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VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Good morning, California, and welcome to this meeting of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. I am Neal Forniciari, your co-chair for March. Angela Vazquez, your chair will be joining us a little bit later. I'm going to call this meeting to order and ask Director Hernandez to call the roll.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Yes, Chair. Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sanai.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Presente.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Toledo. Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I'm here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Vazquez. Commissioner Yee.

Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.
MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Presente.

MR. HERNANDEZ: And Commissioner Forniciari.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: I am here.

MR. HERNANDEZ: You have a quorum here.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thank you. Boy, I was just reflecting on how much I miss you guys. It does seem like it's been a long time and it's great to be together and see you all again. We spent three really intense months together, and it's good to get back to -- back together again and see you all. So welcome.

Angela, Commissioner Vasquez, will be -- will be joining us a little bit later. She'll be in and out. And I will be obviously taking over when she's out. So I'm going to -- before I go through the run of show, I'm -- I'll open it for announcements if any commissioners have any announcements.

I just have one thing I'd like to share with y'all. I've been invited by the San Joaquin County Grand Jury
Association to make an informal presentation next Tuesday about my experience on the Commission, and so I will be doing that. I think the Grand Jury -- the statewide Grand Jury Association would certainly be a great resource for us to use in recruiting for the next round. So I'll just open it up if anyone else has anything they'd like to share. Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair, and I miss you all, too. I just wanted to share that I will also be speaking at a virtual event on redistricting, the Fight For Fair Maps. That's next Wednesday, March 16th, at 5 p.m.

The organizers have collected folks from across the country who have been working in redistricting. So other panelists include the director of public engagement from the New York Independent Redistricting Commission, the president in Illinois of the Muslim Civic Coalition, and then a D.C. lawyer and advocate for civic engagement. So it will be an interesting conversation where I just reflect on the pros of independent redistricting.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Oh wow. That sounds great. Is it open to --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes --

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: -- the public?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes. It's open --
VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: -- to the public. I'm not sure how to get this information to you all. Maybe I can send it to Anthony and -- or Alvaro and have them send it out, yeah?

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: That would be awesome.

Yeah. Thank you so much. Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair. Yes. So I have a gig coming up next Thursday with the League of Women Voters Diablo Valley and on a panel and sharing about our experiences.

I mentioned, too, your redistricting engagement subcommittee is working on a -- is working with Marcy and Martin working on a slideshow, an updated slideshow, you know, for this post-maps period just kind of summarizing statistics and you know, what our maps accomplished and such. So hopefully, everyone can find that useful as they have opportunities to share.

Also managed to get an op ed into the Cleveland Plain Dealer, the Ohio -- an Ohio newspaper, sharing about my story and our story and why maybe Ohio should think about independent redistricting, so.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah. Great. So that
updated presentation, do we know when we might have that?
Is it -- will it be available by Tuesday?

COMMISSIONER YEE: That's optimistic but --

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER YEE: -- possible. Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: By next Tuesday, we may be able
to have it because it's not -- it -- right now we're
looking at ten slides that just kind of tells the whole
story. So I'm working quickly. Just got all the pieces
together.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Outstanding. Thanks. The
next person looks like Sara Sadhwani, but it says Pedro
Toledo in front of her.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That's weird. Oops. Yeah,
let me change that. I had to use Pedro's link to get in
today, so let me change it. But yes, I did two similar
kinds of panels in the last couple of weeks, one for the
League of Women Voters of the Mount Baldy chapter, which
includes Claremont, which is the area where I work. And
I was joined on that with -- by Helen Hutchison, and that
was really great.

