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CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Good morning, California. Welcome to our Citizens Redistricting Commission meeting. Let’s start with the roll.

MR. SINGH: Thank you, Madam Chair. Commissioner Ahmad? Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Andersen? Commissioner Andersen? Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Presente.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fornaciari?

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Le Mons? Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Aquí.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Aquí.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Toledo? Commissioner Turner? Commissioner Vazquez?

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Here.
MR. SINGH: And Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Here in Grand Junction, Colorado.

MR. SINGH: Roll call is complete. You have a quorum, Madam Chair.

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Great. Thanks so much, Ravi.

So first let me go through the run of show for today. So we will start with announcements and then heading into about 9:45, we're going to do director updates and announcements as well as subcommittee updates and announcements. Two subcommittees have shared in advance that they have some updates for us. So particularly the Finance and Administration and the Long-Term Planning subcommittees. We will go to break at 11 o'clock, and then when we return, the Commission will reconvene at 11:15. We'll be entering into closed session for pending litigation matters, so that means we plan to reconvene for the public at 11:45. So when we go on break at 11, the public should plan to join us back in open session at 11:45 where we will continue our Lessons Learned conversation. We have a few guests and some topics that we wanted to make sure that we closed out this conversation with.

Lunch will be at 12:45. Forty-five minutes for lunch, and then at 1:30 we will reconvene to do sort of a recap and go over next steps for the Commission. We will
plan to go to break at 3:15. Continue our conversation.
We've extended the meeting by thirty minutes from our
typical ending time, so we'll take -- we plan to take
public comment either at 4:30 or upon close of business.
Any questions or updates? All right. So at first,

COMMISSIONER YEE: Commissioner Kennedy has a --
CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Oh, yes. Thank you.
Hi, Commissioner Kennedy.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Hi. Just -- we keep copying
and copying the same error on the run of show. We
actually go to break at 3 rather than 3:15, because our
ninety minutes goes from 1:30-ish --
CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Good catch.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- to 3.
CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Yep. Thank you.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Sure.
CHAIR VAZQUEZ: All right. Any announcements from
commissioners? Yeah, Commissioner Sinay?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Good morning. I just wanted to
remind everybody that Commissioner Fernandez and I are
presenting tomorrow for Women in California Lead -- Lead
California Women, and it's going to be a great panel.
There's four of us on the panel. The first presenter
will be talking about women in government -- what the
numbers look like and such in California. And then Commissioner Fernandez and I will be giving our post-maps presentation. And then Kathay from Common Cause will be giving kind of their perspective on the new maps, and then we'll be taking questions and answers. It is open to the public, and staff has done a great job of posting it on all our social media. So hopefully, all signed up or shared it as well so others can present. I think we have around a hundred people already signed up. So we'll see.

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Great. Thank you. Any other updates or announcements? All right. So I will pass it off to Director Hernandez to kick us off with director updates.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. Okay. So first as you all know by now, Marcy Kaplan, our outreach director, is leaving the Commission on a new adventure. Her last day is Friday, April 1st -- and no, this is not an April Fool's joke. I do want to wish her the very best in the new adventure. I also want to thank her for all the hard work she put into everything that she did. Her commitment to putting together the best products for the CRC and the wealth of knowledge about outreach that she shared with the CRC and staff.

On a personal note, I want to thank Marcy for her
constant support and assistance throughout our journey. As I have shared with her before, we made a great team, and I attribute our success to that teamwork. And once again, I want to thank Marcy for everything. So thank you, Marcy.

Moving on, I also wanted to share that Fredy Ceja, our director of communication, and another member of our great team, has officially offboarded last week. If you recall, he was on a part-time basis since February, but his new job demands require his full attention. Martin will continue to do our communication, notification and website update as we had reported out last week. Any questions on staffing?

Okay. I will move on to our budget we have posted for today's meeting. Updated by just summary report. We've been working with DGS budgets to reconcile the information as much as possible, and we'll continue working with them to review and reconcile the information, both theirs and ours. In an effort to provide you with real-time information, we're using the invoice amounts while DGS reports most of the time reflect what has been paid out by SCO. And there's a lag of about two to three months in their reports. And the other thing is that they categorize information different from how we're capturing the information and reporting
As you all know, we had our bulk of our expenditures in November and December, and so you'll see some changes on the budget summary because of that. We'll continue to work with DGS budgets to review and reconcile our information. So now, I'm going to go right into that report.

Starting off in regards to the salaries, you will note an increase in the total expenditures of about a million dollars. I miscalculated the salaries on the last report that was reported in January. And I also did not include the RAs and student assistant wages in that January report. So now, we've updated that information to reflect both the corrected amount as well as the RAs and the student assistants. That's our overall salaries.

December travel, TECs amounts are now reflected in the Commission per diem and travel. This item also increased over 500 thousand. I miscalculated the expenditures for the per diem, so that has now been updated. And then the TECs -- we're expecting about fifty thousand that are being processed. In this last month, over twenty thousand dollars' worth of TECs were processed. And so that's not reflected in the reports from DGS because they haven't been paid out. So it's one of the discrepancies that we keep finding.
Videography, this amount reflects the total amount expended through December 2021, and we are updating the information with the January, February, March. March will be a little bit higher because we had all of our Lessons Learned meetings.

The Line Drawer and Legal Services were updated to reflect all invoices received, and we don't expect any additional invoices coming in. So that is the extent of it. We have added ASL contract. It's one of the higher contracts, so we included that in there so you can see that.

In regards to the transcript, this item has been updated. The contracted amount includes the three different contracts that we've had over the course of the Commission. It does include invoices for December and we're leaving about twenty thousand there for the new vendor to complete the missing transcripts from meetings in August and September.

The outreach contracts, this includes all the media contracts that Fredy completed. We believe all the invoices have been received. We received the final invoices for one of the vendors earlier this month. So that's also included in there because we're basing on the invoices -- but our budget reports that we get from DGS don't reflect that because, again, there is a lag of
about two months.

The most significant change, I would say, is in the All Other Operational Costs. You'll note that the amount went down significantly. As we reviewed the DGS reports and dug deeper into what is included in the OE&E -- and OE&E stands for Operational Expenditures and Equipment. We found that their reports included the videography, line drawer, and outreach expenditures in that amount. And so we reduced it because we're reporting it separately. We were double-counting it, and so now we reduced it by nearly two million dollars. So now, you'll see that this reflects more of updated information and a better picture of where we ended in December. And we are working on projections through June 2022. Those are more accurate projections based on that information, and we're tracking our expenditures for the monthly January, February, March, and we'll report that out at the next meeting. I went over that rather quickly, but I wanted to make sure I opened it up for any questions, comments.

Okay. Seeing none, I'll continue. Our budget change proposal, our budget office has been working with the Department of Finance to update the BCP document. We have increased the overall ask to include staff salaries and RA's salaries and travel funds for meetings. The travel funds are for the Commission to travel for the
scheduled meetings in accordance with the Bagley-Keene. And we have to find the locations, travel expenses for staff, as well as our videography team. And so the total amount of the revised BCP is now 5 million, 527 over the next eight years. That is everything I have.

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Thanks so much. Any other staff updates, director updates or announcements?

MR. HERNANDEZ: Not at this point.

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Great. Commissioner Sinay and then Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can you repeat what the budget is for the next eight years? Sorry about that.

MR. HERNANDEZ: What our ask is as of the other day, is 5 million, 527 thousand. And if you recall, that's an increase of about two million dollars from what we originally submitted. Because we've been adjusting and working with Department of Finance to dial in all the numbers. Yeah.

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Yeah. Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. Thank you. So for ASL and captioning -- so you might remember some meetings ago I asked kind of in passing, just, are we required to have both? And our legal team actually did investigate this, and it looks like we're actually not required -- we're required to provide access if requested, but not required
to provide both, and not required to provide both all the time absent a request. So it looks like we've been going above and beyond. And I'm just curious -- I don't remember how we made that decision at the beginning. I mean, I think it's a good decision, but -- and then going forward, it just seems like something we should actually decide and not just assume. So I'm wondering, Director Hernandez, if you can somehow go in the Wayback Machine and figure out how we decided to do that from the very beginning. Just let me know. Yeah. Thanks.

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Thanks. And I see Commissioner Kennedy and then Commissioner Fernandez after we get a response. Was there a response from --

MR. HERNANDEZ: Oh, forgive me. I don't have a response. I don't recall. I'll have to research it. But it looks like Commissioner Fernandez may have that response.

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Got it. Okay. Maybe then we can go Commissioner Fernandez, then Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. And I will have to also rely on my partner, Commissioner Akutagawa, for language access, but I do know that the ASL was part of our language access that we approved a long time ago. And then the captioning, I don't think that was part of it, so I'm not sure about the captioning part. If
Commissioner Akutagawa remembers?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA:  I don't.

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ:  Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY:  Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to get an update on where things stand as far as archiving documents, materials with state archives.

MR. HERNANDEZ:  We are still working on the archiving of the website files. As you recall, when we did the migration, we're moving everything into the Microsoft world. And so we've renamed things. We are preparing that information for when we do provide the information over to the archives department. We haven't done that yet. We're still moving all the documents. The other big task that we are still working on is the database itself and the links to the different documents, shape files, and so forth, that we're still working on that we don't have. Once we have that, I think, it'll make it easier to just transition that information over to the state archives. But as of now, nothing more has been done other than our end trying to organize the information as best as possible.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY:  Thank you.

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ:  Any other questions? Commissioner Yee, did you have an additional? Commissioner Fernandez, and then Commissioner Fornaciari.
COMMISSIONER FERNÁNDEZ: Oh, I think we might -- okay. I guess I'll do it. Kristian, do you know why we were doing the captioning? I was just trying to think of maybe how we got to the captioning part of it. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: So the captioning that we were requested to do was sort of -- that was originally done by the Applicant Review Panel and that was carried over. And generally, it's sort of a best practices thing that we've noticed amongst agencies that we work for. So I'm not sure -- I don't even know where the original request came from. But I know that we did that for the Applicant Review Panel, and so we carried it over to the Commission.

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I know we're not discussing getting rid of captioning, but I would strongly recommend keeping captioning because a lot of people have our meetings going on in mute because they're at work or whatnot, and so they're reading. Also, as you get older, sometimes it's just nicer to have captioning so you can follow along. And I have used captioning at times in our meetings when I've missed something, and I'll quickly look to see what was said since it's delayed. So to me captioning has been amazing, and I think it has made it
accessible to a lot of people. I think of all the things we've done maybe the captioning has been one of the -- besides being live -- one of the things that has been helpful.

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. Thanks. Yeah. I guess, I absolutely agree with what Commissioner Sinay said. I mean, I wouldn't want to see the captioning go away. And in the scheme of the budget, the over and unders, it feels pretty small in terms of -- or it seems like it's relatively small, I guess, in relation to everything else.

Just for the sake of asking the question, I just want to just verify -- so I do notice that the videography costs are higher than budgeted. I'm figuring it's due to the fact that we had much, much longer meetings which then put the video team, Kristian and his team, into overtime and also additional days and all that. So I think just for the sake of asking the question and so it's also noted and recorded I just wanted to verify that as the case.

And then also, Alvaro, again -- also on another note, I noticed that the column -- the very last column where you have the over and under or the over budget/under budget -- it says contract balances. Are
you noting that only because those are the contracted amounts that are still expected? I noticed that there wasn't anything similar in terms of an over and under for like the per diems and the staff salaries and other OE&E costs, so. Is that more of a formatting thing?

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: The reason we have that is because the contracts have a very specific amount to them, and so because they are over we're going to have to amend those contracts and that's why they're included there. Whereas our per diem and our salaries, we have a budgeted amount, expectations, but there isn't a contract that holds us to that. It is what it is in those instances, whereas in the contracts we have to amend those contracts to reflect -- or to allow us to continue on through the end of June and thereafter. So that's why I've identified that. The amendments will have to represent that amount when we go through that process.


CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: All right. Any other comments on this issue? All right. Let's move to subcommittee updates. And I misspoke earlier. We'll also have some updates from Redistricting Engagement in addition to Long-Term Planning and Finance Administration. So first up, Finance and Admin.
VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah. A couple things I just wanted to bring up. We were going to have a discussion about staffing today, but it seemed like the agenda was jam-packed, so we're going to put that off until later. We had a long discussion with Alvaro -- I mean, Raul and Alvaro about staffing and slots and all those things. So we'll explain that next time we get together. We didn't think it was urgent. Let's see. At the last meeting there was a lot of angst about the budget and how the budget is going and being overseen. And so Alicia and I just wanted to offer that if anyone else is interested in taking our places in the Finance and Administration subcommittee that we're open to that. Anyway, we're open to that if anyone is interested -- wants to be another set of eyes on the budget in depth, then we're open to that. It's up to the chair to appoint committee members, so we just want to bring that out.

Another thought that we had was maybe -- we talked to Alvaro about this a little bit, but maybe potentially we can -- if the Commission is interested in bringing in an outside set of eyes to take a look at the budget. It seems like -- I mean, it's challenging and difficult, right, to figure out what's happening. The state does things very differently than I think most of us are used to, and trying to deconvolve all that is a challenge. So
I think Commissioner Fernandez has something she'd like to add so I'll stop there.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Not that you need to stop. I was just going to wait in line. It's been a very frustrating process, and I know that I've shared that with all of you in terms of the expenditures and trying to tie those down and they just keep fluctuating and we don't know -- I don't have a comfort level. So I would recommend that we contract to have someone look at the expenditures that we've spent since August of 2020 so that we do have a better idea. And the reason we also need that information -- and we need it to be as accurate as possible -- is we do have to send a report to the legislature and split it out into different categories. And I definitely want to make sure we have the best information possible.

And then also a part of that contract -- I know that the FI$Cal system -- so that's the accounting/budgeting system -- it appears to be cumbersome. It's different than the one that I used to use when I was in that area. And maybe some additional training on that and how to read those reports would be really helpful. And again, as Commissioner Fornaciari noted, anyone wanting to take over, that's fine. There were comments that I did take personally last time in terms of giving our subcommittee
a lot of power, and we had no power. Everything we did
we brought back to the Commission. We had a lot of
work -- policies, reviewing applications, duty
statements, budget, expenditures, looking at different
meeting scheduled programs. So no power because
everything came back -- we weren't a decision-making --
we weren't a decision-making subcommittee. So with that,
I think that's all I had to say. Thanks.

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Thank you. Commissioner Le Mons,
Commissioner Akutagawa, then Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Hi. First I want to start by
thanking the subcommittee for doing an outstanding job in
the work that you guys did. So that's how I feel about
your role in that.

The second thing I have is a question as it relates
to -- I thought we hired -- there was a very specific
role in our staff that was budget. So if someone could
just explain to me whether I'm accurate in that and then
what the expectations were of that particular role, if it
indeed, existed.

And then, finally, I'll just say that I would
support if the subcommittee feels like we need an outside
set of eyes to do the final analysis in service of a
report, I would support that. Because quite frankly, I
would think that that job is not the job of the
commissioners in the first place. So anyway, those are my feelings about it and thoughts. Thank you.

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Thanks, Commissioner Le Mons.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I just wanted to say thank you to both Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner Fernandez. I have to say I am so glad that both of you took this on because I would not want to be in your shoes. You both did a fabulous job just -- all the work that we had -- it just really takes -- just really a committed and very, I guess, detailed eye to really look at all the work that needed to be done.

And I also agree -- I felt like everything was always brought back to us as a Commission. They did the kind of the legwork to help ensure that we didn't have to get ground up in a lot of the details and just helped us to get us to a place where we can move things along. So I just want to thank the both of you. If you choose to just say, I'm done, I want to move on and allow someone else to take our place, I don't blame you. If you choose to stay on, which would be still great because the knowledge that both of you have built up, I would absolutely still -- I would just say my trust is always in what you all would do on our behalf in the best interests of both the Commission and the state. So I
just wanted to say thank you to the both of you.

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair. I want to say thank you as well, and also an apology that it felt personal. Because I think a lot of times there's a lot of frustration when it comes around the budget, policies, and systems and all of us trying to really get our arms around what is it that we need so we can do governance versus what is needed for the day-to-day, where we draw those lines. And we've talked a lot about understanding what is the role of staff and what is the role of the Commissioners. What's the role of subcommittees? And there have been times when we're -- different times when people are like, wait, I didn't know that.

But I think there was a real frustration on understanding the system and understanding staff's role. When I look at our staff chart, I agree with Commissioner Le Mons -- we didn't have one person for the budget. We had multiple people that work on the bureaucracy that is the state and budget processing and all of that. And so it gets very frustrating when you see how much investment of taxpayer's dollars goes into managing the bureaucracy that's called the state government and the state budget and how nonresponsive that system is. We always go back to our staff and our commissioners have yet to receive
some of their reimbursements. And for me it's the biggest one, which was in September -- and there's no follow-up and there's no follow-up from staff. It's very, very frustrating.

And so I think a lesson learned here is just that we need to be clear -- we need to be more clear with each other where our frustration is directed. And again, thank you so much, Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner Fernandez. And also could you be -- I want to build on what Commissioner Akutagawa said, and tell us what is it you're really saying? Do you want to step down? Because it is -- as your colleagues, we want to support you in whichever way you want. And if it is time, let us know. You both have taken on a lot of other tasks as well, so just let us know. We're here for you, and thank you.

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Thanks. Commissioner Fernandez, then Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to respond to Commissioner Le Mons. He asked if we have a position to do this, and we do. We do have a position, and we've had a couple people fill that position -- the budget position -- but they're just -- there just seems to be difficulty in getting accurate information in terms of what the actual expenditures are.
And that's from the FI$Cal -- it's the accounting system that the state uses -- and so at this point, unfortunately, because we're so short-termed, we really need answers now. We don't have time to try to figure out the FI$Cal system and read it and interpret it and ensure our expenditures are accurate. I think at this point we just need someone to come in, scrub the data really well, and give us the information that we need to report to the legislature.

And also the -- we obviously need to know where we're standing so that we know how much additional funding we're going to need for the next few years. Because part of us estimating our budget change proposal and our need is based on what our projections were, and now that -- I'm not sure how great those projections were -- so it's all -- I think we just need to really get a good handle on it, and if our budget officer can also get some FI$Cal training on how to read those cumbersome reports, that would be helpful as well in some of other staff probably -- Raul and Alvaro would probably benefit from that as well. Thanks.

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Great. Thank you. Commissioner Andersen, Commissioner Fornaciari, Commissioner Le Mons, and Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you, Chair. I
also want to thank both Commissioner Fernandez and Commissioner Fornaciari for the monumental work that they have done on this subcommittee. I completely agree with everything that Commissioner Le Mons said and the way he said that. It was just -- now that we know we do have a person that's kind of a bit odd and the whole structure is very unusual -- I completely agree with what Commissioner Fernandez said about let's get some second eyes in there. It is time -- often things get not "audited" but almost, but in terms of our whole purpose of the Lessons Learned is to understand this is what happened. Now, this is what should happen as we move forward. And this subcommittee, I also agree -- the amount that you guys ended up having to deal with I don't think anyone ever considered when it first started.

And I would almost say for Lessons Learned and moving forward -- just from my perspective -- I would love to have the subcommittee itself actually give us, like, a little summary at some point. But I would separate budget expenses from admin, the policies you're going over, the duty statements. Those are sort of separate items, I believe, that would make this a much more distinct, handleable job. And the reason I'm -- where I'm coming from on that is I think several of the subcommittees started out with one idea and then morphed
into something else. And I believe this subcommittee
clearly did and it involved -- it actually took both of
you as Commissioners away from other things that I think
you would've liked to have done, could've done even more
of. Which is a crime in itself, because we need all the
appropriate people in the appropriate subcommittees --
not to say you weren't great on this. And I want to say
again, thank you, thank you, thank you, but if we want
second eyes I'm all for it even if we want to go to the
state auditor to go, hey, looking back at this, how would
you redo things or -- I don't know -- the appropriate
person.

And I also believe, as Commissioner Fernandez just
said, it would be a learning experience for everyone
involved in that to rereview this. So I would agree with
that. If the subcommittee has the time to say, this is
how we think it should've gone -- separate these out. I
believe that, as part of our Lessons Learned, all the
subcommittees are supposed to say, this is what our task
was. This is what our task ended up being. I know Line
Drawing subcommittee is certainly going to do that.

And again, I would separate -- I would've, looking
back, I'd separate those two. It was too much work it
ended up being. And things that didn't necessarily have
to be together. But thank you, thank you, thank you for
all the work you did and are doing.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thanks, Commissioner Andersen. So I'll just -- I think I speak for both Commissioner Fernandez and I -- it's just been frustrating, and in some ways we feel like we're letting you guys down by not having all the answers that we'd like to have. And so we just want to offer if other folks want to step up that that offer's out there. And we really, really appreciate your kind words. Thank you for that. And we're happy to carry on. Just wanted to offer that to the Commission. Let's see.

With regard to the expense reports, we had our budget meeting yesterday and asked to have Wanda send every commissioner kind of a summary email of what she has in the queue for you all just to make sure that she's got everything in the queue. All of the expense reports at this point are at DGS -- except for like three or something like that, and those were recently submitted and they're in the first step of the queue. I guess DGS is the last step of the queue, and so they'll be coming out the other end of the mystery train at some point soon. Apparently, one came in yesterday.

And I guess there are still some that haven't been submitted yet. So I would just encourage the Commissioners to get those in as soon as they can, but we
all should be getting an update soon. And I think that's all I had. So Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah. I feel like there's an action needed here. So I want to suggest either I will support a motion or make a motion if what we need is to bring in an outside person in particular that's going to require an expense to do this soft audit or whatever we want to call it to get to the bottom of whatever it is we need to get to the bottom of for what sounds like a couple different objectives.

Also, I'd like to suggest that the subcommittee shift to a more facilitation capacity with that process. We're trying to wrap up here; we're also trying to get the financial data that we need (indiscernible) Lessons Learned as it supports recommendations. So it sounds like we're talking about bringing someone in. I'm imagining that we're paying that person that we're bringing in to do that. And this person would be skilled in being able to get to whether that person -- I don't know if that creates a whole hiring process or what that's going to look like, but I guess I need to have a little bit more understanding on this objective outside party. How are we expecting to do that, and can we move forward with getting the ball rolling on that? And then that'll take some of the weight off of what's being
expected of the two of you, which I personally feel has become unreasonable. And you continue to offer your knowledge and experience from being a part of this committee since the beginning, but bring in the right resources necessary to get us to our goal. Thank you.

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Thanks. I want to make sure Commissioner Kennedy has a chance to ask his question or make his statement and then we can get back to Director Hernandez and Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Chair. Yeah. Going back to what Commissioner Sinay said, a lot of this is about where our disappointment needs to be directed. And certainly in my case, a hundred percent of the disappointment is with the state and the state systems. I certainly appreciate the excellent work that the subcommittee has done and continues to do. And we just need to make clear to those who need to understand that all processes related to this Commission need to acknowledge and accommodate the very time-bound nature of this Commission. And I don't think we're there yet on procurement. I don't think we're there yet on budget and expenses. We're maybe partway there on human resources, but all of these processes need to understand the severely time-bound nature of this Commission. So thank you to Commissioners Fernandez and Fornaciari, and thank
you, Chair, for the opportunity.

