a person is in charge of the whole
state on plans. And so I think that that's important to share as just with 2030 that there are different ways of doing it so that they can think about it and it's not just the line drawers coming to them with their ideas, but they can think about it in both ways.

    Either way, I think the mappers did need more staff. They needed more folks in the background to be capturing some of this information. And that would mean a bigger budget as well. But that there really is that piece of just capturing what we're saying and what we're doing I think really should come from the mappers and not our staff, because the mapper -- they're all more connected -- to ask our outreach staff all of a sudden to do that piece was a little tough for them because it was kind of new. And even though they knew those areas and stuff, I thought it was still tough for them, and I thank them for jumping in.

    Yeah. So those were -- those were some of the comments -- I'm sorry, I mixed up Andrew's comments with my thinking, but I did try to be very clear when it was his.

    COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. Thank you. Excuse me.

Commissioner Fernandez?

    COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. I'll try to be brief with this. But I think we all came away with the
key to successful mapping -- brownies and peanut butter. I'm pretty sure that was the key to it all. But seriously, I did want to do a quick thank you to Karin, Andrew, and all of the mappers. I was going to name them all, but I'm probably going to forget someone, so I'm not going to do that. I did like that they kept track of who was working, which group of -- one or two commissioners were working with what specific mapper, and so we would adjust in terms of what areas we were working on. So I really appreciate them keeping track of that, because as the chair, you had so many moving parts. So thank you for that.

The ripple effect. I don't think I really understood the ripple effect until we actually got in there, so just a reminder of the ripple effect and that you're representing forty million Californians. And you might think that moving seventeen thousand is something simple, but it's not. We can just ask Commissioner Fornaciari or the rest of us in terms of how easy that is.

And QGIS -- it is hard. We used, like, probably not even one percent of the features that you can -- you can get a certification in this QGIS. So yes, it would definitely be nice to have more training on that.

And in terms of -- I wasn't sure if maybe
Commissioner Andersen misunderstood me, but when I said that I did like the one or two -- or I don't know if it was Commissioner Andersen or Commissioner Sinay -- I can't remember now -- I still believe we need to do live line drawing. I do also believe it was helpful to have one or two commissioners work with the mappers, because that would've taken so much more time. And honestly, we were working every single day. So I'm not sure when we -- so it would've been well into midnight and early in the morning.

And then just my final thing is, once we start -- or once the 2030 starts the mapping process subcommittee work, you really need to minimize or eliminate that, because the commissioners just need to focus on the mapping. And Commissioner Kennedy and I were working on the final report, so right after we had approved the draft maps, the two-week period that we kind of had a break -- we didn't have a break. We were working on the draft report, where we should've spent most of our time thinking about from draft report to making changes and looking at some of the input that was coming in. So just really need to take all responsibilities away from the commissioners once you start drawing the lines.

So I think that was -- and then the final report; that was much more labor-intensive than I thought it was
going to be. Again, it was during the crucial time when we really needed to focus on drawing lines. So we need to -- either, as I think Commissioner Andersen said -- hire staff to do that or make it more explicit. And I don't know if it's a line drawing function, because they need to be focused on what they're supposed to be doing, as well. Unless they hire other staff that that's what their sole focus is, which is fine. But we really need to solidify that so that it's not the commissioners' responsibility. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you. Commissioner Vazquez?

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thank you. I generally agree with what has been stated around our Lessons Learned around mapping. One thing I did want to reemphasize that has been on my mind is the need to visualize other data -- large statewide datasets, particularly ACS data. I believe we did ourselves a disservice when discussing non-VRA areas and really only being able to reference community of interest data. I mean, like, what else could we reference besides the input that we were getting? Which I then think -- I think narrows us into having to have discussions based on, well, here's what the community groups have submitted jointly. They've done organizing and have gotten, ostensibly, a critical mass of input, and they've
filtered and curated it and given it to us versus this one maybe potentially one or two dissenting or additional voices.

If we had had ACS data, which is a much broader, comprehensive dataset and much more frequently -- it's a more comprehensive dataset, particularly around income. We, in my opinion, could've had much more comprehensive discussions on particular non-VRA areas. We were challenged -- and I think what this resulted is in -- at least for me, so I'll speak from my experience -- for example, out in the Inland Empire -- I'm from the IE. I'm very familiar with those cities, those regions, those neighborhoods. It made it appear as if I was pulling things out of thin air when I would say, oh, well, actually this community doesn't really go with that community.

If I had had ACS data -- again, particularly around, honestly, just, like, median income for a city or a neighborhood or what have you -- my arguments, I think, would've appeared to the public much more grounded in data and reality and not like, Angela was drawing her personal version of what the IE should look like, which was not at all my intent or my objective. But without solid data, especially again, in non-VRA areas, I could only reference COI data, which again, is necessarily
qualitative.