And then I did one last week for Berkley. And
again, it was just kind of sharing my perspective of the
experience, but it was teamed up with two political
scientists from -- one is from the Brennan Center and
another, Chris Warshaw, who does expert witness testimony in VRA cases and stuff, so looking at redistricting nationally.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Great. Thank you. And just for the record, Commissioner Toledo is here. So Commissioner Anderson.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: On a much more local note, I'm doing a presentation for a local high school, you know, one of their -- actually it's not the American history class. It's actually the civics class, and so you know, gerrymandering, you know, the -- how an independent district -- redistricting plays all into that and the whole process of it. A lot of kids are pretty excited about it.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Great. Sounds like fun.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. I also are on a -- I'm on a panel with Commissioner Sinay for the end of the month, but I'll let her talk about that piece of it. And then I'm also on a panel next week, March 15th, with the Sacramento Hispanic Chamber. It's here in Sacramento, and it's the California new political landscape reapportionment. And we have a pre-meeting today, so I'll find out more about what that's going to entail.
VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Wow. We are a busy crowd. Anything else? Oh. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thanks. I just wanted to -- well, we'll talk about this, as we said, in our subcommittee report, but we will give kind of the guidelines, the conversations that we've had with legal as well as probably will create a form so you all can just send -- submit to us so we kind of have an up-to-date list of who's doing what and keeping track.

And there's -- it will all makes sense when we talk at the subcommittee level, but I think this is really, really exciting. And I just ask just to add a little ticker in your list to be like, okay, I need to let the subcommittee know. And we'll keep saying it, and I know it takes three times to create a habit, so I'll just keep saying it. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thanks. Just a reminder that I had asked Anthony to send out, and he did send out, the announcement of an event organized by Represent Women, which is out of Tacoma Park, Maryland. And it's unfortunately falling during meetings this week, but I'm noticing that the panel discussion on Fair Representation Act, House expansion, and independent redistricting committees falls during our lunch hour tomorrow.
So assuming that they stay on track from 12:40 to 1 pm, which is a -- sounds like a short panel, but anyway, there is going to be that panel discussion on Fair Representation Act, House expansion, and independent redistricting committees as solutions to the representation crisis. So I'm hoping to listen in on that and encourage colleagues to as well. Thanks.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah. So we'll have to be sure that we stay on track, too, so that our lunch is on time.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez. So as Commissioner Fernandez and I -- Commissioner Fernandez mentioned she and I will be on a panel, and I keep doing it wrong but I think it's California Women Lead. It -- there -- it's an organization that looks at women who are appointed and women who have run for office or are interested in running for office or are elected and such.

So we'll be talking about redistricting on that panel as -- we're representing the north count -- the northern -- the north part of the state, the southern part of the state, two different political parties, and both being appointed to the Commission as well as both having been on school boards, me as appointed and her as
running. So all sorts of different little nuances.

Thank you.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. Outstanding. Wow, that's a lot of work going on. Good stuff. So as far as the run of show goes, we have a four-day meeting focused on lessons learned. There is an attachment in -- under the meeting header that goes through the run of shows -- run of show and lists out the topics we'll be discussing and the rough time frame that we'll be discussing those topics so everyone can follow them.

So today will be all lessons learned. Tomorrow morning, we will start with the business -- a brief business meeting. Roughly, the morning is lined out for that business meeting, but it'll go as long as we need. We'll have a brief closed session during the business meeting tomorrow. And then we'll -- tomorrow afternoon, we'll continue with lessons learned and then on into Friday and Saturday with the lessons learned exercise.

So to facilitate the lessons learned portion of the meeting, I'll be turning it over to Commissioners Kennedy and Yee to manage that. But before I do turn it over, I want to thank those organizations that sent in letters. There are three letters from organizations to us that are also in the handouts for today's meeting.

And I just want to note especially the group that
put together some feedback for our Lessons Learned exercise. It's a fifteen-page document with a lot of good stuff. And I just want to acknowledge and appreciate the work that those organizations put together to help us in our efforts and provide their perspective on our work and how we can improve it. So thank you for that. And with that, I will turn it over to Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Forniciari, and thank you, all, for being here. I think all of you are aware that I've been highlighting the importance of Lessons Learned pretty much since the very beginning. I think it is incumbent on us to do what we can to leave behind a -- or leave things as well-prepared as possible for the 2030 commission. We certainly have plenty of time for that.

We're also aware that there is also already interest in the legislature in moving some reforms forward in relation to the Commission, and we don't want to be behind the eight ball on this. So I think this Lessons Learned discussion is very timely.