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Great. Thank you. Director Hernandez and then Commissioner Toledo.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you. So I just want to once again mention that the process -- and thank you, Commissioner Kennedy for acknowledging that the state process is not the easiest to navigate. The information that we get is based on the reports that are provided and the payment of those invoices is a process that -- it goes through separate and apart from that report.

So I don't disagree that we can bring someone in to look at the information, but the information is only as good as what we're getting from the Department of General Services in the reports. So they won't see the reports. What I've provided you today is a combination of some of those reports as well as the invoices that we've captured and the information that we've captured. So I just want to say that's the case, unfortunately. I don't know how much more a second pair of eyes is going to change the process itself.

And so the information -- we are getting more information. We are getting summaries of the information. As I mentioned earlier, they categorize the information different from the way that we're
categorizing the information. I think moving forward, one of the lessons learned is that the Commission needs to identify how they want their reports. I'm pretty sure that most of the departments that have been around for over fifty years have very specific type of reports that they request and have the information organized in a certain manner that helps them in their processes in reporting and so forth. So we don't have that. A lot of the information is just lumped into one big old category and so we're having to pull out that information.

And I just wanted to make sure that you're aware of that. Moving forward, I think it would be something that we would talk with the Department of General Services to try to create specific reports for this Commission moving forward that will help future Commissions in getting that information timely as much as possible and in an organized manner in which their reports will easily be translatable by future staff. Thank you.

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Thanks so much. Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you, Chair Vazquez. I'm just a little bit unclear on the problem statement that we're trying to solve. Because I think I'm hearing a couple of things, and I'm wondering if the problem that we're trying to solve -- and I don't know if this is
correct, but is the problem that we're trying to solve
the auditing of and accounting of our reconciliation of
the invoices and other budgetary processes? Or is it
additional support for the committee and for the
Commission in the budget process? Additional reports of
that that might be coming through? So I'm just trying to
get some clarity on the problem we're trying to solve.
And there may be multiple problems, but what specific
problem we're trying to resolve or trying solve with this
resource that we're trying to obtain. So just a question
for the group, I guess.

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Does anyone have a specific response
to that right now?

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah. I'll take a shot at
it. Part of it is that there just -- I mean, let's see.
If we just simply compare the budget estimate we had in
January to the budget estimate we have now -- I mean,
it's in many areas it's significantly different. And I
mean, Director Hernandez has given us an explanation. I
mean, there were some mis-projections and also some parts
of contracts were included that we were counting
separately were included in the OE&E.

But it just -- I think for me a second set of eyes
would just give me some comfort that another group was
looking at our data so that when we put this report
together for the Department of Finance we're in a more comfortable place that we're -- that this report is going to be accurate and will provide the next Commission an appropriate and adequate budget. So that's where I'm coming from if that helps clarify it.

I did want to respond to a comment by Commissioner Kennedy about departments not understanding the time-bound nature of our work. And that is an excellent point in just -- I want to share a conversation that we had with Raul last week about it. Apparently, last time Raul put together documentation for each department to help -- like a documentation on what the Commission's about, how to work with the Commission, what the constraints are, so that when this Commission rolled around that there would be some documentation from the past so that people with no experience with this Commission would have documentation and be able to understand how to work with this Commission.

Well, apparently, the purge time frame for documents is seven years and so those documents all got purged. And so there was no documentation for anybody to go to at these state agencies to understand what the Commission was about. So Raul had to go back through that whole teaching process with those organizations again. And so what he's working on now is, again, resurrecting that
documentation for those organizations and ensuring that those documents get flagged and don't get purged. But in addition to that, we're going to be keeping a set of that documentation ourselves for the next folks to have to bring back in case those organizations lose their own documentation, we'll have it. And so there'll be an opportunity to retrain and get things up and moving more quickly.

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Thanks, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I share Commissioner Toledo's position at this point in terms of now I'm not clear on exactly what we're trying to solve. Commissioner Fornaciari just said something as it relates to -- he said a lot of things, but the thing that jumps out for me is accuracy. So I think accuracy is critical. And if the subcommittee has some concerns about our current resources -- being able to deliver that accuracy, I'd like that to be explicitly stated because that would be the solve that we as a Commission have to fix. I don't know that that's the case. I'm not making an assumption, but I'm posing that as a question, because we have several objectives we're trying to meet here with this information.

And I think that maybe what we need to do -- well,
this also seems very time-sensitive in terms of our broader objectives, so I think that maybe if we could better understand it -- you may not be able to deliver this now, subcommittee, but if we could better understand the exact problems -- even if they're multiple -- and what your proposal is in terms of a recommendation on how we solve them -- then the Commission, the body, can do its job in making sure that that happens. I think we can have a lot of discussions about how we feel about it and what we think about it, but if there are some action items that need to be taken -- I mean, that's the responsibility of the Commission. And I'd like to be clear as to whether that's being called for today or if we should anticipate that being called for or not. So that's where my lack of clarity is at this point. Thank you.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: So can I jump in on that? Okay. Yeah. I think Commissioner Le Mons and Toledo, I think those are great points. I mean, this is just -- we don't have a specific action, I guess I would say right now. I mean, it's an idea that we brought up and we wanted to float to the Commission. I don't know exactly what it would look like. I mean, I think I shared my objective for this. I think Commissioner Fernandez might have a comment, so I'll turn it over to her.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Is it okay to go, Chair?

CHAIR VÁZQUEZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you. My specific action would be to review all of the expenditures from August 2020 to current. And then the second piece to that would be to take that information and project out what we expect our future expenditures to be. And the third piece of it would be to have accurate information or as good information as we can get, to then compile the report that goes to the legislature. And then, I guess, fourthly, a result of all of this would be to have better information, as Commissioner Fornaciari said, for the 2030 Commission in terms of the expenditures. But that would be in the report to the legislature, which the legislature uses that budget and expenditure information to fund the 2030 Commission. So we really need that information to be as accurate as possible.

So the goal for me would be to have accurate expenditure information that we can use to project future expenditures.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Commissioner Le Mons, did you have a response?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: And then -- yeah, go ahead.
COMMISSIONER LE MONS: So I'd like to say that A, I step in to support that. I don't know what that looks like, Chair, if we still have our two-person subcommittee limitation. I want the subcommittee to feel supported. That kind of analysis, I'm decent, I'm good at, so I could do. So I'm willing to support them however you see fit to do that. I don't know if that maybe is the formation of a -- I don't know. I'm not going to try to solve that piece. I'll leave that to you, Chair. I'll just make myself available and --

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Gee, thanks.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: -- I think we can go from there.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons. So just to time check us, we're at 10:25. We have two more subcommittee updates to get through before 11. So maybe Commissioner Fornaciari and Fernandez, there's an offer on the table for Commissioner Le Mons to sub in for one of you. And we still have our limitation of two-people advisory committees. So you can either accept that offer now or we can table this for the next meeting and the next chair to make that appointment.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Chair, I'd like to make a comment on that --

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yeah.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- before you move on. So a couple of things that I've been waiting to say. One, I think I want to just be clear in terms of the language that we're using about why this is even coming up. There is not a problem. I think there was perhaps maybe a misperception that the request was coming because there might have been a problem. I don't believe that there is a problem.

I think what I'm hearing from the committee is that for the sake of better clarity, and also transparency, and also because while they have acquired a great knowledge in the processes, for peace of mind for all and also for, again, transparency it would be best to have a recommendation is to have a audit of all of the finances specific to what Commissioner Fernandez was saying.

And so on that note, I think to Commissioner Le Mons's offer, perhaps instead of subbing in if Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner Fernandez is willing or intending to remain, if nobody else wants to take their place, maybe separately, and what might be better, is to create a separate audit committee for the purposes of this particular task instead of saying it comes under the auspices of the Finance and Administration Subcommittee.

I think that that for the sake of transparency and
also having a separate set of eyes under the guise of a
different committee, perhaps creating an audit committee
that Commissioner Le Mons and perhaps another
commssioner who's interested and willing to serve with
him can do that much, much more deeper dive. Be that
kind of third and fourth pair of eyes.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: The other question I have
is, and maybe this is also a question for, I don't know,
Alvaro or someone else, but is this something that the
state auditor's office could help support, since I
believe this is what they do for the state? Although I
may be wrong in terms of understanding one of their main
roles. But anyways, just wanted to add those. Thank
you.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Okay. So I'm hearing and accept a
recommendation for establishing a separate subcommittee.
So first, let's get through that piece.

Commissioner Le Mons, would you be willing to be on
an audit subcommittee? And then I'll look for volunteers
to join that subcommittee first? Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes, I would be willing to do
that, Chair.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thank you.

Okay. So do we have volunteers to be on that
subcommittee with Commissioner Le Mons?

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I was actually going
to propose that very same thing what Commissioner
Akutagawa said. And yes, I would be happy to be that
fourth set of eyes.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great.

Commissioner Taylor, were you volunteering, as well?

Do you want to arm wrestle Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah. I was, again, never
have a problem serving where needed. I had the same
thought in mind. And then I was like, wow, I'd actually
be using my accounting degree instead of fighting crime.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Commissioner Andersen and
Commissioner Taylor, how do you want to proceed?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, I have an engineering
degree. I don't have an accounting degree. So if the
accountant would like to step up, I'd be happy to step
back.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Okay.

Commissioner Taylor, sound good to you?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes, that's fine.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Okay.

So we have a new subcommittee, an audit
subcommittee, Commissioner Le Mons and Commissioner
Taylor. Thanks so much for your service.

Commissioner Le Mons, did you have anything else you wanted to add?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: No.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I've gotten myself into enough already today.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yeah. Be careful what you wish for.

All right. Commissioner Kennedy, I know you had your hand up for a while. Did you have anything to add on this committee update?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: No. I'm very happy with the outcome.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Okay.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thanks.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Last call for comments on this committee update or we'll move on.

(No audible response).

Great. Thanks so much.

Term planning. Just as a time check for the rest of the Commissioners, we're going to give 15 minutes for each of these next two subcommittees. So please plan to keep your comments brief.

Long-term planning?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, yes, sorry about that.
I was --

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: That's okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- looking for my document.

Let me shift gears right now.

So based on the information or the discussions that we've had actually throughout the full Commission, I was keeping track and so was Commissioner Akutagawa as everyone else was in terms of potential legislative changes. And also based on lessons learned.

So what Commissioner Akutagawa and I did was we put together a listing. And we divided it out into different sections and it was posted yesterday, I believe. And the first section, A, is the potential changes that we think there's general consensus and maybe not. If there isn't, then we can either put in or pull out some of the items. But these were the items that we felt that we could move forward with. We see it kind of like a lower hanging fruit in terms of not much discussion on the negative side of it.

And then we have section B, which is other areas that are currently intersecting with other committees. And so they are items that were brought up, but they are being addressed elsewhere.

And the third, the longest area is area C, which is areas needing further discussion. So that would be...
either we haven't discussed it yet or there's been quite a bit of discussions, and it's not at the point where it appears we're comfortable moving forward with it.

And then the last section, D, is the constitutional code language areas.

So what we were thinking of is really just concentrating on A in terms of those areas where we feel we can move forward with. Again, I see a great opportunity in having an author, having an assembly person willing to author this and not having to look for an author in the future and, right?

We are totally aware that we can continue to request legislative changes in future years, but I also feel that the topic is, I don't want to say hot, but at least it's present in most people's minds right now. And if there's a few items we can take care of during this process, that's less that we have to take care of in the future.

And so Commissioner Akutagawa, did you have anything on that?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think you gave a great summary. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So of the six items in A, one is the requiring (audio interference) state incarcerated people. Okay. I don't have to say thing.

Okay. Commissioner Sinay?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: So sorry, I haven't gone really deep on this. I think that the As make sense. And I guess I was just curious on how did B2 and A2 differ?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: The reason we put B2 is because there is a separate -- Commissioner Kennedy and Commissioner Turner are also working with the Federal Bureau of Prisons to get that information. So we wanted to show that there's additional action on this effort that we want to proceed with. There's a legislative government language change that we would need to pursue. And then there's also other action and communication. And I believe Commissioner Kennedy was also checking with other states to see how they're dealing with the federally incarcerated population.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Also on that note, I believe there is also ongoing conversations from a census perspective to reallocate those who are incarcerated so that the census numbers will come with the reallocations already done.

So there's multiple streams of work going on. What we just noted in that section A is the part where we felt we can address, and then there's the other parts that are also simultaneously being addressed. But there are multiple pieces that need to be addressed so we wanted to note that in the A part.
And also just make it clear, what we are proposing is that we'd like to take a vote today on the parts that fall under section A to be able to move forward with the legislature and the sponsor that has been lined up already or who has stepped up to help move our items that we're interested in moving forward. So just for clarity.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. And then I guess to clarify the clarity, if there's items that as a Commission we feel aren't in A and we need to move to C, that's fine too, and we can work with that as well.

So it's A for now; doesn't mean that that's the end all to everything so.

Chair Vazquez, did you want me to call on -- okay.

I see Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner Kennedy and Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Fornaciari?


I'll just comment first on list A. I think 1 through 4 I support. I think we're ready to pull the trigger on those. I think A5 I think we need a lot more thought about what that looks like, what fully functional means in -- yeah, I'll just stop there.

And I guess A6 I'm okay with going ahead with too.

But I think A5 we need a lot more work.

So help us understand what the process is, though.
Because if you look at the -- it's 25250 -- what is it --
2 -- 8251, it says that the language must be provided
verbatim -- well, that's not what it says, I'm
paraphrasing -- by the Commission. And that the
legislature can't change the language. We provide the
language.

So what's the process we're going to go through to
develop the language for these bills?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So in terms of developing
the language, we would work with our chief counsel on
that language. And then also there's specific ways
things are written in code. And I'm hoping that maybe
our chief counsel can help us on that piece of it.

Commissioner Akutagawa, just step in all the time,
please.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I guess maybe I'll
take a step back. So what we're going to do is once we
get the list from grouping A, an agreed-upon list that
everybody's comfortable that we move forward to, what we
will do is we will present it to the legislature.

And then from there they still have to agree to
either accept all or they may choose to accept a portion
of it. The ones that will move forward with the sponsor,
legislative language does need to be written. They will
be working with our chief counsel. But also what we were
told is that they have, I guess, language writers on
their side. They have counsel on their side that will
also help to craft the language in the proper way.

My understanding is that we will still have a say in
how that will -- what the final language is going to look
like. They will help us to write the language, but we'll
still be coming back to the Commission to present the
language and all that.

So there's still multiple steps, but we've just got
to get to an agreement on what do we want to forward so
that then the work could start.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you. I've obviously
not been able to keep up with things quite as much as
normal, but I did check the handouts for today's meeting,
I believe, around this time yesterday morning, and the
only thing that I recall finding on the handouts page was
the run of show. Maybe I'm mistaken, but I don't feel
like I'm in a position to support anything at this point
because the last time I checked the handouts page the
only thing there was the run of show. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you. Again,
this is more like a process, which is what Commissioner
Fornaciari was saying. I sort of thought that we were
going to jump into essentially some of the ones in D, some of the ones that I thought there was consensus about. We need to move the final date, the idea some of those items.

So I'm kind of surprised that we're not -- and I thought that is what our person who has the offer on the table, hey, I'll help you out, was actually talking about doing that.

I see some of these other ones as, yes, absolutely. I kind of see these as lower hanging fruit, which is great to go with. I don't think A4 is low hanging fruit at all. As soon as they say you don't have to do the contract and regulations for, like, say, the line drawers, that's going to just blow up. I might be misunderstanding what we're actually talking about on that item.

And then I see several of the ones in C that I thought we did, indeed, have -- that we're in total agreement about. Like, what's a day in C5, C12, C2. I thought those were -- I didn't believe that we had any dissent in exactly what those were. I thought those would be A items. So I'm a little taken aback. Unfortunately I, also like Commissioner -- wait a minute, did not have the time to really, really go over these and say, okay, I put these as A and those as -- a
decision to rearrange it. I appreciate the way you
brought us together because this is the only way we can
actually have this discussion. So I really appreciate
that.

And the language on the bills, I do a have a process
question. So this subcommittee is going to essentially
propose the language, or is that going to assign certain
languages to other subcommittees? I'm not quite clear on
that as we kind of walk through.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So the issue -- and I
appreciate all of the questions -- the issue, concern,
whatever we want to call it, is in order to move forward
in this legislative cycle, the bill needs to be read
before the end of April. And we don't have any meetings
scheduled in April right now. So it's either we do it
now, or we skip this whole legislative cycle and it would
go on to the next cycle. And if that's what the
Commission chooses to do, again, we do have an advantage
right now or a positive that there's an assemblyperson
willing to author the bill for us.

And yes, we were looking at -- and if there's items,
as I mentioned earlier, if there's items where the
commissioners feel there is general consensus in moving
them to A or moving them from A, that's a possibility, as
well. And as Commissioner Akutagawa mentioned, once we
come up with the language, we will forward that to the
Commission and receive input. And there's an entire
months of going back and forth where we'll have the
opportunity to make amendments to that language as a
Commission if we need to.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I was just going to
jump in on what Commissioner Fernandez said. I think,
yes, there are things that some people would have
thought, oh, this should have been in A. But as we
learned the last time we tried to just give the whole
list, things that we thought were easy ones were not
quite as easy. And so Commissioner Fernandez and I just
tried to identify the lowest of the lowest hanging fruit
so that we can at least get something moving in this
cycle. Otherwise, as she said, if the will of the
Commission, the entire Commission is to not move forward,
it is just with the knowledge, then, that we are going to
miss this cycle. And that's what we were just trying to
avoid, is we wanted to at least forward at least a
couple, three, four of the lowest of the low hanging
fruit. So that's one.

We knew that what may seem like obvious to one may
not seem so obvious to others. The constitutional ones,
to be honest, we chose not to put that forward as part of
the group A because the work on it that's required is
significant. Whether it's having the legislature vote to agree or if they choose not to and they don't want to, then that means we have to go out and gather signatures. There's a whole big process and in the timeframe that we have -- and to be honest, I mean, we have 15 minutes for our report. And we thought, okay, we don't have 15 minutes to go through everything and debate everything. So we were just trying to anticipate like what is the lowest of the low hanging fruit so that we can move on. And then we could have continued conversations on everything else because we knew that we would need to. But while we can, we were just trying to see if we could just move even just a few things along.

However, again, this is all up to the will of the Commission. We just want it to be clear that if we miss this opportunity because we don't have a meeting scheduled at least in April right now, the earliest is we're looking at mid-to-late April. And that likely, from our understanding, what we were told, is going to be too late for us to take advantage of this legislative cycle. So we just want you all to know like what all the parameters are and then make an informed choice in that way.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: And I'm going to time check us. We're at 10:46.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Two quick thoughts. One, yeah, really thanking the subcommittee's good work on this. And a reminder that we did give the subcommittee full discretion to choose what they wanted to put into our first package with it, what seemed feasible, not necessarily everything that seemed to have consensus behind it. So just appreciate the work they put into making those choices.

For A6, I want to suggest that we phrase that in terms of three months before the map deadlines. And since we found out, map deadline can be a moving target. So to make that a period of time rather than hard calendar dates. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you.

So --

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: We need a motion.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I believe we'll need a motion. But it appears that at least one commissioner, Fornaciari, A5, we may need to move that one out. We can move A5 out.

Are you good with that, Commissioner Fornaciari, if we move that and move it to area C?

And again, if we do end up moving forward with something and we do in future meetings there's items in C
that we've decided and if it's still going through the process (indiscernible) --

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Did you lose your audio? Did I lose my audio?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: It may be me.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Was it me?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think it's you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I forget what I was saying. See, that's what happens. Oh, if we do move forward with something, and if there are items in our future meetings and we decide, oh, we're good with moving C5 or C12 or whatever it is forward, we still have the opportunity to amend that until it is actually finalized. So it's just -- the goal is, and maybe it's not going to be our goal, which is fine, the goal is to try to get this information read by the end of April to get into this cycle. And if the Commission decides not to move forward in this cycle, then that's what the Commission decides. I hope that made sense.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you. On that, A1 and A2, that's the reallocation and putting that into
our existing language, that is the reason why D1 makes
total sense, which is change the final map date, add an
extra month, because that takes an extra month. I would
like to sort of tie those together.

Now, if the legislature, then, comes back, goes
well, let's just put it in there, and then we can go,
well, because we need to do that, we need the extra month
and do it that way, I'd say yes. But in our proposal, I
would like to add that into A1. Like D1, I'd like to add
that in.

And I like Commissioner Yee's idea about A6. I
would like to move ahead with fully functional. I mean,
because this is work with the state auditor. So this
isn't say exactly what we're going to do, but I think we
should get that ball rolling.

The one I said about A4, exempting from state
procurement and contracting regulations, I don't think
you need to necessarily exempt, but there's an item where
we need to somehow address the timeframe of that.

And so I'd like us to move along on -- talk to the
right person about what we do there, what we can do
there. So I'd like to include that, but I don't believe
that's amending our language. I think that has a lot of
discussion involved in it with the appropriate people.

So I would like to, if we're going to do a motion
and say, hey, these are the items we want to start moving on now, I would like to add I'd keep some of A4 in there, and I would like to add D1 into it. I would also like to add C12, because I think that's like a duh. And C8. Oh, also C5 into that -- in which case I would even go ahead and start the motion if -- I'd wait until other people say things before, but then if you want someone to do a motion, I would be happy, I would do that for you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

Commissioner Fornaciari and then -- or Chief Counsel Pane, did you want to --

MR. PANE: Yeah. If I could just --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

MR. PANE: -- briefly just clarify one quick point. We've mentioned it in the past. I just want, just as a refresher for the Commission, as you'll note in section A, there's A1 and A2, both referring to the elections code. As a reminder, the process that Commissioner Fornaciari talked about earlier, it obligates the government code in 8250. And since the election code is not part of the Commission's statutes, it technically doesn't have to go through a more rigid, particularized process the way that the other government statutes will need to. Just wanted to clarify that.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fornaciari?
VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: So just to follow up on that, Anthony, so any changes to 8252 are completely and wholly up to us in what the language says and what we submit. I mean, we're --

MR. PANE: Well, not -- I mean, somewhat. So any changes to the Commission statutes have to be agreed upon in the exact language by the Commission. But of course, it takes two. It's not just the Commission. The legislature has to also be interested in that.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Right.

MR. PANE: And so the language that the legislature ultimately wants to go with has to be the exact language the Commission thinks and agrees to. So what I think is easily foreseeable as a process is right now the Commission decides on recommended amendments. Then the Commission with any of those goes to the legislature and says, how many of these are you interested in? We're interested in these topics. And they say, we're interested in a certain portion of them or we're interested in all of them.

And they help to craft some language together and say, this is what we're thinking is in the bill.

And then comes sort of back to the Commission to say, what do you all think about the language? So that portion, where it says, what do you think about the
language is a requirement for changes to the Commission statutes in government code sections 8250 et seq. That part isn't required for elections code or changes to Bagley-Keene or something that falls outside of the government -- the Commission statutes.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Right. Ultimately, we would approve those -- the language that would change 82 --

MR. Pane: You would -- the Commission would have to agree with that language. And if they do not, then it cannot take effect.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Right. In the election code, the A1 and A2, the legislature could just do that on their own without us.