We did our best to make it quantitative by asking people to give us maps, but I think it's essential. I think we were done a disservice by not having ACS data visualized. We were often bringing up -- asking folks to -- or asking the mappers to bring up the heat map on different race and ethnicities from census data. That got really -- again, that got really problematic in non-VRA areas, and we were cautioned by counsel about how much we could even discuss what we were seeing when folks brought up the heat map again.

So it just -- we need an additional dataset so that we can have more concrete discussions about what a region actually looks like and which communities are in where. Because it also -- if we didn't hear from a neighborhood through COI input, the only data we had to reference was census data. And that to me, again, it's just not -- that's not fair to those communities, either. If we didn't reach them, and we didn't get COI input, we were flying blind in many of those regions and that's really just not fair. And again, especially with the problems that we have heard about undercounting in the census, we just need to be able to titrate a lot of this data with additional sources. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you. And just to add to
that, Commissioner Sinay has mentioned several times the need for making more of an effort to incorporate other non-U.S. Census Bureau data as well, reports, and locally generated studies that can help inform our understanding of different communities. Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I want to absolutely just emphasize what Commissioner Vazquez just said. I also felt similarly to her in some of the perspectives that I had in which perhaps, the community of interest testimony may not have been as quick to come in or, perhaps, was absent. And I think part of it was informed by just personal knowledge and experience having grown up in certain areas or living in certain areas. And I think that was maybe the same for some of the others.

I also would say that given that there's only fourteen of us -- and I say, only fourteen in the sense that getting any larger would've been rather interesting in trying to manage a really large group. But trying to cover the entire state -- there were other parts of the state where we've heard feedback that there was, I think, perspectives or perceptions that we were not truly as well versed in some areas. And I think additional information would've been helpful other than just the COI input and the census information. I think there are other things we each may know, but I will say that at
times it felt like we were being challenged if we were stating something other than what was relied upon from either census data or COI data. And so I would absolutely agree with, again, what Commissioner Vazquez said, and would just encourage that we do look at other sources as well, too.

I also wanted to just weigh in on the visualization question. Personally, for me it was -- it was a really weird transition going from three visualizations then to the live line drawing. Because in the visualizations, I don't know -- it was maybe meant to be practice, but since we didn't really look at the numbers in terms of the population numbers, I felt it was kind of weird because we went from, yeah, let's just group these areas together based on what we think we're reading in the COI testimony to now when it came to live line drawing, oh, no, we cannot include that because the numbers are off -- the deviations are off. I think what would've been more helpful is one, be more strict around the deviations even on the visualizations.

I also felt like three rounds was a little much. I think we should've just gone straight into the line drawing -- the live line drawing. And I do agree, I think live line drawing is important. I think some of the direct work with the line drawers was helpful after
everybody kind of got the hang of what was supposed to --
what was okay, but I think the visualizations were -- it
took so long. They went, they came back, and sometimes
they came back with stuff like, that wasn't what I said,
or that wasn't what someone else said. It was something
totally different, and I feel like we were losing time
with each of those visualization iterations. Maybe the
first one would be okay, but then after that I think it
would've been better to just go to live line drawing.

The last thing I want to also say is, Commissioner
Sinay mentioned that we should just use one source. I
would say that any emails that, I think, any of us
received were forwarded to the Voters First account, and
so it was visible to everybody. I can't say that -- I
mean, just because it was on Twitter didn't necessarily
mean that it was something that we had to take into
account unless it was something that was forwarded to the
two-hour public input database. And not everybody was on
Twitter. Not everybody was on social media.

So honestly, I think for me it wasn't something that
I put a lot of weight into, because I felt like we made
an agreement that -- and for transparency's sake, using
the central database that we had was going to be our main
source of understanding community input. And that
anybody who was posting on social media should also be
sending an email to us so that it could be posted for all
the public to see. And maybe that's an instruction that
we can give for the future is to say, you're more than
welcome to post on social media but also don't forget to
send us an email with your same comment so that it can be
captured and shared with the public at large as well,
too, so. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner
Akutagawa. We are down to our last few minutes. If we
are to get public comment in before lunch, we'll need to
wrap this up soon. But if we need to keep talking, then
we'll just need to go until lunch and come back after
lunch, so. Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Great. Thank you,
Commissioner Yee. Oh, just quick about the live line
drawing. That was reference to a public comment that
came in. I totally understood what the commissioners
were saying about the visualization and live is both a
good thing.

I want to talk about the time frame. We had three
days between -- we declared final and it's certified.
Not nearly enough time because the line drawers needed
time, the report needed time. And yes, it is helpful to
the line drawers during that time should be putting all
the maps together but also verifying that the district
descriptions are accurate. And so the three days we had in there that's technically -- we sort of went as close to possible as we could've, and that was not correct. We should really extend that.

And I agree with what Commissioner Sinay was saying about what Andrew had said, in terms of a little more space to get the comments in would -- was also needed. So I would revise in our new Gantt chart process, I have very definite ideas we have to give to Commissioner Kennedy and Commissioner Yee about how we should revise that.