MR. Pane: Correct.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. And so a little bit more on the process. I kind of got lost in Commissioner Fernandez's explanation, and so I want to make -- see if I understand. I mean, so this -- this bill, proposal, whatever, has to be read into by April, but we can change it? I mean, what -- what does that all mean?

MR. Pane: So as best as I can understand -- I'm not exactly a legislative expert, but my understanding is, right now, there's what's referred to as perhaps to as a -- and perhaps the Chair will probably do a much better job of this than I will. I hope I don't butcher it too
much, Chair Vazquez. But there's a spot bill, which is a placeholder. And there's a certain period of time when a spot bill needs to actually have content in, real content, specific areas before it moves out of the committee. If it doesn't move out of the committee, it's dead.

So there is, I think, the info -- probably formal/informal time frame in which there needs to be actual content to this spot bill is end of April is what we're hearing. And so that is the reference that I think Commissioner Fernandez and Commissioner Akutagawa are referencing.

So if we are successful in getting the Legislature to agree with the Commission on these particular topics and that topic has language and that language goes in the spot bill, now it's no longer such a spot bill anymore as it is actual, quote, a real bill, and it has content to it. That language is what the Commission is going to -- again, assuming it -- that what's in the bill is referring to the government -- in the Commission statutes is language that the Commission is going to have to adopt and be okay with by a supermajority in order for it to take effect, if that helps.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: So --

MR. PANÉ: How'd I do, Chair?
CHAIR VAZQUEZ: You did pretty good. I will just say that there's still going to be -- and I'm sensing what maybe some of the angst is. There will -- once the bill is live, we go through the process of amending it should we want to continue to wordsmith it.

So we can continue to have conversations and go, oh, that's not really -- we thought this was what we wanted, but based on questions from the committee, questions from the public, et cetera, like, we think we should actually word it this way. But we need sort of original -- we need a starting point set of language written up, but that is not going to be the final -- we're not stuck with our first draft, but we need to decide that we want a first draft for us to move forward with any of these.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: So can we -- so, I mean, it sounds like, conceivably, if we decide to go through with all of the A's, let's say hypothetically, and we decide we keep -- we're really not happy with the language for a couple of them, we could take them out or whatever. Could we add ones that we didn't start with if we feel like we're at a point where we're ready to pull the trigger?

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: It -- that may be more difficult, especially --

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.
CHAIR VAZQUEZ: -- because it's easier to take stuff out than add stuff, especially substantive pieces, to different sections of the code. And I'm not even sure that that's allowed if we would, you know, sort of bring in other pieces of the code in a particular bill. Yeah.

Commissioner Fernandez.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Actually -- actually, it can be done. I've actually seen -- what did you call them? Spot bills, placeholders, Chief Counsel Pane? That they started out in one subject and complete -- by the time at the end, it was something completely different because someone needed some language change, and so they added it to that bill because it was an active bill.

So you could theoretically add to it and amend to it. So -- and what's important about that is we need to make sure we track it so that no one's adding to our language or our bill. I hope that made sense.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Friends, we are at 10:59. We haven't had a motion; we haven't had a vote. We also have times that are in for our closed session and then we have a panel when we reconvene. So I think, unfortunately, we're going to have to move these -- the rest of these subcommittee updates to our afternoon
session and eat into some of our next steps conversation in the late afternoon around 3:30 is what that is looking like.

So thanks, everyone, for the conversation. We will pick this conversation back up at 3 o'clock or 3:15. And then, yeah. Let's go to break. And commissioners are -- take a quick break so that we can begin our open session. Let's say, let's take a five-minute break, so let -- or sorry. Commissioners will reconvene closed session at 11:05. The public, we will see you at 11:45. Am I doing that right? Yes. Great. Thanks, everyone.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 11:00 a.m. until 11:47 a.m.)

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Welcome back, everyone. I think this might be a historic moment for the Commission that we have (indiscernible) no action was taken, and on time and on schedule. So (indiscernible) much.

As a reminder, we did not complete (indiscernible) director updates or subcommittee updates and (indiscernible) those discussions until later at 3:15. And so with that, we are going to continue our lessons learned, and I got a few guests, I guess, now.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Angela, your audio is really breaking up. Are you -- okay. Sorry. Commissioner Vazquez.
CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Sorry. I have to use headphones because I'm in a not private space.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: You sound good now.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Now? Okay. Great. So we did not take any action in closed session and we will be moving into our lessons learned conversation for today. So first up, we will have -- I believe we have our guests ready for our discussion on our Statewide Database support.

So with that, I think I would love to welcome -- I see Karin. I see Jaime, Linus, and Seth. Great. Okay. I will hand it over to the Statewide Database team.

Thanks so much.

MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you so much, Madam Chair, and hello, Commissioners. It's really great to be here. Really appreciate the invitation. So your Chair has already done a great job introducing everybody, of course. The Statewide Database team that is present today consists of Jaime Clark, who you all know very well. And then also some of you have met Linus Kipkoech and Seth Neill, and I'm really glad that they could join us today.

We watched your presentation a few days ago, a couple of weeks ago, about Statewide Database, and we know that there are some questions about Statewide
Database. So what we did is we took those questions, we
divvied them up based on the person that is best suited
amongst our team members to address those questions. And
so I'm going to start by talking a little bit about the
Statewide Database relationship with the Legislature, and
then I'm going to move things over to Jaime, and then
we'll just kind of go down the list, if that's okay.

So again, I'm going to start with the Statewide
Database relationship to the Legislature. So as you
know, we are part of the University of California, and
we're also part of the University of California at
Berkeley, and we're part of University of California at
Berkeley School of Law. And I'm just saying this because
it seems like every time you add something onto that we
are part of, there is a set of documents and bureaucracy
that goes along with it.

I bet you there's somebody at Berkeley who is really
upset that they did not invent bureaucracy, but you know,
it is what it is, but they're doing a pretty good job
with bureaucracy. So I think Seth and Linus both will be
addressing part of that because it makes it very
interesting to work in that space.

But it also means that it addresses how we're
funded. We are funded through the allocation that the
University of California gets from the State Legislature.
So basically, it first goes to the University of California. They then parse funding out to the campuses, and then the campuses, they parse the funding out to the various schools or departments. So that is how the money gets to Statewide Database.

So being part of the university situates us behind academic firewalls. So that means that we operate independently of the Legislature just like many other programs that are also funded via the same mechanism. And we, however, also, of course, do have a relation -- a relationship with the Legislature because we're fulfilling the mandate for them to build and make publicly available the redistricting database for the State of California. So that's basically, in a nutshell, how that works.

The legislature asked Statewide Database at some point through the decade, and I think it was maybe around 2017 or 2018 or so to look into options to provide public access for redistricting software. And the reason for why they asked us was, you know, we do a lot of things that nobody else kind of wants to do. And we are also -- that's also how we get stuck with a lot of the census programs.

But we're also well-situated to do this because, obviously, we are one of the very few organizations aside
from the CRC that deals with redistricting on an ongoing matter -- on an ongoing basis just because we're building a redistricting database. And because of that, we're also in the loop with whatever tools are provided, what is developed by -- by others, what other states are doing, and so forth. But also because we are independent and we have good relationships with people that use redistricting data.

And you know, generally, familiarity with the subject matter -- and I could talk for hours about my history, of course, with communities of interest and my quest to build a COI tool which actually started in 2008 when I started to ask, you know, various funders whether they might be interested in building a COI tool. When I reached out to various software developers to see -- you know, redistricting software developers to see if there was any kind of interest in this. And when I reached out to -- finally, in 2010, to Google to try to get Google to perhaps integrate a COI tool or COI input tool into Google Maps, and I struck out.

And so this is how far the COI tool development goes back, and anybody who knows me has probably gone to sleep at some point when I talked about the need to, you know, develop tools -- develop input tools and make it easier for people to participate and kind of getting rid of,
like, reams and reams of paper.

So of course, the 2011 -- your predecessors, the 2011 Commission, also put into their report that there was a need to look into this and to, you know, perhaps look into creating some sort of a tool. So this is basically just been an evolution. And you know, we started talking to the Legislature about this when they asked us to look into it and started to do a bunch of research just to make sure we weren't dropping the ball, just to make sure that nobody else was working on something like that, and essentially just struck out all along.

And then in around 2019 or so, I think, the -- we talked to the Legislature about funding. So they basically reached out when the Commission funding came up, and we talked to them to try to figure out whether this -- this, you know, idea to actually develop something ourselves since nobody else was doing it was consistent with the State mandates. And they asked us for budget estimates. Then they included some money in the state budget. And I just think it's really important to understand that they don't have a contract with us, so there's no contractual relationship with the State Legislature. This is basically part of, again, funding for UC and we're fulfilling a mandate.
And they also did not provide any input about what specifically we were doing. Like, for example, what kind of, you know, functionality is in there and so forth. They also don't have any access to the data. Basically, everything -- and you know how hard it is to get data about anything that you're collecting from the University of California, so this is just part of this.

We started to develop in earnest in 2019. And you know, once the Commission was seated, we reached out to transition staff about the mandate to coordinate with you all, and you may remember starting to see us on a more regular basis at that point. Generally, Jaime and I were present, and we did a, first, really formal presentation on the COI tool on September 25th and talked to -- also about the multiple levels of tools and access that we have planned to provide access to redistricting data.

And you know, the best laid plans, of course, COVID happens. We had this fantastic idea about providing access through libraries and library computers, and Jaime spent more time than she will admit on, you know, running up and down the State of California and talking to libraries about repurposing census-used technology and then swapping over to making the tools available. And then COVID happens, and you know, things have to change very quickly.
So with that, I'm going to just move it over to Jaime, and she can tell you a little bit about more -- about this. So thank you.

MS. CLARK: All right. And hi, commissioners. Good to see you all. I'm going to talk about just the process of developing all of the tools, and there will be an emphasis on the COI tool because that's kind of what you all had talked about most in your lessons learned discussions last couple weeks.

So the tools themselves were developed really with a focus on getting input from stakeholders, huge input from -- coming from organizations and groups. For example, the Black Census and Redistricting Hub, Disability Rights California, MALDEF, Advancing Justice, NALEO, Common Cause, League of Women Voters just to name a few. Apologies to anybody listening who I'm leaving out.

And also, we worked with a number of smaller regional community organizations, so not just, like, the big national or statewide organizations but also smaller organizations serving more local populations. And really, this collaboration began years before the COI tool was eventually released and became publicly available.

In terms of developing the tool itself,
organizations had direct access to the COI tool for at
least six months in advance of it being made publicly
available. Throughout that time period, we requested,
and when possible, incorporated their feedback on an
ongoing basis throughout development.

As Karin mentioned, we also developed the COI tool
and all of the tools kind of with an eye on making them
available in what we were calling redistricting access
points in libraries throughout the state. As Karin
mentioned, a lot of resources really went toward working
with libraries to get these points sort of set up in --
at least one in every county in California, and we were
working on training library staff on assisting their
patrons with using the tools. And of course, those plans
were uprooted due to the pandemic.

In beta testing, and again, specifically with the
COI tool, we also got feedback from your predecessors,
the former commissioners, to see what they thought would
be the most effective for members of the public and sort
of what they -- you know, what they wished they had had
in 2011. We hope that this Commission can be a resource
for us in developing future tools for 2030 both before
and after your terms end.

So again, kind of with our time line of the COI tool
specifically, once this Commission was seated, we gave
multiple public presentations throughout the fourth quarter to get feedback on the functionality of the COI tool as the COI tool was the most urgent, the most immediate tool that we knew was going to be released.

In October of 2020, we spent time with each of you, each individual commissioner, getting feedback on what to incorporate in the COI tool. And we worked closely with the COI tool subcommittee from then on. We implemented your feedback as much as we could, given the development of the tool itself took over two years and the Commission was seated around four months before the tool was actually publicly available.

Your feedback was really valuable to us. We implemented -- you know, for example, we implemented more language access. You asked us to make the tool and all the associated materials available in 16 languages total, which we did. Also, some of the input we were able to incorporate from all of you is what information should be collected from users about their communities and also about themselves.

On that last point, by the request of the Commission, we collected more personal information about users than we had sort of built in initially when we were developing the tool. And you know, Seth and Linus will go into this further in detail. But ultimately, that did
end up impacting the time line of when the Commission could receive submissions from the COI tool, and all of that was ironed out, of course, for the tools later on, the online redistricting tool and QGIS.

Kind of leading into that, part of the feedback we got from the Commission was to open up public participation through the COI tool as early as possible. So the tool went live in early January 2021. And at that time, Statewide Database was ready to start delivering all of the data we collected from the COI tool to the Commission.

And of course, also at that time, your data management team wasn't yet hired and your data management system, Air -- which ended up being Airtable, wasn't set up, and so the Commission wasn't able to accept the data at -- in 2021 when we were -- you know, when the -- when the tool went live and members of the public started using it and submitting their COIs to you.

So with that, I'm going to pass the mic to Linus, who will talk a little bit more sort of about that time line and the details around Statewide Database being able to transmit data to the Commission.

MR. KIPKOECH: All right. Thank you very much, Jaime. And thank you, commissioners, for inviting us to today's meeting. I'm going to go directly and talk
about, you know, Statewide Database training the USDR members and also discussing the data turnaround and helping set up Airtable.

As Jaime mentioned, you know, we started working with USDR late in December 2020. We trained them on multiple areas, including we talked with -- trained them on, you know, the GIS layouts and all the redistricting process and -- and the kind of BIOS format we were going to produce, you know, the submission were going to be in different (indiscernible) formats, so we trained them on those field. In particular, you know, the person we wanted in more, and Phil ended up being the CFC data -- on the CFC data management.

So we work with Phil who was really great at setting up Airtable so that, you know, provide a helpful way for the members of the public to access the submissions. So we had to change how we were sending data to Phil, because one, initially when we developed the tool, we did not have any information on how the CFC is going to accept the submission.

So Jaime also mentioned that initially, when we deal -- we got feedback from the CFC, we collected information that were, you know, PII information that were private. And so we ended up having to remove those before they put -- we put it in Airtable.
Also, we send Phil, or to the CFC we sent another copy of that data that contain all the information without removing any personal identifiable information. So -- and also, we worked with (indiscernible) storing these data, as -- I think Jaime also mentioned that working at UC Berkeley, or being part of UC, there's a lot of bureaucracies, and some of these bureaucracies that I think they use for, given the kind of error where cybersecurity is a big issue, and we don't want to be a victim or, you know, I don't know, data being leaked out, or people are accessing information that they do not have the right to access. So in every step for our sending data to CFC, we have to make sure that all the security protocols and policies were met and satisfied before we can send the data.

So we send data to CFC. We send share files, PDF, and (indiscernible) files. And those are the data that we already removed the personal identifiable information, and send them at the database, which contained all the data that we, you know, we collected from the tool. And so on our end, we send every -- everything that we collected to CFC.

One thing we don't know is what amount of -- if the commissioner had -- what kind of view they had Airtable, because we send everything to CFC data management team.
So that is it. We send everything we had on our end on a timely manner, and we have a few things that we learned during this process.

One, it would be nice if in the future, we know what kind of a format or how the CFC is going to accept this data, so we can build into the process, because when we are already in the development and then halfway. Or like at some point, we hear what the CFC want the file, what format they want, it's hard to sometimes adjust because we were already in the development.

So in the future, if -- you know, at the beginning that becomes part of the process, it will make it easier for us to send data and go through all these required standards. You know, getting all the security clearance, making sure that all the policies and all the security requirements are met before, you know, we have to send in the other ways. We may have another delay.

All right. And then with that, I'm going to pass to Seth who is going to talk more about -- he might end up touching a few of the things that I said, and others.

Thank you.

MR. NEILL: Thank you, Linus, and hello, commissioners. Thank you again for having us here to talk about -- about the -- the access tools and the data.

So as Linus mentioned, all I'm going to talk about
the ownership of the tools and the data. A lot of the
points I'll be touching on have been addressed a little
bit by Karin, and Jaime and Linus, but I'm going to focus
a bit more on the ownership questions.

So to reiterate Statewide Database as part of
Berkeley Law, and so our work product is owned by UC
Berkeley. That also means, as Linus mentioned, that we
have to comply with rules and regulations, including
security measures around data, and in our work in
general.

In the development of these access tools, our access
was, of course, on functionality, and also, on making
sure that the data that we were gathering could be
transmitted to the Commission. Ownership was not a
question that we were actively looking at development
since from our point of view, the dataset was always
something that was going to be a publicly available one
that would be shared and handed off from us and made
public. And so that could certainly be a lesson learned
to add a bit more focus or consideration into these kinds
of questions.

For -- so as I mentioned, we are -- we follow the UC
regulations around the - any data that we collect or work
with. So that would apply to the data we transfer, as
well as the security on both our servers, and any other
servers that we are sending data with personally
identifiable information included in it. So because of
that, we did have to work with the Commission to make
sure that the data storage setup met the different
requirements from the University of California and
Statewide Database. That we also have to follow when
working with that kind of data.

There were some other requests along the way that we
weren't able to fulfill, because of the same
requirements. Things like, for example, earlier on in
working with USTR, one of the members of their team asked
for access to our servers, which was not something -- the
kind of access we're able to provide just due to the
different security issues. And that's a level of access
that not everyone on our team has, either.

So but in general, or just going back to the data
that we were collecting, CRC did receive all the data
that we collected with the tools. We did not withhold
any data. And as Jaime mentioned, we collected some
specific pieces of data at the request of the Commission.
For example, those IP addresses. And if there were
commissioners who didn't have access to all parts of that
data, maybe including personally identifiable
information, that may be a matter of policy or of the
functioning of the Airtable or the different views of
Airtable. But that data was transferred whenever it came in.

Also, there are no other outside groups or individuals, including the legislature, had access to any data until they were transmitted to the Commission and then made public. The CFC owns all the data that they have, or that you have, with which is the same data that -- the same the database has. And it remains true that no other outside individuals and groups, including the legislature, have access to the data in any way other than through the Commission's website.

The redistricting tools are still available online, so that data is accessible to the users through their own accounts. And is also archived securely in accordance with UC policies that cover all Statewide Database data. And we are not using that data for any other purpose and sending it to the Commission for the redistricting.

UC, University of California, does own the tools, which means that we at Statewide Database can maintain them. Members of the public have been using them to participate in local redistricting processes, and the tools will continue to be available for people who want to participate in CVRA District things, and/or to learn about redistricting in general for educational purposes.

One other note is that open source software is a
separate question for making the data that's captured by tools publicly available, or management of that data, that may be collected. And of course, we'll continue to evaluate other opportunities to bring transparency to these kinds of access tools or in future cycles.

In terms of overall recommendations, as mentioned by Linus, it could be very valuable to have the data management team earlier in the process, so that issues around data management and storage can be worked out, communicated around, so that the Commission can securely receive data in its preferred format as soon as possible.

And to that end, Statewide Database could also identify infrastructure needs and time lines for the CRC to be able to receive data to allow for easier coordination with that team. And along with that, of course, technology can also change a lot over the course of a decade. So there may be other opportunities to revisit these kinds of questions, and look at them in terms of the technologies that may -- that we might not be expecting, or thinking about, or planning for, that might enter the scene between now and the next decade.

So thank you, and I'll hand it back to Karin at this point.

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah, thanks so much, Jaime, Linus and Seth. Really appreciate you guys. And just wanted
to wrap up by saying that from our perspective, we think it's been really beneficial for the State of California to have our two independent redistricting organizations with, you know, you obviously fulfilling your mandate. And congratulations again to redraw the federal and state lines while Statewide Database ensures access to data, not only for you, the Commission, but also very importantly to the general public, local jurisdictions who are really heavy data users, and then, you know, everybody else, really. Lots of researchers, and you know, academics, students and so forth.

I think that from our experience, the ongoing collaboration between our two groups has been great. It's -- you know, it ensures transparency, and it ensures that transparency remains a cornerstone of the process. You know, the fact that Statewide Database was able to bring in decades of experience on how to make the data, you know, complex data as accessible as possible while the CRC really pushed to put an emphasis on, for example, expanding language access. I think that really benefited everybody.

And you know, again, as database and software development is obviously a multi-year, very complex process. And we're looking forward to your feedback on what tools and functionalities we're most helpful, and
what ended up being less important than anticipated. And
you know, we're looking forward to the lessons learned.
And that's it for us. Thank you. We're here for
questions.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you. And again, I'm going to
try to keep us going on time. So if commissioners could
keep their questions direct and brief, and same for
responses for our guests. I want to make sure that we
get to our other two presentations before 12:45. We may
extend into 1 o'clock.

Commissioner Fornaciari, Andersen, and Yee?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So as far as PII goes, was
that a bottom? I mean, is there a lesson learned that we
should consider? I mean, I don't -- so I don't know if
you guys know the answer to this, but I'm just throwing
it out there for the lessons learned team. That maybe
we ought to look at the PII that we asked to capture.
Did we use it all? Is it -- did we need it? And is it a
bottleneck to our challenge for you know, working

[continued]
weren't really planning on capturing that much PII. And then at the request of the Commission, we ended up, of course, capturing more of it. And sort of due to that, there was a UC policy that -- or a UC -- yeah, a UC policy that needed an agreement that we had to work with the Commission on. But also, there were some bottlenecks just in terms of the way that the Commission's data storage was set up. So for example, initially the way -- and I think maybe, yeah, I think the way that the Shapefiles were being stored on your server was sort of private by obscurity. So in the same way that your documents in Google Drive are private, because nobody knows the URL. It was something similar to that. And so we couldn't send you, for example, our Shapefiles with all of the attributes that were collected. So all of the IP addresses, and people's email addresses, and their names. We couldn't just send that to you, and then have them posted where it was planning to be posted. So we then, you know, developed stripping all of that PII out of the Shapefiles before it was sent to you.

Additionally, we did do a huge database dump every time that we exported any of the submissions to you. So that was on a daily basis. So the Commission itself, like the California Redistricting Commission, has all of that data, and I don't know the extent to which
commissioners ended up actually using it, or that
individual commissioners even had access to that
information, or have access to that information at this
time. So to my knowledge, Commission didn't end up
actually using that data, but we did collect it at your
request.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you.

Commissioner Andersen and Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, thank you for that
explanation, Jaime. That was very good. And I
personally like that I don't have access to that, to my
knowledge of it, but again, and I do recall the whole
classification of it was to check -- the reason why we
asked for it all was to check, you know, are these real
people? You know, are they coming in from other
countries, all this sort of stuff. And then we didn't
really use it to my understanding. But I have other
questions.

Number one is -- and Karin, this goes back to the
budget, and how Statewide Databases gave their money. So
when the Legislature wants you to do the tools, and they
said, okay, great. So they put extra money for this in
the statewide budget. But if you are getting your money
from the UC system, then did they allocate that to UC to
go directly to you, or did that go into kind of this -- a
general UC overall, and eventually you might have seen
something kind of trickle down eventually, or -- you
know, I'm wondering how that how that happened.

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah, thank you for that question.
Commissioner Andersen, I could probably write a book
about that topic, honestly. So the answer is it's a
mixture of both. So some of it was actually earmarked,
and usually like permanent allocation is not. That's
just part of the UC budget. And then, you know, you just
kind of have to keep your fingers crossed, and make a lot
of phone calls, and send a lot of emails. Sometimes it's
easier to get funding through that process than others.

So for this one, because it was a mandate, there was
actually a line item, I think, items in there. I'd have
to look it up. I can send it to you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: All right. Thank you.

MS. MAC DONALD: But that's not usual. That's not
usually how we get funded. Yeah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Thank you. I have
two quick questions. One is, you know, we talked about
the archival. UC's archival policy, and all this data,
that is in perpetuity. Is that correct? There was no
purge involved at UC, you know, as far as the data that
you have collected that Statewide Database collects.

That is -- there's no -- at no point does that get
dumped?

MS. MAC DONALD: I think that's a question, perhaps for Seth. I will just tell you that for us, the most important thing was just to make sure that there was a backup in case something goes wrong on your end. Just so that these data are even there. So you could rebuild. Because you remember one of the lessons that we learned that was not in the report from the 2011 Commission was that their website failed. You know, they lost all of their data. So we're like, okay, we're just going to make sure that there's a backup just in case, because you just don't know, you know?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, that's why I'm wondering if Seth wants to --

MS. MAC DONALD: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- answer that about as you know, we heard there was a lot of information that went in from the 2010 Commission to get to us, but it got dumped in seven years. So we didn't get it. So I'm just wondering about any of that. Is that an issue?

MR. NEILL: Yeah, thank you for the question. I can respond to that. The University of California has a data retention schedule. And so, for example, for most documents, I think would be two years or something along those lines. And so it is not in perpetuity a
retention schedule.

MS. MAC DONALD: And having said that, that those are minimum standards, if I may weigh in, Seth. And honesty for us, it's not a big cost. We can basically, if there was this Commissioner Fornaciari probably knows this, there was this Amazon server thing called the Glacier --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Um-hum.

MS. MAC DONALD: -- where you really put things on ice, literally, you know, it doesn't cost lot. So you know, we can save things on Glacier, you know, for longer than that. So yeah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. The reason I'm saying that is I'm assuming that Statewide Database, you know, in terms of your, you know, you have to go back ten years from the census. So I'm assuming that most of your data is a ten or twenty year time frame.

MS. MAC DONALD: Our data, we have data back, you know, to the early 90s. So yeah, because if you look at the dataset, you know, the dataset actually spanned more than ten years, we went all the way back. Yeah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay, thank you.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you so much.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Actually, sorry, I have one last question to --
MS. MAC DONALD: Commissioner Andersen, can you please keep your questions brief? We have two other panels to get to in twenty minutes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, thank you. It's to update the tools. Is that an ongoing process, or is that something we would -- the Commission should maybe ask for in budget wise to make sure that the CRC and the Statewide Database can work on in like, two years before, like the last couple of time frames to get ready for the 2030?

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah, I think that will be a good recommendation to maybe get together a couple of years before and check in and see what the state of the art is at the time, and what could be done. And then also collaborate on potential budget items. That's a great idea. Thank you.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, I'll pass for the sake of time, but I really appreciate the Statewide Database.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you. Appreciate you, Commissioner Yee.

All right. Thanks so much to our Statewide Database team. With that, let us move over to data management. So I think Marcy, sorry. Director Kaplan, did you have something?
DIRECTOR KAPLAN: I don't know if this -- whether this is coming up or if this is later. I know the prisoner reallocation that was done and the time frame that that took. I know the Commission has talked about the time line for 2030. I don't know if this is the time to just hear a little bit more about that. If there's, you know, just the time frame it took from when the state got the census data to when the Commission was able to utilize. And if there are recommendations or other work that the Statewide Database does ongoing over the ten years, or opportunities for the Commission to look at additional support to expedite that process for 2030, should there not be an opportunity to get a later deadline if this is the time to talk about or not. So I just wanted to flag that.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: The Statewide Database team, do you have any brief thoughts on prisoner reallocation processes that you might make recommendations on?

MS. MAC DONALD: Thank you for that question. Could I please -- I'm not really prepared for that. I have a lot of thoughts on that topic, and it's going to blow your time line for today. So if I may just get some time and maybe come back to talk about that some other time, I think there would be, I think, better -- better prepared. Thank you.
MS. MAC DONALD: Great, thanks. Okay. Thanks so much to our guests who are waiting. Let's move to data management. I will hand it to Tony and Paul from our data management team.

MS. ANTONOVA: Hello. Hi. It's good to see all of your faces. Thank you for inviting us to speak. I wanted to apologize in advance. I'm a bit sick, so my voice might be a little weak.

But yeah, I'll just -- I'll jump in with a quick introduction. I'm Toni. As you all know, I'm the data manager for the CRC on staff for the CRC. And Paul will also be joining us, and he's the data analyst also on staff at the CRC.

Our team was quite a bit larger. We had some students that helped us, and contractors as well, and have the size of the team and who worked on what kind of varied throughout the whole process. I guess I'll give a little bit of a high-level overview of how we collected and ingested a couple of different data types. And then I'll jump into some thoughts about the future.

Yeah. We had a couple of different, you know, kind of categories of data. I think as a team, we typically thought of the spatial data as its own category. So that's everything that came from the Statewide Database, from the (indiscernible) community tool, the district map
drawing tool, QGIS, and so on. And occasionally, you know, attachments sent directly to the CRC that contained Shapefiles.

I’d say a second category of data was nonspatial data that we received digitally. So it’s emails, form submissions. In one case, we got an entire file of YouTube videos. So things like that.

And I’d say a third bucket, basically analog formats. So any letters, or the paper COI that we received. We handled each one of these differently, and the process for ingesting it, and it changed and stream -- to be more streamlined throughout the months that we worked. You know, when we started, we had in office staff essentially upload all the data to some tabs on the website. And then my team pulled all of that semi manually, you know, with some maybe automations to make it quicker. We pulled all of that into Airtable.

We also did some, kind of like, manual downloading of spatial data that we received from the Draw My community tool at the very onset to pull that into Airtable. You know, and as we worked throughout the months, we could have optimized each one of these processes.

So for spatial data coming in from the tools, we had the help of Phil, who was a contractor and I think
initially worked with the CRC for you -- from the organization USDR. He was mainly in charge of kind of like automating the ingestion of data from Statewide Database on Amazon into Airtable. And he worked on creating some programmatic scripts that I could run manually. But every day that would just bulk upload everything that people had submitted on the websites into Airtable.

The end goal there was to have that be a fully automated process that I didn't need to be involved in at all. We never reached that point. I still had to essentially press a couple of buttons every day to get that bulk upload going.

For the second category of nonspatial data that we received digitally, we at some point moved almost entirely to using Airtable forms on the CRC website that directly populated the public submission and Airtable. And the more forms that were used and the more forms we made available online, I think the more the public began submitting through those forms as opposed to through email. I think that was a big turning point for us. That was the point at which we were able to essentially make the Airtable, more or less, live, because the majority of the input we were receiving was through these forms that would automatically kind of filter into
Airtable.

The third category of letters and paper COI. Of course, there's not much to do in automation there. We had in office staff scanning those in bulk, usually sending me a folder, which I would upload in bulk to Airtable. Those pieces of data -- this data, or those submissions were the hardest to process. You know, I had staff essentially copy pasting the submission into Airtable as much as they could, so that the commissioners had like an easy way to read the text that didn't involve opening the attachment. But for a lot of them, especially handwritten ones, that was impossible.

To jump into just some thoughts I have about, I guess, things that would have made the data management process go more smoothly, I think something that was mentioned earlier, also by Statewide Database, is just to hire data staff earlier in the process.

When Paul and I came on board we already had kind of a backlog of things to do, and the tools were already largely chosen. That's Airtable and AWS. I think, like, hiring data staff earlier and having that data staff be involved in the actual structuring of the data management process and processes would be super helpful.

I would even consider hiring data management staff that is solely in charge in ingestion, and I guess, like,
data collection, data processing, and cleanup. And then separately having a team in charge of analysis, because our team was in charge of both, more or less, and often we didn't actually have the capacity to do any meaningful or useful analysis for the Commission to use. And by analysis, like, you know, of course it could get really complicated, but I mean even simpler things like providing an overview of, you know, high-level topics that are being discussed. You know, I think that's something that we found hard to do with the rest of what we were tasked with.

Yeah. A couple things I think, you know, that would be helpful, if the data staff is involved very early on is, one, just an understanding and fully automating the ingestion process from the very beginning. We were always improving things, and those improvements require different levels in engineering knowledge.

I myself am an engineer, so it was very easy to take contractor Phil's work and run it every day. I think had someone on the team not had engineering knowledge, that would have been close to impossible. And then that would have been a huge bottleneck to actually getting everything from the COI tool into their table, or anywhere else.

I think, like, more clearly defining maybe the roles
of Statewide Database to line drawers to data management at the very onset would have been really helpful. I found that we -- we kind of toggled different responsibilities that sometimes, you know, overlapped with each of those teams.

Having like -- have, like, a data engineer on staff working that were embedded with Statewide Database at the very onset I think would help -- would help us architect a more, like, automated ingestion process from the onset. And maybe having an analyst, you know, that's on staff and embedded with the line drawers would -- would allow us to provide more meaningful insight.

And with that in mind, I think in separating those two, and the Commission can think about hiring people who have perhaps academic experience doing both of those things, it's quite a -- it could be quite a -- like, even just labeling topics that you find in the COI submissions that are being discussed.

You know, we were doing that a bit freehand, but I think someone with academic experience doing research on, you know, a topic that's similar to redistricting would be able to do that in a much more organized way from the onset. And same with -- same with the data engineering and ingestion aspects. There are people whose professions, you know, are solely focused on that. And
so having someone responsible for that aspect entirely
from the onset I think would be helpful.

I'm reading my notes here.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: If there are -- maybe I can start
the process of inviting questions for commissioners. As
a time check, we're scheduled to go to lunch in five
minutes. I am guessing that we might be able -- I think,
technically, we can go until 1:15, but that only gives a
15-minute lunch. So let's do this. Let's go until --
plan to go until 1 o'clock and -- yeah, let's go to 1
o'clock. Again, if I could ask commissioners to be -- to
be brief with their questions, that would be great, so we
can make sure that we get our line drawer perspective at
least part of this conversation.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: So yeah.

Toni, thank you so much. Thank you -- and Paul,
thank you for your hard work. And this is great
feedback. I'm hoping you're kind of capturing this,
like, in an outline for us, because I think some of this
is a little complex to just kind of digest.

But one of the things that I'd like, if you could,
you know, kind of think about and maybe give us, in a
narrative form somehow, is, you know, what -- what do we
need to hire -- you know, what skillsets need to be hired
ahead of time, you know, data skillsets right to work
with the Statewide Database, and then what can wait until
the next Commission maybe is seated? Because it sounds
like, you know, we probably need to get the data part of
it going sooner than certainly we were able to. So thank
you.

MS. ANTONOVA: Yeah, of course. Thank you for the
question. And I definitely have written kind of an
outline of notes that I can send and share with Alvaro,
and he can share it with you all.

I -- let me think -- essentially, at the onset, I
think -- I mean, it -- you know, the Statewide Database
and the line drawers did provide analysis and data
ingineering to a certain capacity. So it's very possible
that they can take on some of these tasks themselves.

I'm not sure how, you know, the organizational --
how much the organizational structure allows for what and
where. But I think, for example, Phil provided data
engineering experience. I think having someone like him
on staff full time would be really helpful, with their
heads just focused on the data ingestion and collection
aspect, and building tools for that.

I think someone like Paul could have been also
focused full time essentially on figuring out ways to
summarize the data. You know, I think at the very
beginning it would have been helpful to hear from the
Commission, you know, what is the purpose of collecting
this data, you know, beyond providing public input. But
like, what does the Commission want to know, and you
know, we can start with that question and from there
figure out how to get those answers.

Something, you know, we, I think, as a team wish we
had more foresight to do earlier on is actually code the
data, which for us meant label it with different tags.
That's a really, like, easy way to just look on maps to
see what topics are being talked about in different
regions. But because we didn't start off doing that at
the onset, there's just such a huge backlog of it later
on, and so much work and time spent on just managing the
ingestion of this new wave of data that it was hard to
make -- to make that provide meaningful insights.

But if, you know, if Paul, for example, from the
very onset had just been focused on designing like a
hierarchy of labels that would provide the Commission
answers to their questions, I think by, you know,
November a lot of those questions could have potentially
been answered. And it -- yeah.

So I guess, like, that's kind of how the two
different responsibilities, I think kind of like
specialists could have been hired for. And the two teams
don't even necessarily need to work together. I think typically -- I know typically in tech -- in tech organizations and -- that those are kind of like separate capacities.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thank you. Toni, I know I interrupted you as you were making sure that you had made all of your points here, so I'll give you this opportunity to say if there are any additional points you want to make sure that we internalize.

MS. ANTONOVA: I guess -- I mean, I mentioned, you know, coding. And I guess I just wanted to, like, underscore the importance of that in my opinion. You know, I think it -- during our processes, you know, it ended up being on the Commission to largely read through the data and ingest data from different regions of California.

I really do think, at the very least, having someone solely in charge of data categorization and labeling from the onset, having staff doing that for every submission coming in at the onset, would have provided, like, such a clear view of what's going on with not too much complicated work, you know, needed.

That's something that Paul and I started doing at the end, and actually Paul has created kind of a very interesting and detailed hierarchy of labels after the
Commission submitted the maps. And I -- yeah, essentially, like, I think focusing on that piece, which we really didn't at the beginning, would have -- would have been really, really helpful for the Commission.

MR. MITCHELL: Can --

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Oh, sorry. Go ahead.

MR. MITCHELL: Yeah, sorry, Toni. I just wanted to put a second underscore under what Toni was just giving out, which was emphasizing, you know, basically, what is this data? Because we can get it all into a, you know, table and then you can see this table. But then the fundamental question becomes, you know, very simply, what is it? Like, is this a geographic comment? Is this a social interest or an economic interest?

And within those three areas, more specifically, you know, what is this applicable to? Is this spatial comment about a contiguity issue, or a split community, or something like that, et cetera? So there's lots of very weedy examples that we could throw at you right now.

But that -- I think what, you know, we wound up having here at the end was -- you know, we've got all the data, and it's clean and very nicely put together, and associated with attachments and spatial data, whether it's COI or you know, map attachments that people assume is graphics, et cetera. But the fundamental ability to
kind of mine the data I think is really where -- like, at
the very end of this, you know, we -- I think Toni and I
will be able to provide you with kind of a crosswalk type
table to try to explain what these attributes are.

And I think that that's something that I would
absolutely hand off to whoever the next, you know, data
analyst or data manager is coming into the job. It's
like, here's the kind of input you're going to receive,
and these are the kind of, you know, abilities and -- and
attributes that you can query, to then inform you, the
Commission, and -- and the public as to what exactly the
data is.

And Alvaro also here just pinged me something that
we should also mention, which was that we were running
the -- the map viewer, too. So this was kind of like an
ad hoc task that -- you know, for me it was, you know, a
first love, because I come from a GIS and a geographer
background.

So you know, sharing the work that the line drawers
were putting together, I think, is an imperative thing
that I would put on your list to, yeah, be something that
you guys -- and think it's very crucial. And there are
great tools now that don't necessarily require, I think,
a lot of very specialized people. You know, you can
bring the data -- spatial data into a viewer. And we're
updating this on a -- on a nearly daily basis through December.

So that was another, yeah, I think very important contribution that we're making, which was totally different, you know, obviously than processing data.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great.

MS. ANTONOVA: Just to -- I know we're --

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Can we make it a quick comment?

MS. ANTONOVA: Yeah. I know we're really running out of time, but just a quick comment. I do think though -- and I don't have an answer to how this would happen, but just like collaboration between the line drawers, Statewide Database, and data management staff, to the point of perhaps providing a single tool would be something I think that future Commissions should consider.

The forms that we provided to the public to submit their input are something that -- that essentially could have merged with the COI tool and the district drawing tool to be one digital place for a member of the public to submit anything that they would like. We spend a lot of time in the weeds trying to figure out how to handle data from all of these different sources, when I think, at least on the digital front, it all could have been one. And I -- yeah. And that's the --
CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great.

MS. ANTONOVA: -- last comment.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you so much. Yeah, thanks so much.

Commissioner Yee, did you have a quick question?

Great. Thanks so much. Make sure you get first in line -- I'll make sure you get first in line for our line drawers if you have questions.

Thanks so much to our data management team.

Appreciate it. And I know this probably will not be the last time we ask for your reflections on this process. So thanks again.

Okay. So nine minutes, we're going to do a rapid-fire download from our line drawers.

So Andrew, Karin, and Jaime are wearing their line drawer's hat. Yeah, let's -- let's jump in and we'll see how far we get in nine minutes.

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. Thank you so much again, Chair. Jaime and I received a long list of questions from Commissioner Yee. Thank you so much for sending those questions over. I think we could be very efficient just reading through our answers. And we can try to do that in, like, five minutes.

So I'm just going to start with the first one, which was general feedback. And I think our general feedback
will be that this is an -- this was an interesting, all
encompassing, and sometimes overwhelming process, and I
think that in the future, and as happened in the past,
anybody who takes on this job just really needs to
understand that that's going to be their life. And if
they have a lot of other clients hanging around on the
periphery, something is going to have to give, because,
essentially, I think, California redistricting, you have
to live it as a consultant, because it's just really --
it's all encompassing.

I think the CRC needs to understand that if you want
a certain level of service, you need to be able to pay
for it, and really put that into the budget. One of the
strengths of the '21 RFP, as compared to the one 2011 was
that it was focused on more than just the lowest cost.
And I think that may be more important even in '31 to
consider that so that you get somebody you really want to
work with, or the next Commission will. And you probably
should build in some assumptions into the contract that
you ask for additional deliverables, even though you may
not know what they are by the time you're, you know,
drafting the RFP. And with that, over to Jaime.

MS. CLARK: The next question was around whether
three rounds of visualization was the right number, or if
there should have been fewer or could have been fewer.
One idea is perhaps to start on the visualization process after the census data is released but before the official redistricting data set from Statewide Database is released.

Although, of course the Commission -- everybody would understand the data wouldn't necessarily be -- it wouldn't be the final data, and it might necessarily be accurate, depending on where incarcerated people are assigned in that initial data set that's released by the census. The Commission could get a sense of how many people live where, especially in around the visualizations that might include things like just understanding how many people are in different communities as opposed to try to draw district-sized visualizations.

It would also give the commissioners a chance to kind of get comfortable with how population is distributed throughout the state without kind of eating into their main -- to your main line drawing time, could potentially give you enough -- or give the next Commission enough wiggle room to do a second set of draft maps, if that's the wish of that Commission.

MS. MAC DONALD: The next question was about whether direction for visualization revisions could have been given more clearly. And we think maybe better consensus
early on about the purpose of each round of
visualizations would have been helpful. Like, for
example, this week we want to get the sense of how big
the COIs are, and next week we want to start dividing the
state into regions, and so forth.

Also, perhaps having some Commission discussion and
consensus on visualization requests when there's
obviously contradictory directions. Like, for example,
one person will say, I want to see phase A and B
together, and the next persons says, I want to see B and
C together, but all of this cannot be accomplished. So
yeah.

So line drawers become better at identifying those
as they come in -- or later in the process, once they've
drawn the areas over and over, of course. But anyway,
next. Back to you, Jaime.

MS. CLARK: Okay. The next question was around
mapper work load and how to avoid sort of extreme mapper
work load. An idea would be to make sure there's really
a clear sense of direction and consensus from the
Commission on what is to be done or certain goals before
line drawing even begins. That would allow for more
efficient use of line drawing time.

For example, some of the discussion or decisions
around section 2 were sort of late to be implemented in
terms of where section 2 districts were, how section 2
districts were to be implemented. And you know, even
just thinking about LA County, sort of like what the
overall shape of the districts would be, or overall goals
of the Commission. That was -- sort of ended up being
more clear later, and identifying that ahead of line
drawing would have been, I think, a big timesaver, and
probably a workload saver as well.

MS. MAC DONALD: The next question was about
generating PDFs and how that -- how that seemed to be a
lot of work for not a lot of benefits. And we agree
wholeheartedly. And we're hoping that there will be
better technology available in 2031 -- oh, my gosh, in
2031. Though, you know, one always has to obviously be
aware of options to avoid the digital divide.

MS. CLARK: And next was around mappers working with
Commissioners offline to develop ideas being very
helpful. We're glad that was helpful for you. How to
make such offline work more accessible to commissioners
and more efficient.

We think that building that process -- or building
that concept of, you know, small groups, like one
commissioner or one or two commissioners working offline
with mappers, sort of building that in as an assumption
rather than something that evolves over time. And then
that will allow issues -- or you know, decision points
even to sort of be surfaced in advance -- basically, to
be thought through in advance or -- and for individual
commissioners also that understand certain, for example,
population constraints in advance.

MS. MAC DONALD: Next question is about how the
mapping phase might have been different if you'd required
all the commissioners to learn and use GIS -- QGIS. And
we assume that the technology is going to be even more
friendly in the future and barriers are going to be
lower. But having said that, I really doubt that every
commissioner is going to want to learn QGIS. I think
it's asking a lot. And you're already being asked for a
lot. And you know, that will be an additional skill, I
guess, that you would have to incorporate in Commission
selection processes.

It would be helpful toward the end, I think, to be
able to do a little bit of GIS when you're trying to
identify some specific solutions to some of the
tradeoffs. And the risk, of course, is if you have QGIS
or something available to everybody in the beginning,
that everybody has, like, their perfect map, and then
you're starting to defend your own map. And we,
honestly, on the line drawing, we've all been there.

So it's like you have a map, it's the perfect
solution, and then you start to defend your map, rather than, you know, maybe being openminded and -- and actually working with everybody else on a solution.

MS. CLARK: Next question is should the Commission have taken a week early in the process to run a full, hands-on practice mapping exercise. Pardon me. Sure. Our answer was, sure. We did do that one back in training pretty early on, but certainly, you know, more time could have been spent preparing for line drawing during those initial couple months rather -- yeah, I think, sure.

MS. MAC DONALD: And the next one was, is there a better -- more clear and consistent approach to naming the draft districts, maybe counties and letters. And that will be -- our answer is that it depends on whether you think it's important to have some record of the evolution of the district over time, or whether the simplicity of naming it is more important.

You'd also need to ensure that any system doesn't bias Senate numbering or the (indiscernible). So that needs to be kept in mind. And also that a district that starts with county and then a letter may not end up as a district that is even touching that particular county. So just a little FYI.

MS. CLARK: And the next question was around clarity
up front, around what non-census data the mappers had available. For example, the submitted COIs. We did all have all of the COIs in our areas loaded onto the map and could have pulled those up at any time per Commission request.