I also agree with the other resources of, like, with our neighborhood maps. We were drawing before we knew that, oh, L.A. had neighborhood maps, and I knew about San Francisco. And that is, though, for purposes -- those do clarify our COIs. And we would reference the heat maps -- it was because many areas said -- I'm thinking of in L.A. -- well, this area -- we all shop at the same markets, they're all -- it's this large Spanish-speaking area here -- and we pulled up the heat maps, it was to clarify our COIs.

And so we need to clarify our numbers and clarify our COIs, which is part of our six criteria. We do need these additional sources. We needed the tribal lands map, and that wasn't technically included in the census
data. But these maps are out there, and we should be using them -- the 2030 should be using them.

Neighborhood maps. The ACS data is from the Census Bureau, so we have school districts, water districts.

I believe we -- the Commission should be using those because they really are trying to clarify what are communities of interest? Because those are -- that's the criteria at our numbers -- and back to the number idea -- our visualizations were based on percentages of numbers, and then we refined them from there.

But Commissioner Akutagawa is absolutely right. They, like, got completely revised, but it wasn't exactly what people had said. And doing one or two of those, I would say, would be absolutely the max that we ever really needed before. But I would do a visualization before we just jumped into live line drawing, because you need a basis to start, so.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thanks, Jane.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And everything else was great. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Thanks, Jane.

Appreciate it. I'm going to go to Katy for public comment, 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. It is (877) 853-5247. When prompted to enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed, it is 85298300771, for this meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press the pound key. Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a queue.

To indicate you wish to comment, please press star nine. This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it is your turn to speak, you will hear a message that says, the host would like you to talk, and to press star six to speak. If you would like to give your name, please state and spell it for the record. You are not required to provide your name to give public comment. Please make sure to 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.

And we do not have anyone in the queue at this time, Chair.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thanks, Katy. Appreciate it. So while we're waiting to see if we get some callers, just want to thank Commissioners Yee and Kennedy
for putting this together. Thank all of you for all your hard work and input. I want to -- yeah, there's definitely an opportunity next week for all the "I forgot".

I want to tell Commissioner Vazquez that I'm a big fan of titration myself, so we should do some titrating. And kind of my reaction to this -- there were a lot of comments we should use other data, but I never felt it was as explicit as we talked about it today. And so maybe we would should think about, in general -- maybe we should think about what other data would be valuable and maybe kind of line that out for the next Commission so that they can jump into it. I see Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: Thank you. I appreciate that, Commissioner. Some day. Maybe. I'll think about it. I did want to mention and make the recommendation that for the line drawers that it be included in the contract that they do provide printed maps of the -- either the visualization or the draft maps for the Commission to be -- available to the commissioners to view, especially if we're in live meetings. I think those became extremely valuable in just seeing the specific areas that a particular commissioner was focused on, but then interpreting the entirety of the impacts for
any changes that might result as of discussions.

So having those maps and making sure that they are part of the contract would be ideal. This go around -- Andrew, I believe, just went ahead and just had them for the L.A. when we met in L.A., and then also did that for San Diego. But it wasn't part of the original contract. I think it should be. I think it's a necessary tool for the Commission to be able to see the entirety -- and printed in that size in which he printed it was much better than trying to look at it in a PDF or printing it out yourself on a 8-1/2 x 11 piece of paper. It's just not helpful in that manner, but having it in the large visual, I think, is really helpful. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Are you thinking of the wall maps, Director Hernandez?

COMMISSIONER HERNANDEZ: Yes, exactly.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Vazquez? Chair Vazquez?

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yeah. Thank you. Building off of Director Hernandez's concrete recommendation, I do think we should put in the contracts -- and my recommendation is that we put in the contract, use of and provision of additional datasets in a GIS mapping format. Those absolutely exist. They exist from the Census Bureau. I
know because I've worked with those datafiles -- so they exist. And my understanding is that it was the mappers themselves who were resistant to pulling in that additional data. I'm not sure if it was a workload issue or a philosophical difference, but if we put it in the contract, then we will have it. So that would be my recommendation.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Very good.

Commissioner Andersen, quickly?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Just a quick -- that was not in the contract which we got originally from the statewide database. It does specifically say the Census Bureau -- the information from the census data. And that's why they did have an issue with it. It's like, that wasn't in the contract. They pulled in some, but yeah, and it's a great recommendation. But in terms of as we look at going backwards, we go okay, make sure we don't -- make sure that area gets addressed in the RFP/RFQ.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thanks, everyone. We are overtime and we have no callers, so I'm sure the instructions have long been over. So I'm going to adjourn this meeting at this point, and we will regather on Thursday next week -- Thursday and Friday -- to continue this work. So thank you, all. Have a great
rest of your weekend, and we'll see you next week. Take care.

(Whereupon, the CRC Business Meeting/Lessons Learned meeting adjourned at 12:47 p.m.)
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