So -- and also having the COIs delivered to us in GIS layer. GIS format was a huge step forward for the individual mappers versus 2011. And certainly figuring out how to make that data as useful as possible for discussion for commissioners, I think, would also really be part of sort of that evolution for 2031.

I think some of -- some of these questions also could have been probably flushed out with the line drawer subcommittee and communicated to the whole Commission that way also.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Team, I'm -- it's 1:01. I also have to step away shortly, so I -- I need to go to lunch. What do we want to do? We can, technically, go until 1:15. That gives us a 15-minute lunch. So how do we -- how do we want to -- yeah, Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I was just curious to hear from Andrew, since I don't think he wants to come back on the back side.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yeah. But I just want to know what folks want to do, because I need to step away. Do we
want another 15 minutes, or are you -- is everyone okay
doing a 15-minute lunch? Okay. With that, I need to
hand this over to my Vice Chair.

Thanks, Phil.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Thanks. Okay. Yeah,
did -- are the -- carry on with -- do you have more
questions to answer?

MS. MAC DONALD: Yes, we have a few more. Thank you
so much.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

MS. MAC DONALD: And then we can hand it off.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

MS. MAC DONALD: So the next one is -- and thank you
again to Commissioner Yee for this very thorough list of
questions.

So how about having further data visualizations, for
example, ACS, and income data, and so forth. So
reasonable people can disagree on more visualizations.
We heard you about, you know, maybe these visualizations,
there were too many of them. Honestly, the ACS data are
going to tell us less and less because of privacy issues,
and the data don't necessarily inform the criteria.

We could perhaps, you know -- or you could perhaps
look into types of informative maps for areas with little
public input. But you know, generally speaking, you have
to just be clear that you're looking at estimate data and want to make sure that estimate data that are nongranular and range data, that they don't speak over the public testimony of a, you know, neighborhood group or community group, because there may be some tension, and you know, the data may not correspond.

Next. Over to you, Jaime.

MS. CLARK: The next question was around adding printed large scale wall maps of drafts and final maps to the contract. And is probably apparent to everybody, the redistricting software is not built for this purpose. It -- the features in it -- you know, it's a lot more difficult than other software to create maps that are really pretty, legible, easy to understand.

So if you wanted to add that into the contract, then certainly, and who know where redistricting software is going to be in ten years, but I think, you know, with the caveat that the maps might not be beautiful.

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. And then the final question was, does it make sense to add post maps consulting to help the counties with the parcel splits into the CRC line drawer contract, or should this be left to the secretary of state. When we think that that would be a very important piece, actually, to add as an optional thing in case it comes up. Hopefully the census
geography will continue to improve, so it's not necessary. But I think the CRC could either do it yourself with your data management team, I don't know, or you need to be very explicit to seating that responsibility to someone else and then really getting somebody to take that on. Just to clarify that SOS is actually not responsible for that particular piece. I think they're responsible for some other pieces.

But also, anyone within the state bureaucracy is going to be pretty hesitant to look like they are modifying the CRC's adopted lines or to, in any way, interpret them. So I think that would be best left to the CRC. And that's what Jaime and I have and yeah, please, go ahead.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thank you.

Andrew?

MR. DRECHSLER: Hi, thank you, commissioners.

Thank you, Vice-Chair.

Just a couple of additional comments on, you know, just was thinking about thoughts and observations. Going back to Toni, I really want to heap a lot of praise onto her for everything that she did from the time she started to the time she got a lot, a lot, a lot of data up and running. It was a huge task and just going -- in talking about that just for a little bit, having her or that
position hired earlier on, I think would have been beneficial to the overall project.

She and Paul and the rest of the team did a great job getting all that data up and running. And map viewer. I think map viewer was very beneficial for the commissioners, for the public, for everybody involved in the process to be able to go in, click on the map, and go look at the previous lines, the current lines. So that was something that was very beneficial to the overall process.

And Airtable. Airtable, I think, provided a great benefit to the Commission, was able to be able to categorize, look up data quickly. I think technology's only going to get better in the next ten years. So something having the next Airtable, whether it is Airtable or the next version of Airtable, I think will be beneficial. Because I think that was something that would move that up on the timeline as well.

I know the data subcommittee had worked on that and looked at different options. But even if you could move that up sooner, I think that would be beneficial for everybody involved. So those were -- and one last comment I thought -- or just observation was making the Native American reservations as a COI. I think you, at one point, gave us direction across the board to treat
those as COIs and try to not split them where possible was helpful. And we paid close attention to that. I know in the southern part of the state, specifically where a vast majority of them are, that was helpful in giving us that direction early on in knowing not to do that. So that was helpful. Yeah. And with that, I mean, we're into your lunch. So if you have any questions available to answer them.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thank you.

Thank you all for that.

Let's see, so we do have a few minutes. I'm going to, being the generous chair I am, we're actually going to take a half hour for lunch and come back at 1:45 so. You know me, nothing but generosity in the chair seat.

So with that, let's go ahead and ask any questions, if you have any follow-ups for our line drawing team? And I hope it's okay that we're keeping you all late, too, so sorry about that.

Commissioner Sinay and then Andersen.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm kind of still on the fence on commissioners working one-on-one with the line drawers, just because on the one hand, it is more efficient and effective. But on the other hand, is that working outside of the public eye.

And I know you mentioned it a little bit, but not
necessarily with that kind of lens of how -- anyway. If
I could hear from all three of you, because I know each
of you probably have a different perspective on how that
worked.

MS. MAC DONALD: Yeah. I'm happy to start with
that.

Thank you so much, Commissioner Sinay. It's nice to
see you. And thanks for that question.

I think absolutely it's efficient. And I think that
as long as you keep things transparent in terms of coming
back and then reporting fully to the entire Commission
what just happened, we tried something out, this does not
work and here is why, I think that particular piece can
be integrated very effectively, perhaps, into the overall
process.

I just think it's that eye on transparency and
reporting back to everybody to bring everybody up to
speed. And so to make sure that everybody's on the same
page.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Jaime?

MS. CLARK: Yeah. Thank you.

And if I can just piggyback off of that, I think
it's also really helpful just from like a being a mapper,
right, like a mapper perspective to then also be able to
have individual commissioners come back to the full
Commission. And when there's a question like, well, how come you did it like that? Why didn't you try these two cities or moving the line here, then the commissioner can sort of say, we did look at that, and this is the reason why for the population it didn't work, or this other COI ended up getting split, or whatever the reason would be can be really helpful just as a mapper who's also a human trying to remember a bunch of stuff, remember a bunch of moves you tried to make. Having somebody else to help keep track for you.

But also I think it can help to -- yeah, I don't know. I think it can just sort of help in terms of building trust amongst commissioners with the public to commissioners. And yeah, we also really appreciate, I guess, all of those interactions too. Just wanted to say that as well.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thanks, Jaime.

Andrew?

MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. I really agree with Jaime and Karin, everything they said. And I think there are some nuances that I think when the mappers were working one-on-one with the commissioners I think helped overcome some of those nuances. But emphasizing the need for transparency, coming out of those sessions talking about what was done and why it was done, I think is, of course,
very important.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

Commissioner Andersen, just have a couple of minutes left. So --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: -- go ahead.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Just a couple idea -- I'd like to, again, everyone sort of put their comments in. We heard from, I don't know if you guys were on to hear this, but Toni sort of mentioned moving ahead, the idea of forward, 2030, trying to get this involved with the data management system, the Statewide Database, and also line drawing ahead of where it was before.

And with that in mind, they actually mentioned about one, how long do you think that should happen ahead of time with developing tools also then in terms of working with the line drawer. And in the embedded, she actually mentioned about like having from the CRC, like a data engineer quote embedded with the Statewide Database in terms of getting the access flowing back and forth to the Statewide Database.

And then a data analyst kind of quote embedded with the line drawers who are actually like, yeah, we need this, this, this, and this what don't have. Could you
guys kind of comment on that idea, the pros and cons?

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: So we don't have the Statewide Database with us right now. We have (indiscernible) with us right now. But we can get --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: True.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: -- that question to the Statewide Database and get some feedback on that. We have --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: -- I mean, we have to be crystal clear on this --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: -- right? They're not --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: They --

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: -- representing the Statewide Database right now.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: True. And that's -- yeah. But so for the line drawer, then, straight line drawer --

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Straight, yeah.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- let me modify my question, in --

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah, no, I think the question's clear from what the lines drawer part of it is, Jane.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.
VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Or Commissioner Andersen.

Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, okay. The reason I'm saying this is because we have the benefit of both, a little connection with Statewide Data and line drawing. And I don't think -- I mean, there's a chance of that not happening in the future.

And in terms of writing a proposal for a straight line drawer, one of the things you think, wow, they really need to know ahead of time, because otherwise the CRC could be really out of luck. So I would think the embed question --

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Okay. Well, we'll go in reverse order.

I'll start with Andrew this time.

MR. DRECHSLER: Yeah. I'll publicly say that I think more collaboration between all sides, data, the tools, and the mapper, I think makes sense. I think more collaboration is always better so. Whether or not that person is embedded or not, that's a question, I think, for the Statewide Database.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Jaime?

MS. CLARK: I hope I'm understanding the question correctly. And in terms of analyzing the data, I believe, Commissioner Andersen, you said having a data
analyst embedded with the line drawers. I guess the question is sort of like what exactly did you want to be analyzed? Is that about grouping the data? Is it about finding sort of holes in the data? I think that a lot of that could potentially be accomplished with, again, sort of like using the map viewer. Maybe having a map viewer that instead of points had area so then there's more -- you can like see exactly where there's overlap and where there's not overlap.

And then it also kind of brings up this question the Commission maybe is dealing with around how do you balance the basically having like a form that's sent in with the same comment over and over and over again versus a single comment from one person who might not have capacity or their community doesn't have a ton of like advocacy infrastructure built in.

So I think that the collaboration that we did have with the data management team was successful. Definitely the data management team was awesome, had a mammoth task and did it very well.

And yeah, aside from that, I'm not sure that I necessarily understand the question, but that is my response.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: So we are overtime on our break.
So Karin, if you could just be super brief, that would be awesome. I expect that we will have more opportunity to interact with our state -- our line drawing team, sorry, and the Statewide Database too.

MS. MAC DONALD: So thank you.

And Jaime answered for both of us. And just wanted to say that Toni and Paul were heaven-sent, and we really appreciated working with them. And Toni, I just, if that wasn't clear before, let it be clear now, you guys were great. It's very difficult, I think, for a data management team to come in; they don't usually know anything about redistricting. So for the line drawers, they need to bring the data management team up to speed on what is needed. And basically just getting that data management team in early, making sure that the roles are clearly defined, making sure there's good communication and plenty of opportunity for communication is going to just make this whole thing run even smoother than it did.

And again, Toni and Paul, thumbs way up. You guys came in and you had an incredible amount of work. And we really appreciate you. So thanks for coming up to speed so quickly.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Well, thank you all for all your hard work and your team. Thank the team for us. We thank you for being here. Sorry to cut this off, but we
are late for our break.

And so we'll be back, we'll take lunch, take a half hour for lunch, and we'll be back at 1:49. Take care.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 1:18 p.m. until 1:50 p.m.)

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Welcome back, California.

Thank you for joining us. We are into our afternoon session -- after lunch session recapping next steps.

We have a special guest, a 2010 Commissioner Ancheta has joined us to give us some of his -- well, I think I'm stealing Ray's thunder -- or Commissioner Kennedy's thunder. I'll turn it over to him.

Sorry about that.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: That's all right, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Yes, we're very fortunate to have with us Commissioner Angelo Ancheta from the 2010 California Citizens Redistricting Commission.

Commissioner Ancheta had responded quite quickly to my initial invitation. Unfortunately, we were in the midst of the email switchover, and his timely reply to me ended up in our junk mail box that I didn't find for a couple of weeks.

So we unfortunately weren't able to make arrangements to have him with us earlier in this lessons
learned process. But he's been gracious enough to join us today.

We've asked him to kind of focus his remarks on the differences that he sees between the 2010 process, the 2020 process, and how lessons learned from both might benefit the 2030 Commission.

But I've asked him to feel free to address any other issues. We shared with him the list of topic prompts that we had prepared for the lessons learned discussion. So I am happy to turn it over to him.

Commissioner Ancheta.

MR. ANCHETA: Well, good afternoon. Thank you for inviting me. So a belated congratulations on completing the map. I haven't had a chance to talk to anybody from the Commission or the staff since doing the map, so great work.

And I think it's also great that you're going through those lessons learned process. We did various things on Commission (indiscernible) sort of postmortem analyzes, developing legislation. But we didn't really go into it as thoroughly as you have been doing, sort of looking at ways to help the next Commission.

We did do a set of surveys and produced a compilation of recommendation, but was not quite as structured as well as you're doing it. I think it's
great that you're (indiscernible) process.

So just a couple of disclosures. So I'm also speaking as a former commissioner. Some of you may know, I was sort of helping with the Commission as the last chair of the 2010 Commission.

But starting in May of last year, I was working with (indiscernible) census and redistribution of the -- as a legal advisor. So I kind of went radio silent at that point, more of a background person helping that coalition so.

Today that representation is (indiscernible). So today I'm just sort of speaking on my own. And I'm not trying to represent all the former commissioners, but wanted to sort of give you a flavor and some sense of what I've been watching.

And I do have a pretty good background in terms of what you did between the line drawing process. And I've been paying attention to some of the lessons learned discussions. So I'm pretty much up on a lot of the stuff. But I'm certainly not saying that I know everything that's going on or has been going.

So what I wanted to do is just sort of quickly just remind folks of what happened in 2010, just over a calendar. You're going through a multi-track process it seems like now where you looking at both legislation,
lessons learned, things to sort of put together for the next Commission.

So one thing I would just suggest upfront is that you not try to rush any legislative stuff through. You do have a spot fill that's available to you. That's great to have because it moves legislation fairly quickly.

But particularly if you're still sort of working through some of the priorities and trying to find out which ones are the ones you really want to get behind, and especially if you're looking for Constitutional (indiscernible) which are a whole other animal, I don't think you need to rush it. I wouldn't worry that you happen to have a spot (indiscernible). You can certainly work it through. And you certainly want to work with some of your potential supporters and you want to check with the auditor's office in terms of their scheduling in those (indiscernible).

So again, sort of a reminder, I'm not trying to replicate what's available in the League of Women Voters' report from 2013 or those recommendations that the Commission put together, this sort of frame where we were in terms of the work we did. And I think it seems to be interesting because the question seems to keep coming up is, how did you guys do it in less than seven months? I
think that's a kind of -- how in the world did you do it?

And the short answer to that is, well, we did it because we didn't have a choice, right? Those are the (indiscernible), right?

So when you work with that set of deadlines, you try to figure out what can we actually accomplish in this very tight period, and you try to scale appropriately.

Now, that doesn't mean we didn't make a lot of mistakes or that we didn't, at least initially, be overambitious. We set a lot of really wild goals upfront because we didn't know what we were doing a lot of the time, because we were setting up the Commission for the first time. We didn't know how much input we were going to get. We knew we had to finish some maps.

And we decided to do some draft maps in the interim so. And at the time, that wasn't actually in the statute. So you didn't have to draw a draft map.

So the calendar is pretty tight and we set up the infrastructure and the hiring in January. The full Commission was seated at beginning of January.

The ED, the executive director, actually happened the RFP -- not the RFP, but the job announcement had actually been out earlier by the Secretary of State's Office. Secretary of State was dealing with the transition, not the (indiscernible) case.
And things moved pretty briskly in terms of hiring, establishment of committees, various kinds of structures (indiscernible) place.

And as you're well aware, lots of different (indiscernible) contract getting things started. So that's not something unique to any one commission. They're all going to be dealing with that start up problem.

And really a lot of rookies. You're talking about state government, right? I think Commissioner Fernandez has been with the state government for a while; that helps a lot. None of us had a lot of experience with state government. We did have a lot of experience with federal and local.

So if you look at the calendar, we set up input hearings. Census data came out in March. Very ambitious set of hearing, well over twenty hearings initially. If you look at some of the transcripts, crazy numbers we put out initially. Eighty hearing was actually broached as a target, one for each assembly District. Obviously not a feasible process.

But we put in quite a bit of time and quite a bit of effort to have them spread across the state. Now, that's obviously a big difference given the COVID constraints, if you've dealt with that, you weren't able to go out and
actually meet people. And that's a lot of fun. That's
really one of the big fun parts of the job is going to
places and traveling and actually meeting.

So part of what you have to figure out is, well, how
is the next Commission going to process all of that in
terms of live meetings, in-person meetings, and hybrid
meetings, okay?

So we did contracting for the VRA attorney, the VRA
consultant. We saved a little bit of time because we use
an interagency agreement for the RFP, or rather the RPV
analysis. We had Dr. Barreto, who was at the time at
University of Washington (indiscernible). So we saved a
little bit of time there in terms of contracting.

We made the mistake, in my opinion, of releasing a
first draft map without sufficient RPV analysis. And we
got called on it. That's something no Commission should
do. All right. Don't release a draft without getting
the VRA districts together.

And then we proceeded to, at that point, to try to
get a second draft going at some point in July. We
didn't get to that point, but there was actually a second
draft. But we did put together a lot of visualization.
So there was an iterative process similar to what you
did.

And we had to finish our map basically by July 31st,
since we had a 14-day posting (indiscernible). So it is around six months after terms of finishing the map and then getting the report to them.

We had extra requirements. We had pre-clearance requirements under the VRA. So we had to submit the maps and the report to the DOJ. And that was ultimately certified January of the following year.

We were sued multiple times. There were two lawsuits in state court going to the maps themselves. One in federal court. One lawsuit dealt with the referendum, use of the Senate maps. All of those were dismissed.

And then there was a referendum in 2012, which was approved by about seventy percent with twenty-eight, twenty-nine percent (indiscernible). So that's the completion of a map in a nut shell.

Now, we did go through a process of analyzing inflation (indiscernible). We had a bit more time after certification to work that through. So you're actually pretty far ahead of us in terms of thinking about legislation, which is why I would suggest maybe slowing down a bit and thinking about the package that you want to produce for the legislature.

We did started doing postmortem analyses. And at some point, you just come to the realization that you're
downsizing, right? And that's a big part of what you have to figure out over the next few months is, well, what are we going to do over the rest of the term, and what can we do realistically in terms of actual activities and staff (indiscernible). So it's a lot to work through.

One of the things that happened, I think it's been mentioned before, is we had a catastrophic website crash in 2014. And I've been trying to re-create a lot of stuff from my old emails and from old documents in terms of figuring out what we did. Of course, memory is -- my memory doesn't work very well at this point, going back that far. And there's some things there, and there's quite a bit that we lost so that's a big problem. Because, other than the fact that that we severely downsized, went to a much lower budget, there's not a lot of activities that are sort of -- you can track very easily. Particularly in 2013 and 2014.

You know, there was -- there was some litigation that we got involved in. There was a challenge to the Arizona Commission structure. We got involved in that Commission. That went to the Supreme Court. There was another rather frivolous lawsuit we dealt with later in the term that kind of went away pretty quickly. We had a barebones staff. We had one, there less than a 1.0 FTE,
which one of the staff that worked with us in 2011 stayed in that position for quite a while. She left in 20 -- end of 2018. And we had two retired annuitants come in. And I think they were part of your transitions, Patrick McGuire (ph.) and Cynthia Dai were helping the Commissions.

And that's sort of the formal work. The only thing that sort of picked up later was the work with the auditor's office in terms of transitioning, you know, getting folks to apply for the next Commission.

Now, the big extracurricular activity was something we were able to -- we were able to do because of the funding we got from the Ash Center at Harvard -- Kennedy School at Harvard. And I list that as extracurricular because that was not something that we had planned on getting. We were able to get the award from Ash Center largely through serendipity. I think, Gil Ontai, one of the commissioners, had happened on a competition that the Ash Center was sponsoring, and we went through a process of applying, and we won. We won the competition.

So that activity, which was focused on out-of-state, you know, promotion of the Commission model was from basically 2017 through 2020. And ultimately it transferred that out to Cynthia Dai's consulting firm. So that's why it should be on the books anymore for the
state operations. But again, in extracurricular activity, not -- not official Commission activity. Not -- not all of us participated in some of that work.

So that's sort of the overall calendar over ten years. We did have a stable chair for a couple of years. Stan Forbes was a chair for a while because he's based in the Sacramento area, and it was easier for a Sacramento person to interact with the staff and, you know, sign off on documents. But we did go to a rotational system, I think in about 2017 or so, just to kind of take the burden off of Stan and to allow him to participate in the (indiscernible) grant. But you know, most of those years were pretty dormant. We met maybe twice a year. And there were periods where we didn't have any -- or we voluntarily didn't take our per diems because we wanted to save money. Some of our budget went up a bit, midterm, so we were able to actually command some per diem dollars.

But one think you sort have to figure out -- and if you're able to get more money, that's great, but if you're -- thinking, what are you going to do over the next four years, you have to make some serious decisions about what -- what you're going to get for your budget and what can and cannot. If a lot of you are really willing and able to do it voluntarily, you can do quite a bit. But
you may not have a staff that's going to support you
because you won't have the money.

So you got to figure out, well, what -- what can we
do -- we're not going to have as much money in the next
couple of years. So you know, there's an unfortunate
reality, which is that for about a year or so you -- you
were among the most powerful people in California, right.
If you think about it, you -- you drew the lines for the
Congressional delegation and the State Legislature and
the Board of Equalization. And you had tons of money.
And you had everybody paying attention to everything you
ever said, okay. That has ended, right. You are no
longer the most powerful people in California. You were,
for a while. And that's going to be reflected in less
attention to your work, less dollars. That's just a
reality. How bad it gets, how precipitous the drop will
be is something you may have a little bit of control
over. But that's what happened, right. And it, you
know, having been a commissioner, it's a life-changing
experience. It was for me. A lot of the commissioners
will tell you that. But it's a very different experience
in years, you know, years two through nine, right. And
you have to figure out what -- what do we actually want
to do.

So a couple points. I think you have to kind of --
part of the job you have to figure out is what's normal for a Commission, right. Because the 2010 Commission had a much shorter timeline. Your Commission, it's hard to figure out what's actually normal. Because you have COVID constraints, deadline differences, a lot of -- lot of great innovation, you know that may or may not be adopted by the next Commission. Certainly a lot of, you know, really pioneering work around, prisoner work, working with prisoner inputs. Lot of great outreach. Great accessibility work, you know, lots of different languages being put forward. But you know, wild timeline, shifting timeline.

So you know, I think you talked about different -- different starting dates and extending the -- the final deadline for the maps. Obviously a lot of tough questions. Particularly because they -- several of them involve constitutional amendment. So that's a tough political call. And it may not be appropriate for you as commissioners, or as a Commission, to play a lead on that. Some of you -- you're certainly the lead on legislation, but you're not necessarily the lead on constitution amendments, so you've got to figure out who your allies are. What's a possible coalition. What do you want to try to get forward.

Now, it's perfectly okay if you're sort of putting
out principles and putting out, you know, a wish list, an
ideal set of, you know, statutes or constraints on the
Commission, opportunities for the Commission, but you
have to make some political choices in terms of your
legislation. And I think it sounds like you're doing
some regulatory work, too, which is a little bit easier
to legislate than trying to do it on your own. Or at
least from the auditor's office.

So there's a lot of stuff you can -- you can think
through, but the hard thing, I think for you to figure
out is what -- what can we give to the next Commission
without putting our -- too much of our mark on the next
Commission, right. And that -- that's a dilemma that
every Commission has. We try to stay back and say, well,
if they want our help or if they want us to make us
suggestions, we'll, you know, we have a lot of Lessons
Learned from last time. But we'll let them figure it out
for themselves, and if they want our help, they'll call
us, right.

I think a lot of us know, you call us more than you
actually did. But that's your choice. You can make
those kinds of choices. And the next Commission has to
do the same thing, right. So as you're kind of creating
through and thinking through what you want to leave them
and what you -- what sort of mark you want to leave as --
for your cycle, that's a -- that's always a tough set of questions. What do you actually want them to have that'll make their job better and easier. But at the same time, leave them some discretion to, you know, find their own path. Find their own -- or to be their own Commission. And I think that's a -- that a tricky balance.

Oh, one point as I was thinking about this in terms of your timeline. So there's a -- there's an adage that pops up in Studies of Public Administration and Bureaucracy. And it's called Parkinson's Law. I don't know if anyone's heard that one, but this is sort of the phrasing of Parkinson's law. So, "Work expands so as to fill the time available for its completion." "Work expands so as to fill the time available for its completion." So there's a lot in there. So if you're thinking about, well, let's give the next Commission a year or a year and half, think about what it -- what does it actually need in terms of giving them that much time. Are they going to be as efficient as they need to be? Will they try to do things that they're not really -- that are not necessary? How much of that is what you wanted to do but you weren't able to do? All right, so there are a lot of tough questions. But I think that's an important one to think through as you working on, you
know, what time should we give. How much extra time do we think they need.

You know, we made a calculation back in 2012 to say well, we think four and a half months is good, four and a half more months and we -- I think you can -- you can certainly argue for more, but is that -- how much more? Is a year and half -- is that too much. I would suggest maybe a year and a half to two. All right, if you go into 2019, notwithstanding the constitutional impact that -- that may be too much time. You may not get the most efficient work out of that Commission, if you give them too much time, but you can certainly argue for three months, even up to six months without too much problem, if you don't up the budget, right. One of the issues you have figure out, well, if we're saying they're going to get some extra time, how much more money does that entail. Because I don't know that the -- the legislature is going to be very cooperative if you try to raise your budget to accommodate that extra time. So that's just something to think about as well.

And, you know, you had some discussion this morning about your budget. You got to be careful about your, you know, fiscal oversight, there have been some holes in it, right, over the last year or so. And you've got to get that, you know, figured out because you're not in a
strong political position. And you're not setting up the next Commission very well if you can't say with confidence, this is how much it costs to do it this -- a cycle. So I'd really urge you to make sure that you got everything kind of figured out as -- as you're going forward in that area.

That's about it. And I'm happy to take a lot of questions or go through some discussion.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you so much. And Chair, I'm going to rely on you to facilitate the discussion because I've got just a telephone screen I'm working off of.

VICE--CHAIR FORNACIARI: Very good, thank you. And Commissioner Andersen has a question.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, thanks for coming, Commissioner Ancheta. We really appreciate it. I just have a really quick question. About the budget, how did our, the 2020 budget come around? Was it -- did they just say, okay, this is what 2010 actually needed and then bump it up for money, or what actually happened there? Thank you.

MR. ANCHETA: Yeah, that was pretty much it. Now, we had some say because it, again, straddled the Commissions. So we were the ones who actually had to formally put in the budget request. But, you know, it's
1 a negotiation process. But, you know, the legislature
2 and the government obviously have more power than you do.
3 They set the budget. That's -- that's what you get. So
4 they had anticipated this amount of money. And yeah, we
5 had told them, you know, I'll say that the Irvine
6 Foundation and other philanthropic sources were a big
7 part of the 2010 cycle. That wasn't going to be around
8 this time around. Again, deadlines have been changed and
9 timelines have changed.

10 So that's something that you can influence as you're
11 going forward. But, you know, you can't -- you don't
12 have veto power over budget. So if the legislature gives
13 it to you, that's what you get. As you're thinking
14 through, you know, if you're thinking about, you know,
15 shifting the seating of the Commission and, honestly,
16 (indiscernible) auditor's office, but if you're going to
17 do that, how are -- what are you doing with the budget is
18 an important question. And if it goes into another
19 fiscal year, that means you got to -- you got to look at
20 the '28/'29 budget. So again, it's under your watch.

21 So, you know, again, I think if you have some good
22 justifications that people can buy into, you -- you can
23 up the budget. You know, if you go too far, again, if
24 you go too far forward or back in terms of the Commission
25 calendar, you know, you're going to get asked, well why
you need that much time. And what are you asking for as you as you're going into -- you're talking about going into 2029, what -- what actually do you want to do? How much money -- how much more money do you think you're going to need? You might not get too much cooperation on that.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Other questions?

Well, I have a question. What would you -- what would you have done maybe differently or what -- what changes would you -- would you have liked to have made at the end of your term that you weren't able to?

MR. ANCHETA: Well, you know, again, I -- I had the luxury of being the last chair, so I could give you a lot of stuff that -- some of which was my opinion. Right? You know, I sent you a lot of stuff over several months in 2020 and 2021. So you know, the biggest one, which I've expressed and I think was acted upon, was the VRA analysis, making sure that you started that early.

You know, I think you had some issues around contract pay, you know, just getting that through the pipeline. That came up. And we were -- we did adapt, frankly, because we just -- we should have done that before (indiscernible). You know, I was a -- as some of you may know, I was a replacement commissioner. So I didn't start until about a month in. So I know if I had
been on the Commission early, I would have pushed for that to happen. I don't if it would have happened, but I would've push for it. So I think you've got to make sure that happens quickly because you want to get those VRA districts locked in if you can. You know, obviously, there's a lot discretion about what the districts (indiscernible) options. But that's requirement number two. And, you now, we had to deal with pre-clearance and Section 5 districts, those were immovable objects for the most part when we had to draw. And we knew that from the beginning. That actually wasn't too hard because they were already there.

Any Commission working on Section 2 compliance has a lot of upkeep for how they want to -- how many districts (indiscernible), how they're looking at different combinations (indiscernible). So that's one.

The other area is around communities of interest. And you guys had some comments, you know, way back in 2020. You know, communities of interest is not dependent on census, decennial census data, and it's something you can do pretty early. And because much of it is based on subjective opinions of, you know, people's opinions of what their neighborhoods are, what the communities are can be fairly stable. They may have very -- in fact, they may have very little to do with the actual census --
what the numbers may tell you in the census record
because they're just perceived, their neighborhoods -- as
they perceive. Some of that may be based upon, you know,
long histories. They may be based on what their
perceptions are of neighborhoods and where -- how far
they extend. And that can vary, you know. You had
Little Saigon -- who knows where Little Saigon actually
is, but you had a lot of different opinions on what
Little Saigon is, where it begins and ends.
   So -- but you can get that information early. You
can get that before you get the census. And you know, we
didn't have that opportunity because it was just so
crunched. Everything came in all at the same time.
Census data came in, public input came in all at the same
time, so it was all mushed together.
You were able to, I think, to separate some of that
out. I think you could do more separation. I would
encourage any future Commission to try to get that data
as early as you can once you start hearings. And if you
can, try to map it itself. Because then you can say,
well here's our -- this isn't the final map, this is just
kind of a sense from what we've gotten from the
subjective information that we got from the
hearings.
And, you know, this is certainly very malleable and you
understand that it's part of -- people disagree about
things and you want to try to resolve it. And
ultimately, the Commission has to resolve.

And I think it's better to do that early rather than
in the middle, which sometimes we had to do that out of
necessity. That's all we could do. You, I think, had a
little more time to do that, so you could have but I
think you got crunched into some -- and that just
happens. You know it's a reality, you don't know what
you're doing because you haven't done it before. I think
it's great to put in training but you, you know, unless
you've actually worked on the redistricting, you don't
get a sense of how hard it is until you're actually doing
it.

So that's -- that's something that's inevitably
going to happen with any Commission. They're going to
get crunched as they go into it. So I think one of the
important things I -- and I've stressed this before, is
you've got to find the right balance for the Commission
in terms of you have to set up the infrastructure.
You've got to do the hiring. You've got to the contract.
But there's a really -- you have to find the right
balance when you're talking about public education,
public input, how much you're looking at targeted
outreach. You did a lot of that, much more than we did.

And then, there's a really important reality which
is, it's hard to draw lines, really hard to draw -- until
you do it, you don't get a sense of how hard it is. And
that takes much more time that ever realized, right. So
one of the things you've got to do, and I think you did
some of this but you could have done it in a deeper way,
is you've got to figure out what all this -- what data
(indiscernible) consistent and incomplete (indiscernible)
community of interest data really means when you try to
put it all together. And you ultimately come up with an
independent, Commission-based analysis that was -- this
is what we think. Now, a lot of you may disagree with
that. A lot of you obviously, you said one thing, and
there was differing opinions, but you're the ones, you're
the Commission, you're the ones that have to kind of say,
okay, we've got to pan this out. We've got reconcile
inconsistencies and, you know, we've looked at public
opinion or the public input. We've looked at other, you
know, you didn't -- and we didn't either in 2010, we
didn't look at sort of other data sources too much. It
could be census data, ACS data, other kinds of, you know,
community reports, there's a whole bunch of stuff you can
look at, but you don't have to, and that's a choice for
the next Commission to make, but there's a lot of stuff
out there that helps you figure out subjective community
of interest data. Because, you know, it's very easy to
manipulate community of interest data. That's -- there's a really difficult problem and even more so because you had a really open (indiscernible), right? Which is great; you had a lot of opportunities to give input. But you don't know what's in there, you know, a lot of stuff -- there's a lot of stuff in there that could be, you know, sources could be partisan, you know, if it's an anonymous -- you can submit anonymously, and any number of things could happen. Not to say you should second guess your maps and your analysis and what's in there. And you want to presume that they're -- this is, you know, honest, community-based, you know, from individuals. Or that this is legitimate data. But a lot of it is not. I mean, that's a reality. But how do you figure that out. That's a tough question. Because, you know, folks who have partisan interests or incumbency interests, they're going to put stuff in there but, you know, I think -- I think that recommendation letter from Common Cause -- I don't know if you -- use the term AstroTurf, right. It's in a footnote in that -- that recommendations that, you know, it's sort of putting in stuff that looks like it's community based, but it's not really community based. It's actually something else going on.

I don't have a solution for that, but that -- that's
something that if you have more time, you could kind of
take that and look at it. Because that's going to happen. Because the more you open it up, the more -- to subjective opinions from members of the public, the less control you have over what, you know, what you have to work with. And, you know, it may help to have other kinds of -- and what that data is, is it's a choice. And it may help to have other kinds of (indiscernible) based on (indiscernible) statistical analysis or, you know, get a geographer on board to help you with some of the demographic analysis and geographic -- physical geography kinds of questions that come up.

So there's a lot of stuff you can do and, you know, not to second guess either of our Commissions. There's always tons of stuff you can do if you can find the time and you've got the resources to do it.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah, thanks. That's great. Yeah, we've been grappling with essentially all of that. Appreciate your perspective on it.

Commissioner Yee, why don't you go ahead. I have to take my dog out. So if I'm not back, you're in charge.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. All good. Thank you, Chair.

Commissioner Ancheta, so good to have you here, and thank you for spending your time, giving us a recap of
2010. Thank you also for the help you were to the VRA subcommittee when we were looking for outside counsel. That was really helpful when you were able to educate us and help us learn on the job, and we can get that done. I'm curious about the mapping phase and I've heard that you -- 2010 did more work with one or two mappers -- one or two commissioners working off-line with mappers. And didn't -- made that more of the process or central to the process than we did. So I was curious to hear more from you directly how that went and what you thought of it, you know, and what you would recommend going forward.

MR. ANCHETA: Sure. Now, and with the understanding, that's always advisory. So whenever you have any committee, whether it's, you know two -- and we use two persons more (indiscernible) than we -- whenever you have any kind of two-person subcommittee or whatever you want to call it, you have to be advisory. And you have to run everything by the full Commission.

So we had a lot of two-person teams working with the mappers, you know, directly, and just -- here's what we think, given our understanding of these particular areas. Because one of the things, and this may not be obvious from, you know, whatever historical document you're looking at, but we had two-person teams that were assigned to different parts of the state, right. So one
person was from that area and the second person was from outside that area. So for some balance and we tried to, you know, we tried to have the (indiscernible) partisan balance. So basically we had two experts, and of course, you know, we're all Californians, so can always chime in with what you think is going on in a particular area. But we had two-person teams who we thought would -- that would go through the data more carefully. They knew the -- at least one of them knew the area pretty well. And we built on that when we were trying to put in segments or different sections of the draft map and later visualizations so that some of that was delegated, but it always came back (indiscernible) even though we trusted a lot of what was going on. We, you know, people lived in different areas of the state over their life and they have different impressions and, again, there's a lot of data coming. Yeah, you might miss something (indiscernible) tons of stuff coming in. And one of the hard things, of course, it keeps coming in; it doesn't stop. It goes up until the last day. And even after the last day you give for comment.

So I think that was helpful in terms of delegating some responsibility, but we always made it clear that those were advisory and everybody had, well, not every -- it wasn't always consensual. You guys did a lot of
stuff, which was amazing, the stuff that was consensual.
I was stunned how often you guys agreed on
(indiscernible). We could never have done that on our
Commission. We strived to (indiscernible), you know,
reach a consensus, but, you know, we split more often
than -- I suspect we split more often on the big
questions.

You guys managed to do it pretty much every time
(indiscernible), which I can't see as a realistic
expectation either. That's great that you did it, but I
wouldn't ever build that into any kind of system or
culture. That's rare. But congratulations for having
done that. It's great.

So in any case, yeah, having that kind of
debtation, you have to trust people and, with the sense
that, you know, we're not trying to hide anything. We're
trying to make sure that -- we're trying to be efficient,
right. And that's always a trade-off. You know, the
transparency norm is very strong, but you lose some of
that when you create two-person teams. You know, you've
gotten some flak for doing a lot of closed sessions. I
think, you know, that's a choice you made because you
wanted to discuss VRA compliance in closed session. But
you know, the next Commission might go the opposite
direction. Let's do everything out in the open. That's
within their prerogative to do that. So, you know, as you go to delegate more things to the -- either subcommittees or to the staff, you lose transparency. And that's a choice you can make.

COMMISSIONER YEE: When you had splits on lines, did you guys vote through those?

MR. ANCHETA: Yeah, yeah. Most of the, you know, a lot of the state is pretty stable. Again, we had some locked-in pieces. A lot of the northern part of the state is fairly -- once you've (indiscernible). There's just a little overpopulation, right. You know, we had a lot of struggles over central Los Angeles County. A lot of -- some tears were shed during some of those sessions. It was a tough -- tough set of sessions. People got emotional about where lines were drawn and about, you know, minority empowerment was a big central issue.

But you know, when we disagreed, we agreed to disagree, and we just moved forward. I think we were trying to be very efficient about our discussions, our deliberations, our voting. You know, I cast plenty of, you know, dissenting votes on all the stuff. You know, just accept that and move on.

You know, again, I -- even though you were able to achieve consensus on so many things, that's a cultural norm that you cannot pass off to the Commissions. It's
rare. Everybody will say that's great, but you got to
move forward because if you try to do that, you'll get
stuck. You just can't move forward. But it's -- it's a
wonderful idea. I'm not knocking it. And you -- you got
it. You did a great job with it. We would never have
gotten through it. We would have got stuck so many times
if we tried to do that. We couldn't have done it.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thanks.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: All right. Commissioner
Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. And thank you,
Mr. Ancheta. This has been really good, very helpful.
And you got me to chuckle a little bit about the fourteen
of us, the consensus. It is true, and we have to remind
ourselves that it's a unique fourteen. Every Commission
is going to be a unique fourteen. And so we have to
remind ourselves to maybe step away and realize that not
every Commission will have the same build-up and the same
consensus-building. And not to say there weren't tears
shed. There were frustrations. Definitely were. You
know, I just -- I give it up to my fellow commissioners.
We just, we knew our mission and, you know, we just tried
to get there together. It's difficult though, as you
mentioned.

I did have one question though. You mentioned that
you got involved in the Arizona lawsuit. Was that -- did
they ask you to be involved or -- if you can give me just
a little bit more background on that, that'd be great.
Thank you.

MR. ANCHETA: Yeah. You know, I can't remember if
we were contacted by the -- I don't think we were, but --
it was up in the -- it was going to the U.S. Supreme
Court, right. And it went to the heart of having the
legality or the constitutionality of independent
Commissions. So obviously, we had a strong interest in
it because if it had gone the opposite way, then it would
invalidate the maps, at least the Congressional maps. So
obviously we had an interest. So we did file an amicus
curiae, a friend of the court brief, in that case. And
you know, it was a -- the right outcome for us. So we
still exist, you still exist as an institution. You can
do Congressional maps as part of your work. So yeah, I
don't remember if someone had contacted us directly on
that, but we had been tracking and, again, even if
Arizona had -- even if Arizona hadn't contacted us, we
would have worked it out. Oh, so just to note, you know,
we did have -- you know, Mary Johnson (ph.) worked with
your Commission for some time. We had her as a retired
annuitant to help us out. It'll be tricky if you guys
get sued at some point. You know, the Attorney General
worked with us on one lawsuit that would be the lawsuit challenging the racial diversity on the Commission. They sort of -- that was sort of a Prop 209 challenge saying that you can't do that, because Prop 209 precludes that. You know, as commissioners, you're not (indiscernible) and so that was produced. But the AG representative was there, so we didn't have to worry, and the outlay's there. You know, again, once your budget goes down, you've got to figure what you can spend, and you know, Marion (ph.) was nice enough to help out as -- with not much cost on (indiscernible).

And you know, there's still possibilities for getting sued under the BRA (ph.) federal court pretty much all through the end of your term, but it's highly unlikely that will happen. But that can happen, because of -- you know, it's just where the demographics are (indiscernible) you know, of this vote division occurring in a district, so that could happen.

Now, I think you'll get some (indiscernible) if that happens -- in fact occurs, but yeah, that's unlikely. And I think, you know, most of civil rights groups are perfectly happy with your district. I suspect there won't be any fallout.

But, you know, we had a rather frivolous lawsuit filed against us, or we were named -- very frivolous
lawsuit in '20, so you still have to kind of deal with that. That one's just a real waste -- well, yeah. It was a waste of time, so didn't go -- and it didn't go anywhere. But you have to deal with it when it comes up.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you. I've got a question about -- I believe you said that the state -- well, we're dealing with the state auditor. You were dealing with the state -- Secretary of State before you -- the 2010 came on, and that they'd actually set up a contract for your ED before you guys came on. Was that correct? And where I'm going with this, so I'll just sort of give you the whole thing up front, is the Secretary of -- the auditor put together several different contracts as a kind of example contract for us, not that we had to use them, but it was the idea to try to help us, move us along. And there was great blowback about no, no, no, no, no. The Commission has to use those. Because we're talking about items that maybe we could help set up ahead of the 2030, and not necessarily -- we're not necessarily talking about having them hire certain people, but we are talking about data and key (indiscernible), what systems are out there, et cetera, et cetera. That you should opine about, you
know, what you would think about out in, and I'm sure considered back -- both sides of that issue.

MR. ANCHETA: Yeah, so --

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Just a second. I think you meant job postings, right?

MR. ANCHETA: Right. That's what --

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Did you mean (indiscernible simultaneous speech) --

MR. ANCHETA: I think I may have said --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Both --

MR. ANCHETA: I misspoke in (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Both that and other items.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah.

MR. ANCHETA: But there was a lot of blowback back then, and that was part of the reason they were extending the timeline for the subsequent Commission or Commissions, was simply -- and again, this is just -- you know, the Secretary of State well-intended, trying to get things going and knowing that hiring doesn't happen -- you just pick somebody up -- go through the State personnel system.

So they actually did post the -- you know, they did a job description and posted the job. And mostly, you know, Dan Quayful (ph.) had worked on the selection
process anyway with the auditors, so that was -- we had sort of these to track.

But in any case, that was part of the reason we wanted to stretch it out, so the Commission itself could actually do that hiring. And you know, I was part of the blowback this cycle, because we were part of the -- we were still in office when the auditor had put out RFP, and we just -- no way should she be putting out an RFP. You're putting in stuff into that RFP that the next Commission has to figure out itself, right? No, again, we understand the intent was to get things going.

No, I don't think it's a problem if you sort of lay things out -- here's what we think might be helpful, but you can toss it if you want to, right? It's one thing to put out the actual RFP, which is what the auditor did in 2020. It's another thing to say, well, here, you know, we don't want you to have to reinvent the wheel. Here's a bunch of stuff we think would be helpful, but again, we're not too proprietary. It's not required for you to do anything. You can make some choices here, and these are things we thought about. We've talked to folks with '10. We've talked to a lot of different -- the auditor's office -- all these folks who are working on these, and we want this venture to succeed. Here. But, you know, if you folks don't like it, get rid it, right? You're
okay. So we wouldn't feel bad if you said, well, we want to do it differently.

You have to understand that they have to kind of chart their own path, and who these fourteen people will be, we don't know, and they may have, you know, very different values. There's some commonalities that cut across all of our -- that cut across the law and requirements and what we think our important values for the Commission, but you know, how much they value transparency, how much they value, you know, fairness or equity or efficiency -- how they want to, you know, put those maps together. There's a lot -- there's a lot of wiggle room to do things, you know, much differently than the 2010 Commission or your Commission. So you have to give them that space.

But you know, as our commit -- we had some concerns about transparency by the 2010 commissioner early in our process. We were very specific -- you know, you're doing too much stuff outside of the public eye. I think we felt that can change with some of the (indiscernible) closed session.

Now nothing illegal, nothing untoward, perfectly -- you know, those are policy choices he made, but again, if you value certain things, you know, more than other commissioners might, you will set up your structure with
importance. So if you really value transparency above all else, you don't do too many subcommittees of two people who don't get -- or who aren't having open hearing. You don't do closed sessions, so that's -- but you can do it. You can work it out. The directions can still be fully transparent and comply -- keying in the statute, if you value efficiency, really.

Or another example is, you know, if you really want to help underrepresented groups and do something like a grant program, which you weren't able to actually implement, that compromises -- in my mind, that compromises intent. So you know, that's something I consistently during my term would oppose, which is to have, you know, too close of a relationship with community groups. But that's not a value shared among former commissioners. A number of us were very, sort of, purists when it came to independence. We didn't want to look like we were too attached, whether we had the appearance of any kind of favoritism. Others were perfectly comfortable and recommended, as contained in our compilation, working closely and maybe even funding community-based organizations.

But those were differences of opinion, and that may be something that may be a tension in the next Commission, so you have to figure, well, wouldn't it be
great if you had a grant program, and we're going to give
you all these different options for grants. We did a lot
of research. And they'll say, nah, we don't want to do
it. And you just have to say, okay, great. That's your
choice, your option. Do what you think is right for your
Commission.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Are there any other
questions or comments from the Commission?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'll throw one out there,
because it's been so helpful to hear from you. We really
appreciate it. The tools that we ended up with -- like,
specifically the COI tool, the redistricting tool --
those things were amazingly invaluable to us, and we
didn't know that they were really going on until, you
know, we all of a sudden go, oh, hey, we'll pull a
committee together and be, oh, okay. And unless you're
developing tools like that, you'd have no understanding
what is the head time -- the lead time on those items to
make them happen.

And you know, we've been sort of talking about -- I
don't know if you heard earlier -- is to update things
like that, you know, based on, you know, ten years, the
technology going be even -- who knows? And we've been
talking about actually kind of working, as the 2020
Commission, working with the people who were involved in stuff to actually kind of get those up and running -- not hard but, you know, kind of have them there, so they can kind of turn that over. What do you think about that?

MR. ANCHETA: Yeah. Well, first, I mean, those are fantastic tools. Like, those are really great -- you know, very helpful to map a few arrows -- fantastic. You know whether anybody is -- I don't know if it leaves GIS. I don't know. That's a much more sophisticated GIS system, you know. But at a certain point, folks who are at that level are already using (indiscernible) or GIS (indiscernible). So there's a lot of sophisticated folks that have no problem already, so I don't know if you need to concentrate on that subject.

It's the more basic kind of things, where people can kind of figure out, where's my neighbor? What am I considering to be my community of interest? Okay, how can I get this onto paper or at least on -- or onscreen, so that the folks on the Commission can actually use it and take it seriously.

Yeah, and you know, I -- you know, I talked to Karin about -- I forget when it was, because I mean, you know, Karin and I are friends. I haven't talked to her (indiscernible) because, you know, again, I was trying to maintain a -- kind of a separation, because I was working
with (indiscernible). So you know, she and I talked a lot over those many years about different things like that, and I do recall having spoken to her about some of the tools that the Statewide Database (indiscernible) developing, which evolved into some of the tools you are working with.

So yeah, I think it's fine to do that. I think -- and again, you know, I don't think it necessarily locks in the Commission to use them, necessarily. I'll say I think they would, and I think, obviously, if it's the Statewide Database that's really developing them, you know, I don't know if Karin, wearing her two hats -- we don't know, but obviously, Karin's court is Karin's court, but she's been with the Statewide Database forever. You know, I was really surprised when she decided to do the project, right? We didn't wear her out entirely the last time we were in, so she was able to able to, at least with a second team, put together -- to work as your consultant. And no, if you had asked me a couple of years ago if she was going to do it again, I would've said you're nuts. There's no way she's going to ever want to do it again.

But yeah, I think it's fine for you to work with the Statewide Database on that, because again, that's the official data source, and to the extent there are
tools -- and it's in the statute, right? The legislature has control over that, but they essentially delegate that to the Statewide Database to figure out the specifics. Yeah, with the understanding that, you know -- make sure that it's not something that's totally locked in. The next Commission can't alter it, replace it, discard it if they want to, but you can do that.

Now again, you've got to figure out how much time do you have? You have a ton of money right now, but it's going to go away real fast, right? That's your reality. And again, if you're committed to it, and you know, you maybe not be able to draw on the per diems. And you know, volunteerism, if you're really dedicated to it, is fantastic, but you know, you have your lives to lead too, so and what do you want to do over the next couple of years is -- yeah, I wouldn't certainly commit every commissioner to spending so many times a month, you know, and so many times a year going to meetings and doing a lot of stuff. But if some of you want to really dig in and work on it, great. I think that's fantastic, but yeah, just with the understanding that the next Commission can -- they can ditch everything you ever put together, and it's their Commission. And don't take it personally, right, because that's just how they get that count.
VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay, well, thank you, Commissioner Ancheta. We really, really appreciate your time and your wisdom, so thank you so much.

MR. ANCHETA: Yeah, and again, I'm now a free agent, so I'm not playing with anybody in particular, so I'm happy to just -- you know, call me if you either want more background history or just want some friendly advice on it. I will speak in my individual capacity just moving forward. So happy to help in whatever way I can.

And thanks a lot for --

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: (Indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

MR. ANCHETA: -- letting me talk to you. Appreciate it.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah, we appreciate it.

Thank you. Take care.

I'm going to turn it back over to Commissioner Vazquez.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thanks, Commissioner Fornaciari.

All right, I think we are moving on to a recap of our 2020 process. I'm not sure what the vision was for this section of the agenda, so I might not -- I might need some help in framing the discussion. Commissioner Yee, it looks like you're --

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. So yeah. I think we can
actually skip this part today. I think Commissioner Kennedy and I were thinking we might have things boiled down more by today than we were able to, and besides which, we're getting advice that maybe slowing things down is not a bad idea as well. So you'll recall that there are some outside reports being written -- Common Cause -- legally, voters have a short-term, shorter report coming out soon, and a then a longer report later this year. And some other inputs that'll be on the way, and there'll be more time to boil things, I think. And so boiling down, and so we can save that for today.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: All right. Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to clarify, the collaborative of redistricting organizations did submit their report to us already. That was the shorter one, and then in a year, there'll be another one from Common Cause and League of Women Voters. So we have one, and there's one coming in the future. And the one in the future's the one where they'll contact us and contact some of us and analyze the whole process.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thank you. Okay, so I am sensing some live reordering of our agenda. We did have discussion of a potential motion, but we did not have a motion on the floor for one of our subcommittee reports.
We also still need to discuss redistricting engagement as well. Did we get to -- we didn't get to long-term planning. Got it. So let's -- we did tell a few commissioners regarding the vote that we would have a time certain for that at 3:15, so maybe the best thing to do right now is to start to hear from long-term planning, to hear from redistricting engagement, and then, hopefully, that will free up space for 3:15 to get back to our discussion of a potential motion for legislation.

Great. Okay. So do we -- I think Commissioners Fernandez and Akutagawa, do you have additional pieces for us for long-term planning?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I guess just continue on from what we were talking about. I know there's been different opinions, in terms of speeding up, slowing down. Again, just the reminder that we do have an author, and we were hoping to have the low-hanging fruit, so that we can continue a relationship with the legislature, instead of, you know, dropping off and then coming back. So that's what we were hoping for with the items in the A category, and again, I think Commissioner Akutagawa and I, in terms of the constitutional ones, which are on D, if the Commission -- our recommendation would be if the Commission does want to go that route with constitutional, that we should -- it would be one
bite at the apple.

Like, maybe we all agree to change the final map
date and extend it, but if there's other areas that still
need to be discussed, I would recommend that we wait
until we have discussed all of those Constitutional, so
that we do it all at once, because that is a huge effort.
It's either the legislature has to vote two-thirds, and
then it gets on the ballot, or we have to take that on
ourselves, which would be costly and time-consuming.

So to do it multiple times would be very
challenging, and especially as Mr. Ancheta just noted,
right now, you know, for a year, everybody knew about us.
They still kind of know about us, but the longer we wait,
they kind of forget about us until census comes again.
And as a reminder, these legislative changes cannot be
done in the years ending in 9, 0, and 1, I believe. So
it has to be in those middle years where, kind of like,
everyone's forgotten about redistricting.

So with that, we did have some feedback and some
conversations from some of the commissioners. So far, in
terms of those items in the bucket A -- how about I just
say bucket A? There was a comment about A5, which is
fully functional. We had one commissioner say we
probably need to discuss that further, another one saying
we're fine with it moving forward.
I will say that with defining fully functional, we'd have to be pretty specific as to what we mean by that, so I can see that one potentially maybe being moved off the A list and put on -- I'm getting my list up -- and put on the C category.

And Commissioner Yee did provide language for A6, which was good, to make sure the language says it's before the map deadline, instead of putting a specific date, so that's a very good reminder that we don't know what the future's going to hold, right? There could be some other type of kind of task.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Specifically, he said -- sorry to interrupt. He said three months before the map deadline to be specific, is what I wrote down.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. Yeah, thank you. So anyway, open to comments. I see -- oh, or Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I also wanted to note that Commissioner Andersen also suggested that we also include or move up to the A grouping or the A bucket, C5, which is what constitutes a day; C8, which is about starting the Commission earlier, although I think -- or yeah. Just having an earlier start date for the Commissioner. I think what we understand is that as long as it's still within the same calendar year, even if the
Commission started a few earlier, that that would not require a constitutional change. And then, she also suggested adding to the A bucket, C12, which is about, I guess, codifying that the Commission, and next Commission, can choose to rotate the chairs.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Okay.

Commissioner Andersen? And please, I'm hopeful that everyone will chime in because we're trying to -- if we don't get this through, we don't get this through, and it'll be someone else's mantra to carry forward, but really just trying to keep the momentum going.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I have a process question in this, and specifically, you know, we're talking about different sections. Like, we're talking in A1 and 2, our election code items. You know, 3 through -- you know, A3 through A6 -- that is also, you know, government code -- A254 and A253, et cetera, et cetera. At what point can we mix those is my initial process question. You know, can you mix -- we want to do this, you know, in one bill. Can we actually say, I want to amend the election code section da da da da by saying this and this and this, and I want to do government code da da da da da. Can we mix those?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I would have to defer. I don't know if Chief Counsel Pane knows that, but it would
be something that we would take forward to the
legislative staff that we've been working with to see if
that's possible. I'm trying to -- Chair Vazquez, I don't
know if you've seen different code sections mixed. I
don't think I've ever seen that, but that doesn't mean it
can't be done.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: I think probably Anthony is better
suited to answer that.

MR. PANE: Thanks, Chair. And so my thought is, if
I understand your question correctly, Commissioner
Andersen, could we, in one bill, amend the elections
code, as well as the government code? So I had some
legislative exposure. My thought is the answer is yes
because they're generally addressing sort of the same
topic. If all of a sudden, we wanted to amend the water
code, I think that kicks that bill probably into a second
and different committee, but as long as it could
topically fall in the same committee, my thought is we
can include various statutes. But it probably matters
more by the jurisdiction of the committee that it's in.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yeah, that's a great way, because I
wasn't sure I understood your question, Commissioner
Andersen, and I think, in my experience, strategy-wise,
it may make sense to split -- sometimes it makes sense to
put different codes -- different pieces of codes together
in one bill, and sometimes that can complicate things,
because then your bill sort of lives or dies by what
could potentially feel very particular to a particular
code, so it's I think, in some ways, more of a strategy
question.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, thank you. That was
why. I have a follow-up, because my understanding, at
one point, it was at State level that basically, you
know, each bill's supposed to only deal with one topic,
essentially, you know, one item. I like the idea of
going to one committee, in which case, as I'm seeing, I
this what we're trying to do, even in our A's -- maybe
it's two different things? And if that is the case, what
committee -- the person we're trying to talk to, do you
have an idea of what committees they're looking at and/or
you know, what are they getting to run with for us? What
are they thinking? You know, former Commissioner Ancheta
was saying, you know, if you're going to wait, you're
going to do the actual constitutional amendment, get all
your asks in one basket, essentially. You know, is the
person -- they're no, I don't want to touch that. I just
want to touch these-type topics. If you could just get
us a little more information about that. Thank you.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: That's kind of a convoluted topic --
and I don't know -- I don't know if I'm going to answer it correctly, and I'm going to rely on -- or Linda, did you want to address that one?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I guess I was just going to -- if understanding it correctly, what you said, Commissioner Andersen, I think you're asking, you know, what if the spot bill sponsor does not want to, you know, include certain topics that we're putting forward? I think that our understanding, based on the preliminary conversation that we had with the representatives from the legislature, is that that is possible, that the list that we do put forth to them, if we do and whatever the final list is going to be, they're still going to look through that list, and they're still going to decide which ones they want to carry forward and which ones they're not. So that already is going to happen, yeah.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Right. Right. And with our -- you know, meeting that we did have with them, they just kind of wanted kind of, like, a global understanding of what we were for in the (indiscernible) at that point. It did include everything from A, and it included some other items as well. I mean, kind of what they really wanted to know, they just wanted to know the understanding of what we're asking and the background and why we were asking for it.
I will say that the one for A3 and A4 that has to do with grants and contracting and procurement, that's the one where we've asked our chief counsel and his team to review other agencies to see if they have that authority because that was they specifically asked, you know. They weren't aware, but again, you know, they can't be aware of every single code language in California because that's just very comprehensive. But they wanted some background as to -- and once they understood what some of these obstacles were, then they at least could appreciate and understand why we wanted to go forward. It's not something that we just, you know, off the top of our head wanted to do.

And again, I just wanted to specify that if we do move forward with the grants or the procurement or the contracting exemption, it does not mean you have -- it doesn't mean you can -- or what I should say is you can still go through the RFP process. You can still go through whatever process you want, but it gives you the flexibility, if down to time crunch, like how we were with the outreach and communications at the end. You know, there was that delayed time trying to get some contracts into place for some of these media spots, and that would've been very helpful not to have to go through, you know, the one- or two-month delay, because
we already knew --

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Oh.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- what we wanted to do.

And there was also a delay, too, when we did our language access contracts. That was a delay as well.

Sorry Angela, or --

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Nope. That's okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- Commissioner Vazquez.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: No worries. It's hard to politely interrupt via Zoom.

So it's 3 o'clock. We're going to take a break.

We'll be back at 3:15. If I could ask this committee to, hopefully, take the 15 minutes to develop a motion that this Commission can consider, so that we can take a vote when we come back, that will be great. See you all at 3:16.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 3:01 p.m. until 3:17 p.m.)

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Welcome back, everybody. We will continue our conversation around long-term planning and hopefully have a motion ready to present.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you, Chair.

One favor is if we can have an indication of those that maybe aren't on video but are listening and will be able to vote only because, you know, there may not be
a -- if we don't have enough to vote, we don't have
enough to vote. Thank you.

Commissioner Turner's there and Commissioner Le
Mons. Thank you for your hands up. And Commissioner
Taylor's there as well.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Commissioner Taylor -- great. Thank
you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I don't even know if that's
enough, but sounds great.

Is Commissioner Toledo and Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think I saw Commissioner
Toledo turn his video on and off real quick.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, Commissioner Toledo did
too. Okay. I think that's enough. Off the top of my
head --

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Me too.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Honestly, that was one good
thing about our Commission, I never really memorized who
was what party, so I don't know if we're in the right
parties right now. I think that's probably a good thing
though.

At this point, we did take the break to kind of talk
about it, and what we would propose, unless -- you know,
will be willing to add some of Commissioner Andersen's, but that
would mean that everyone had -- was general consensus
with that, would be to motion to move forward with legislative changes listed in group A, would be A1, A2, A3, A4, and A6. So it would be all of them that are currently in A1, and it's in the potential litigation changes document that's dated March 30th, 2022.

Do we have any discussion? Any concerns?

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, if Commissioner Akutagawa, she very eloquently labeled those couple of items from C that I thought we should add in there as well, and add that to the motion --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- please.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So I'm going to go back and forth with that right now. Because they all -- I mean, okay. So the ones that Commissioner Andersen had, I believe, was it --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: C5. C8.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: C5 --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: C5, C8, and C12.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And C12.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Right.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So C5 is clarify what a day is in defining mapping deadlines. So what would be your
definition of that, Commissioner Andersen? Because I just want to make sure that we're clear as to if we put it in, the rest of the commissioners are clear as to what we would be moving forward with. Does that make sense?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Could I answer that one?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Yeah, I would go with the calendar day instead of the 24-hour. You see under the notes, we have calendar day, instead of 24. So basically, it would be -- the difference would be if we say, okay, we're doing something by noon, that means you have until noon tomorrow. Now I think it would be -- you would have a full calendar day. You know, if you do something anywhere in a particular day, then you'd have to wait a full another day as opposed to 24 hours.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So right now --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Like -- go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So right now, the code section does read, that 8251(b)(2) says day means a calendar day, except that if the final day of a period is within which an act is to be performed is Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday, the period is extended to the next day that is not a Saturday, Sunday, or holiday. So right now the day is defined as a calendar day.

And I believe the discussion is the past somewhere
indicated that maybe a 24-hour period from the time that something's adopted or whatever the case may be. So right now, it is calendar day, Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Great. Then --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So then --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- I would leave it.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: My item would be leave it that way, which means we don't have to do anything.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So we would not add C5 then. Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct. Yes. Check it off.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: All right. And then the next one would be C8, which is earlier start day for commissioners also would impact start date of application process. And on this one, I know that we did have quite a bit of conversation last time where some commissioners thought, you know, starting in the day and the year ending in a zero earlier, like in January, that would not require a change in the language. But if we wanted to start prior to that, then that would require a change. And I know that there were quite a few that wanted to
start prior to, like in the year 2029, right --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, that's on --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- Chair Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. On that one, I was talking about just leaving it. Don't put that in the constitutional amendment. But put that in the regulation so we would be able to move it to, say, January without having to do the heavy lift. That's my intent on that one.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. I think that this is going to require further discussion, but that -- Chair Vazquez?

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yeah, especially with your note about wanting it to be a regulatory decision, I think it would be cleaner if this motion encompasses only legislative ideas that we want to put forward this year. That doesn't mean we're pushing pause any of these other conversations necessarily but that we are committing to a particular strategy, in this case legislative, for the named items in the motion.

And for those reasons, I personally am not comfortable with including C8, because I think that requires some additional deeper discussions before we'd even have language to put together.

And then C12, I'm sort of agnostic. So would just
look for indications for folks as to whether you want to
include 12 in this motion.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That's (indiscernible).

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Andersen, you're
not on mute again.

I just wanted to check in on A6, is it as written or
are we talking about the three months prior to the maps
being due because we've said both languages.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, great question,
Commissioner Sinay, great catch. We will need to -- we
meant to amend A6 to include language that Commissioner
Yee proposed, which is -- which would read as -- sorry,
I've got to scroll back up there: Three days public
notice for meetings held three months before the map
deadline in the year ending in the number 1. So it would
not be specific to a certain month; it would be then
aligned to what the map deadline would be.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. No, because I think
one thing we've learned is in everything we do, it's
better to align it to a deadline than try to be specific
about dates.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Exactly.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So yes. Thank you. Okay.

That was -- I'm done.
CHAIR VAZQUEZ: So I think, if I can interject here. We still do not have a motion. So we need a motion and a second. We didn't get a second before we launched into a discussion. So I need a clarifying motion then a second.

Yes, Commissioner Sinay, did you have a discussion point? Sorry. No. Okay.

So sorry, Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Did you have a motion Commissioner Sinay or? No. Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: (Indiscernible). I figured you had the motion easier accessible.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So the motion was to move forward with legislative changes listed in group A, A1, A2, A3, A4, A6, but A6 would be amended to read: three months before map deadline. So that's my motion.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And to be specific, the three days' public notice for meetings held three months before the map deadline in the year ending in the number 1?

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Do I have a second?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'll second.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: All right. Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa. Beat you to it, Commissioner Yee.

Okay. Any discussion on the motion?

Yes, Commissioner Le Mons.
COMMISSIONER LE MONS: This is clarifying question on the motion. I don't if we were looking at three different suggestions that Commissioner Andersen had put forward. It didn't seem like we closed a loop on C12. And I'm just checking in to make sure we're clear. I didn't hear it in the motion that we decided not to include it. Where are we on the C12?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you for that. And so C12 is to add language to note nothing impedes the Commission from rotating the chair. And what I will do quickly is I will read what the -- how the language currently reads. So it currently reads: The Commission shall select by the voting process prescribed in paragraph 5 of subdivision C of section blah, blah, blah, one of their members to serve as a chair and one to serve as a vice chair. The chair and vice chairs shall not be of the same party.

So that's all it states. It doesn't state that you can or you cannot have a rotating chair. And I believe the purpose of this was just to clarify that the Commission -- that nothing would impede the Commission from rotating the chair, so that there is not confusion. You could have the same chair and vice chair or you could rotate them.

Are there any discussions regarding that?
Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. If I could just perhaps maybe just -- I'll just state -- or maybe it's also a question. It seems like the language as it reads right now gives us the most -- gives the next Commission the most flexibility. We opted to do the rotation. My recommendation is instead of codifying it -- I mean, it's essentially just writing what is implied in the language, and I think that gives more flexibility, and I don't think it's necessary to actually change the code for that, but that's just the perspective that I have.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: So I'm hearing that you are not accepting of an amendment to add C12.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I guess I would just, yeah, not necessarily be in favor of it. I frankly think it's somewhat unnecessary in a way because I feel like it is already included in the language as it reads and to put it in -- you know, it's essentially -- I guess it's -- I guess if it's preferred to make the implicit more explicit, I guess that's what the language does, but I don't know if it's really necessary to go through that, maybe the work.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Okay. Commissioners Andersen and Taylor. And then I want to be mindful of time because we did have folks who need to leave, and I want to make sure
we get a vote on this motion.

So Commissioner Andersen, and then Taylor.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. Thank you. The reason I thought we wanted to put it in there is because if the -- it doesn't say that. It says you have a chair and a vice chair. And unless we had actually heard that the other Commission did rotate, I don't that would have ever occurred to us, and we would have a chair and a vice chair, period. And I thought it was extremely valuable, the rotating.

Now how often, you know, how much it's done, I thought just to give the next Commissions -- you know, because say this next one doesn't, and then from then on, all Commissions just assumed that's the way it is, you just have a chair and a vice chair. I think it would be a loss for future Commissions because I believe each of our different perspectives added things, and also had us all feel a little bit more sense of ownership and more involvement in it, which I think was -- I thought was extremely valuable, which is why I thought, you know, just to be a little bit more explicit and I'm talking about low-hanging fruit. Like, yeah. You know, it doesn't mean you can't do it so I thought we should put it in.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Commissioner Taylor. Commissioner
Taylor. Did you lose me, or did we lose Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Taylor. We can hear you.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Got it. Great. Thank you.

Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay. Yeah, thank you for that, Commissioner Akutagawa and Commissioner Andersen.

I think if the committee who's putting forward the motion is a little skittish about adding that, I would suggest there would be no harm not to add it.

We decided to make the decision we made with the language being the way it is. And I think future Commissions will also have the benefit of the history because it won't stop with us or 2010. So they can go back and see what 2010 did, they can see what 2020 did, they can see what 2030 did. And who knows where things will be in 2060 and so on and so forth.

So that would just say that I support the committee to keep the motion as they've written if they're not comfortable including so we can move forward.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons.

Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah, thank you. So I don't see that as it's written as being restrictive. So I don't necessarily see the need for the amendment. My two
cents, thank you.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you. Okay. With that, let's go to public comment.

Kristian, if you could help us read the instructions.

MR. MANOFF: Sure thing, 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, enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed. It is 89487739062 for this meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press pound.

Once you've dialed in, you'll be placed in a queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press star 9. This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it's your turn to speak, you'll hear a message that says the host would like you to talk, press star 6 to speak. If you'd 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're waiting in the queue, be alert for
when it is your turn to speak. And again, please turn
down the livestream volume.

And we don't have any callers at this time, Chair.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Let's pause while we wait
for the livestream to catch up.

Commissioner Taylor, did you have anything else to
add?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: No. I did a (indiscernible).

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Very well.

MR. MANOFF: And those instructions are complete on
the screen, Chair, and there is no one in the queue.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Okay.

So do we have Director Hernandez or someone else on
staff who is ready to -- there we go.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: I'll read the motion. The
motion to move forward with legislative -- oh, one
second. One second, Chair.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: No worries.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Chair, if you give me a couple
of minutes. I have to reboot here.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Of course. The tech gremlins.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yes.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yes, Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes, thank you. I thought
while we're waiting, could the -- you know, we're going
to go ahead with this motion, and I'm just hoping that
the committee might submit all of our ideas to the
legislature because they might go, oh, you know what, in
their minds, it might make sense to add a couple of other
items with what we're proposing.
I'd hate for them -- I'd hate for us to itemize,
that they might think, hey, this really goes well and
want to champion it for us, not to be put forward because
we didn't actually kind of agree on it. They might
come -- you know, realizing it's an interim process.
I just hope that the committee would -- the
subcommittee would please, you know, show them at least
our full list. Particularly since all the time and
effort you guys put into making it and the discussions
involved in the items so far. Thank you.
CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez and
then Commissioner Sinay. And then let's take the vote.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. And I was just going
to respond to Commissioner Andersen. Yes, we would share
the entire list with them. And I just want to also
reiterate that we will continue to come back to the items
in the other -- the Cs and the Ds to see if there's any
more that we want to move forward. So we're not done
yet. Thank you.
CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Commissioner Sinay.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm not sure I feel comfortable showing them the whole list until we've all agreed and asked to move it forward. I mean, obviously it's a public list, so yes, you can share it with them. But I would feel more comfortable if we actually have the conversations, we come to an agreement before we just hand it to the legislature for them, you know, to put it in the -- I know it's an iterative process and all that, but it's gets hard -- I don't know. I just -- I don't feel comfortable doing it that way. That's not how we discussed it up to now.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Commissioner Akutagawa, do you have a response specific to that point?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. So Commissioner Sinay, I hear what you're saying. I think my first thought is that it's a public document, so they're going to see the whole list anyways, but I think in terms of our follow-up conversation, it will be specific to the specific things that we've all have an agreement on.

I was thinking that in terms of the whole list being seen by them, again it's a public document so they're going to see it anyways. But our conversation is going to center around the very specific things that we're voting on right now.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thanks. Okay.
Director Hernandez, can you read out the motion as you have it and then call for the vote?

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yes, Chair.

Motion to move forward with legislative changes listed in Group A, that's A1, A2, A3, A4, and A6 of potential legislation changes handout. A6 with edits, three days' public notice for meetings. And this is where we've added, held three months before map deadline in the year ending in the number of 1.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Committee, does this reflect your motion?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It does. Just no end parenthesis after 1, right, Commissioner Akutagawa?

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: All right. Thank you. Okay.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I think there might be a call, Chair.

MR. MANOFF: There are no callers in the queue.


DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: All right. So we'll go ahead and start the vote.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Akutagawa.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Abstain.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fornaciari.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Abstain.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: And Commissioner Vazquez.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: The motion passes.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thanks, everyone.

Commissioner Andersen, did you have a comment?
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: You know, I did. And the reason I want to quickly abstain on that one is I thought it was just the three months, you know, before the maps whenever that happened to be, because now ending in 1 means like, that wouldn't pertain to us when we actually made maps. Well, I guess we technically didn't. But if it got kicked like a few days, it wouldn't pertain, and so I thought it was just ending in three months, period. Not in the year ending in 1. I thought that was a residual from the language that Commissioner Yee -- I misunderstood that as the wording that Commissioner Yee was adding until right at the end just before we voted. So I think that could be a bit of a problem.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Counsel, could we get them advice about the wording of the motion and whether we need to have a new motion to reflect the intent of the committee and the Commission?

MR. PANE: Chair, I don't believe you need a revote on it. No. I mean, and again, the -- where we are in the process right now is not the language stage. Right now is just the amendment recommendation stage and then language will be crafted and then it comes back to the Commission to say do you agree with this language.

So we can probably work out any wrinkles if there
are any regarding the actual language when it comes back to the Commission.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Perfect. Great. Okay. Thank you for flagging that, Commissioner Andersen.

All right. Thanks for those of you who hung on for our vote. Appreciate it. With that, I think -- well, first, does long-term planning committee have any additional -- I'm seeing no. Okay.

Then let's move to our redistricting engagement subcommittee. I don't know who that is.

COMMISSIONER YEE: It's Commissioner Sinay and myself I believe.

Commissioner Sinay, did you want to --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: All right. Sorry, the gardener is out there, and I couldn't hear you. And then when it -- I could tell that no one else was talking, I was like, oh, that's me.

So we are in the process of -- first of all, I wanted to thank Commissioner Vazquez and Commissioner Fornaciari, are working with the New Mexico Common Cause to submit an op-ed there. And that -- basically they were selected because Commissioner Fornaciari spoke to the New Mexico Commission that -- when we were nascent and they were nascent, and so as the chair and the vice chair, we thought that that would be a good team. So
thank you for taking that on.

Commissioner Yee and I are drafting two documents. One is a two-pager that just kind of outlines what would be a -- you know, kind of our ideas and including some the thoughts that are coming from League of Women Voters and Common Cause on what a national conference for commissioners of independent redistricting commissions might look like.

And the argument being that a lot of people, a lot of pundits, a lot of advocates, a lot of academia have written about independent redistricting commissions and redistricting, but because the IRCs are so new, there hasn't been a lot of conversation across commissions like we had at our last meeting. And there are some topics that we are the only real experts on because we've gone through it and it could be a unique opportunity to learn from each other. So we're drafting that, and the idea of -- that piece is really to get the buy-in from potential sponsors and you know, kind of start solidifying.

And then the second piece -- the second document we're drafting right now is a simple proposal. Just for funding for those items on our bucket list -- not bucket list, but doc list, that falls outside of our mandate. So if we are invited to speak at a conference or if we --
you know, a lot of the travel arrangements and all, all
the things that would come into play in kind of helping
promote independent redistricting commissions out -- you
know, that is outside of our mandate that we've
discussed.

And we are having conversations with Common Cause
about actually getting funding for them to have a staff
person who can help coordinate commissioners, not just
from California, but from other places for these type of
events. Our staff can't do that. And so it would be --
so we're drafting something that wouldn't be coming from
us. And the funding wouldn't be coming to the system
redistricting commissions but it would be, you know, kind
of a project in partnership with Common Cause and really
the money would be going there.

So those are just the two pieces that we're drafting
just to kind of starting to solidify some of the ideas
and some of the things that have come up.

Also with the idea that, as we were reminded today,
we're powerless now. You know, people are going to start
forgetting -- you know, right now -- you know, people are
still interested in the IRCs and we're still all together
and so let's talk to funders about getting the funding
now to do other work.

Any questions, thoughts, comments? Thanks
everybody.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yep. Sounds like you have the consensus. Great. Okay.

We technically have -- we're technically in the portion of the agenda that is continue, recap, and next steps. But since I think we are, you know, continuing to extend this conversation, we're never going to be sort of closing out lessons learned, at least not for the short term. So maybe I will just open it up one last time for any reflections, but I do think we're probably headed toward calling for public comment at four and adjourning shortly. So if you could please keep your reflections brief.

Oh, we do need -- thank you, Commissioner Fernandez, for the reminder.

We need public comment to close out our agenda item 3, subcommittee report, so if -- Kristian, if you could help us with instructions, and then Director Kaplan, I see your hand.

MR. MANOFF: Sure thing. The Commission will now take public comment on agenda item 3. To give comment, please call 877-853-5247 and enter meeting ID number 89487739062. Once you've dialed in, please press star 9 to enter the comment queue. The full call-in instructions are read at the beginning of the meeting and
are provided on the livestream landing page.

   And there's no one in the queue at this time, Chair.

   CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thank you.

   Director Kaplan.

   DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Thank you. I just wanted to -- I

   know this is probably the last opportunity I'm going to

   see all of you together. I just really want to thank

   everyone for this extraordinary opportunity. I learned

   so much from all of you. I also really just want to

   acknowledge and thank all of the staff, particularly

   Alvaro and others, just for how supported I was

   throughout this whole process.

   I think we were all thrown into something so

   extraordinary. We kind of had the sense of what would

   come, but really there was so many things that we

   accomplished over the last year or so that I was on

   board. So I just really want to acknowledge that and

   thank you all for how supportive you were through this.

   I learned so much from everyone. And really thanking the

   public also. I really thought that this was such a

   collaborative process.

   And really just, you know, an opportunity for me to

   continue my passion for civic engagement and I just feel

   to lucky and fortunate to have had this time with all of

   you. And I hope to stay in touch with you, and I look
forward to see what happens over the next eight years and
in 2030 and seeing independent redistricting expand
across the U.S. also. So thank you, everyone.

MR. MANOFF: And it looks like we do have a caller.

If called 0003 wants to make a comment, please press star
9. All right. We do have a caller with their hand
raised. Just a moment.

Caller 0003, please follow the prompts to unmute.

The floor is yours.

MS. NIMMERS: Hi. Can you hear me?

MR. MANOFF: We sure can. Go ahead.

MS. NIMMERS: Hi Commissioners. My name is Kristin
Nimmers, and on behalf of the California Black Census and
Redistricting Hub, I'm calling to express our thanks and
appreciation for your work over the last year, to engage
communities and redraw California's map.

In addition to distilling a significant amount of
testimony to make mapping decisions, you all faced
unprecedented challenges with shifting timelines, delayed
data, and working to engage California residents during a
pandemic. And despite these new challenges, you made
your deadline, delivered maps for the state that largely
upheld the principles of equity, inclusion, fairness, and
justice with no legal challenge.

And while we didn't agree with every decision, we
believe you had the best interest of Californians in the
decisions you made. And we appreciate the Commission's
effort throughout the process to uplift equity, listen to
black voices, and protect black communities of interest.

Thank you all so much for your work that you've done
over the past several months and look forward to
continuing to engage with you as you work to make the
process better and set the stage for commissioners that
will follow you. Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. And that was all of our
callers, Chair.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thanks so much. I'm also
realizing we technically need to call for public comment
for item 5, continuing lessons learned. Do we just need
to make an announcement? I'm not sure how this goes.

MR. MANOFF: We can certainly call for public
comment again.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Anthony, do you have a --

MR. PANE: So Chair, I could -- I mean, my
understanding is all that's left is taking general public
comment; is that right?

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yes. I'm getting lots of messages
in the chat to add things to our discussion.

MR. PANE: Okay. Then just to cover our bases then,
Chair, then maybe we'll want to just proceed. My thought
was maybe we could just call for general public comment
but no, we'll just do agenda 3, item 3.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Got it.

MR. MANOFF: So we did -- we just did item 3. Do
you want to do item 5?

MR. PANE: 5.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Item --

MR. PANE: Sorry about that. 5, yes.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yes.

MR. MANOFF: Okay. Item 5.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No, not 5. 5 is closed
session. We want 4.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: I have --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, on mine.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yes. Item 5, we're calling for
public comment on item 5, continuing lessons learned.

MR. MANOFF: Got it.

The Commission will now take public comment on item
number 5. To give comment, please call 877-853-5247 and
enter meeting ID number 89487739062. Once you've dialed
in, please press star 9 to enter the comment queue. The
full call-in instructions were read previously and are
provided on the livestream landing page.

And for those in the queue, if you would like to
comment on item number 5, continue lessons learned,
please press star 9.

We have no raised hands in the queue, Chair.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Okay. Thank you. Okay.

I had gotten some requests to add things. Could I -- let's see. Let's do Commissioner Fornaciari, Yee, and Fernandez. And then I will make a judgment call about how much time we have left.

MR. MANOFF: I'm so sorry to interrupt, Chair, but we do have a caller now with their hands raised, would you like to take that call?

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Yes. Let's do the caller first.

MR. MANOFF: All right. Great.

Caller with the last four digits 2829, if you could please follow the prompts to unmute. The floor is yours.

FEMALE SPEAKER: Yes. I would like to comment on the legislative list. I guess that's part of the lessons learned. But I guess item C1, allowing no party preference to be represented as a political party, I don't think that's a good idea.

There's, like, 15 million people that are represented by the two most populous parties, and there's only 6 million people that aren't registered in the most populous parties. And if you start adding to the Commission another seat for the no party preference, that 15 million will lose close to 5 percent representation on
the Commission. And I think proportionately 15 versus 6 million people that are not part of the two parties, that the balance of population representation won't be fair on the Commission.

So I think you need to keep the Commission at 14. That's my comment for your lessons learned. Thank you.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you so much for your perspective.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you. And there are no further callers in the queue at this time, Chair.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thank you, Kristian.

Okay. Commissioners Fornaciari, Yee, and then Fernandez.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: So as far as April goes, I believe the plan is to have the meeting April 27th in Anaheim? I think that is why Director Hernandez just raised his hand.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Okay. Any discussion Director Hernandez? Anything to add?

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: No. We're still working on the location in Anaheim. We're very close to securing it. But it is on the 27th. We'll have Sacramento and Anaheim. Thank you.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thank you. All right, everyone, hold it on your calendars.
Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. If there's time today, I'm sorry for not managing our guest list closely, but we do have Raul available today, and we had asked him to speak to the question of contracting time lines, which, of course, is such an issue in our experience and in our lessons learned so if there's time today, he could discuss that, but if not, then, you know, he's going to be with us for a while, so. Thank you.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thanks. Great. Thanks for flagging that. Maybe let's -- we can dedicate 15 minutes, if folks are amenable to that piece of the conversation and we'll get to him right after Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. And I will be quick. Thank you for the April 27th date. I would like to have the meeting scheduled out all the way until August if possible. So hopefully at the next meeting -- because we really need to get the dates on the calendars for individuals and then you go into the summer months. And those tend to get a little busy.

I would recommend at least maybe one per month, and maybe a half day. I don't know if we would need two, but maybe just in case you could always cancel the half day. That's just my request. Thank you.
CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you for expressing your preference. Okay.

Raul, if you are available, we would love to take an additional 15 minutes of your time. Thanks for waiting for us. If you're available, we would love to hear your perspective on contracting timeline.

MR. VILLANUEVA: All right. Well, hello, commissioners. Good to see everybody.

What I thought I'd do is I'd cover the three RFPs and then all the marketing contracts because the marketing contracts all kind of occurred at one single bounce.

So we had three RFPs, the line drawer, the VRA council, and the videography RFP. The line drawer RFP took five and a half months. The development of the statement of work and the RFP took approximately from October to December of 2020. A large part of that was attributed to work by the subcommittee and gathering background information. And then a lot of work by the Commission in eliciting public comment in terms of drafts.

It was posted January 16th. It was reviewed -- the bids were reviewed on February 19th, in other words one month for the bidders to review the RFP and ask questions and submit their bid. It was awarded by February 25th.
The contact team went from February 28th to March 8th, which is basically going out and getting the contract signatures. It went to all of us March 8th and was approved approximately March 24th and started March 24th.

The VRA council contract took seven months.

Development of the statement of work took about two weeks. Development of the solicitation took about two and a half weeks. It went out December 18th and one and a half months were provided for the respondents to review, ask questions, and submit their proposals.

From February 10th to approximately March 29th, the initial interviews were rescheduled. Part of that because of trying to schedule it in the meetings and part of that in terms of work with the subcommittee and the CRC again making reviews, discussions, eliciting public comment. And there was a big discussion at one point over the conflict of interest disclosures as you may recall.

April 1st through May 6th, there was further subcommittee discussions and public comment taken. As the contract actually was being put together, May 6th through June 3rd, it was the gathering of signatures and it took a while to get the response from the AG, AG's office, to allow the Commission to get the outside counsel. It was sent to OLS June 3rd and approved June
The videography RFP took two and a half months. The statement of work and the RFP was put together between February 9th and March 10th. It was put out March 16th, giving two weeks for the bidders to review, ask questions, and submit their bids. The bids were reviewed March 30th through 31st. It was awarded April 10th. On April 11th it went to OLS and was approved and returned to us April 15th.

So if I may, a lot of the process of the RFP has basic minimums in terms of how long something should go. So in terms of minimums, how long it goes out to the bidders, the process for whether or not there's a protest period.

One of the things I think that was a hallmark for this Commission which did add time to your RFPs, though, was a lot of time really looking into developing discussing, going back and forth between subcommittee and the CRC. And also eliciting a lot of public comment, which I think was a strength for you, and I think you had much stronger results because of all of those discussions even though it did add time.

The outreach contracts, they were requested I think approximately June 14. 15th through the 21st, Fredy and I worked to develop templates for the solicitations and
identifying prospective businesses to send it to. By June 21st through 28th, we finished developing the templates, a prospective budget, and identified the potential bidders.

Between July 9th and July 24th, bid requests were sent to all the different zones. And the first awards were being made July 17th. July 26th, the first awards were being made. And between August 1st and 15th, various other contracts were being developed and being sent for signature.

The first contracts were sent then August 10th through 12th to OLS for approval and returned as early as August 13. And we kept getting -- so you sent a lot of the contracts in batches. So there was a total of nine contracts, most of which were developed in two and a half months and available for the Commission's use.

So I don't know if anyone has any questions on those or?

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thanks so much, Raul.

MR. VILLANUEVA: You're welcome. I think the small business route is really the best one for the Commission to use when it's -- when it's a viable means. Obviously for the line drawer and the VRA councils, it has to go a different route. Things like videography where you're going to see a large amount of expenditure related to it,
an RFP is probably more appropriate, as the small
business has a 250K cap to it. And that's really the
reason we went with the RFP for the videography.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Great. Thank you.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. Thanks, Raul, for that
summary. And what a trip down memory lane.

I was wondering if you could -- it looks like you
might have it already in writing. I'm wondering if you
could just send it to us so we could include the whole --
all those dates in our lessons learned report.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Sure. I have a -- I have an
overview that I can provide your executive director --

COMMISSIONER YEE: Right.

MR. VILLANUEVA: -- for him to send out to you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. Excellent. Thanks.

And you know, just being reminded how long the VRA
and line drawer contracts took and you know, if we had
not had the extra time, what a crunch that would have
been. You know, so I don't know, any quick thoughts on
how to expedite those processes next time?

MR. VILLANUEVA: You know, whenever there's a large
interplay between a subcommittee and the Commission, you
have to pair the two so that one occurs same day of or
within a very close space of the other.
Otherwise, the subcommittees being given a task, performing its work, they were waiting to notify the Commission and get that agendized for the Commission to meet and discuss. The Commission meets and discusses it, provides additional information or work to the subcommittee. Now the subcommittee's got to meet -- the legal advisory committee met live. And so being able to schedule that and have the videographers and everything ready to be able to do it live and agendize it.

So it's those scheduling things and then the basics of having the meetings that extends the time there.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

MR. VILLANUEVA: One of those necessary evils.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Any other questions from commissioners?

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So we were caught off guard by how long everything took. But you know, Mr. Villanueva, were you caught off guard? I mean, you know, you've been part of kind of the state bureaucracy and you were trained in this. So were you caught off guard? And if you weren't, then I don't think that for lessons learned, we so much need to put in every single contract and how long it took, but more guidelines around how long it can take.
Because, Commissioner Yee, you were the one you said let's keep the lessons learned document short and sweet so people read it.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Right. If I had to respond, in contracting, just as it is with hires, being able to define the statement of work or what the person is going to do is the critical beginning part of the process. I put the two together because I think one of the challenges this go around versus in 2010 was a lot of additional discussion in developing statements of work, for the line drawers especially, and then for contract provisions for the VRA council.

That being said, I'm not saying that that was necessarily a bad thing. There was a lot of thought put into that statement of work for the line drawer, which I think delivered a better product. But if I'm going to -- if I'm going to respond in terms of where I thought it took longer, those would be the two.

As far as contracting goes, we contract pretty much two to four times faster than the state does. That's how long it can take if you have, say, DGS do it for you. That being said, it's still a cumbersome process and trying to meet the requirements of the state, protect your interests, and protect the fact that we're working with public funds and those requirements, those are kind
of musts that we have -- we just have to work with.

But I would agree with you, it is a cumbersome process.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Commissioner Andersen. And then I have just a comment.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I want to thank you, Raul, for helping us in that, through all those time lines, the process. It was a learning experience, I think, for almost everyone involved. And there kept on being surprises that at times we realized, looking back, we probably did hear but didn't understand. And so I think in that memo, if you could outline from your perspective the items that are absolutely necessary within the time frame.

Like, you know, just one example you brought up in the line drawing, you know, there is the protest periods. You know, certain periods of time have to be there. You can't shorten it. And if you could kind of include that in your review of those. That would I think be very, very helpful for all of us.

But as a person who worked a lot on one of the contracts, I really want to thank you and make sure the Commission knows how much work you put in to help us meet our goals. Thank you very much.

MR. VILLANUEVA: You're welcome. But that -- it was
a pleasure working with both subcommittees on the line
drawer and the VRA council. Great -- great processes.
Lengthy, but I think the results speak for themselves.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: And I just -- I think Commissioner
Andersen, you put it very well. I do recall Raul in some
of our first meetings, you were very clear and explicit
that contracting could be a cumbersome, lengthy process
that would chew up a lot of the extra time that we did
have. And so just wanted to acknowledge that, you know,
again, heard that message but maybe as a whole we didn't
quite internalize what that meant because we don't have
sort of the right frame of reference or perspective in
the way that you do.

So I also just wanted to acknowledge that. I do
recall you talking about how lengthy and cumbersome the
contracting process was, but, simply, I think for many of
us not having that kind of perspective of what a long
time is in state speak, I think it's hard to
conceptualize until you are in it. But thank you.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Right. You're welcome.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: All right. Any other questions for
Mr. Villanueva?

Okay. Thank you so much. Sorry to have kept you
waiting this afternoon, but thank you again.

MR. VILLANUEVA: No problem. You're welcome. Good
luck to all of you. Have a great day. Tomorrow is a holiday. Please enjoy.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you so much.

Okay. I think all we have left now is general public comment. So Kristian, if you could help us out.

MR. MANOFF: Sure thing. The Commission will now take general public comments. To give comment, please call 877-853-5247 and enter meeting ID number 89487739062. Once you've dialed in, please press star 9 to enter the comment queue. The full call-in instructions were read previously and are provided on the livestream landing page.

And we have no callers at this time, Chair.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Okay. We will give it a minute to catch up with the livestream.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I just wanted to quickly say I was really glad to hear from Ms. Nimmers with the Redistricting Hub that called in to give us a thanks for the redrawing of the lines, and just wanted to acknowledge that and say we appreciate the acknowledgement of the hard work that we did to ensure equity in this process. Thank you.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Thank you so much. I definitely echo that thanks. And I'm glad that folks are still
following along. The maps are done, but the work continues. And so thank you to all of our public partners and community members who are staying engaged in their own ways.

MR. MANOFF: Those instructions are complete on the screen, Chair, and there are no callers in the queue.

CHAIR VAZQUEZ: Okay. Well, I think with that, unless there are any objections, we will adjourn this meeting, and we'll see everybody on the 27th in Anaheim or Sacramento. Great. Okay, everyone, have a good afternoon.

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