A couple of things. First of all, just a reminder that as far as our legal framework, we're looking at potentially changes in various levels. So obviously, the highest level and the most difficult level would be any
constitutional changes. A lot of key elements of the Commission are determined by the state constitution. It is entirely appropriate that those be difficult to change, but I think it still merits a discussion as to whether there are reasons to propose changes in that. And we wouldn't have a direct role in that, but I think our weight behind any proposed changes to the state constitution in relation to the Citizens Redistricting Commission would be very important.

Second of all, obviously, the Constitution doesn't tell us everything we need to know about citizens' redistricting process, and so the next level down is law. The government code, to a lesser extent, the election code, any other elements of code that may need to be changed to facilitate the work of the 2030 commission and subsequent commissions.

Likewise, laws don't always tell us absolutely everything that we need, so the level below the laws is regulations. And I've pointed out on occasion that in the California Code of Regulations, there's a lot of detail about the Commissioner's selection process, and that is -- those are regulations that generally apply to the work of the California state auditor's office, the applicant review panel in the application and selection process.
And then basically the CCR, the Code of California Regulations, goes silent as to subsequent activities that might require some regulation at a level below the law, but nonetheless, codified in the CCR. So we'll be looking to see if there are changes or additions that we would like to see to the CCR as far as regulatory language.

And then entirely within our hands would be procedures. We have policies and procedures on the books. Were those adequate? Are there things that we would like to propose, again, that would make the lives of the 2030 commissioners and subsequent commissioners easier?

I've also said that I have found it useful in previous Lessons Learned exercises to focus on kind of four tags, if you will, for any contribution. So Commissioner Yee and I had put together kind of an expanded outline that we've called Lessons Learned prompts with kind of higher level topics and then subtopics within those.

So for example, if you look at legal on Friday, under legal, we have counsel present and participation in meetings, counsel work outside of meetings, usually for closed sessions, handling Public Record Act requests, selection and use of outside VRA and litigation counsel,
et cetera.

So if we look at those topics and any others that colleagues might want to add into the discussion in terms of strengths, weaknesses, innovations, or recommendations.

So strengths and weaknesses, those should be pretty straightforward. Did you consider -- do you consider the point that you're making a strong point of the process or a weak point in the process? Innovations are things that have changed since the 2010 commission completed their work. And obviously recommendations would be things that we would like to see change between now and the time the 2030 commission does their work.

So for the -- to help the staff who are taking notes, it would be excellent if, when you make a point, either in the introduction to your point or before you conclude your contribution, you would indicate whether you consider it a strength, a weakness, an innovation, or a recommendation.

And then when we conclude next week, if we've managed to make it through the entire outline, we'll kind of be sweeping all of those recommendations up, reviewing them, and seeing if we would like to add any others to the list. Once we -- once we have all of this input, then Commissioner Yee and I will work on organizing it
all into what we hope will be a coherent discussion
document that we will bring back and put before the full
commission with some procedural recommendations as to how
we move forward with all of the recommendations that we
have come up with.

So are there questions? Are there thoughts? Does
anyone have any other suggestions they want to offer
before we take this up?

Okay. Well, the first topic in all of this is the
formation and composition of the Commission. So what we
have in mind, and again, feel free to add items beyond
these prompts, but how the recruitment was carried out,
how information got to members of the public about the
opportunity to serve on the Commission, the application
and selection process.

We had the two-stage application, the preliminary
application with kind of basic information collected that
was then screened for conflicts of interest and basic
eligibility. Folks who got through that were then
invited to submit a supplemental application that
included the essay questions and a lot more information
being requested from us.

How did you perceive that? Are there things that we
might want to suggest for the selection of the 2030
commission? We're looking at the time line for that. My
recollection is from the time I submitted that initial application to the bingo ball drop was more than a year, you know. And we know that the applicant review panel had a lot of work to do during that period. They were -- they were not sitting on their hands or twiddling their thumbs. They were busy that whole time. But just any thoughts you might have on the time line.

Next, the criteria used by the applicant review panel. I know I've heard from some of you that you didn't watch the meetings of the applicant review panel; others did watch the meetings of the applicant review panel. But any thoughts that we might want to put down on paper and eventually pass on to the auditor's office and the Legislature regarding the criteria used or the process of the applicant review panel as well as the first day as we reviewed the applications from those remaining in the subpools to select the final six.

The terms of service for the commissioners and ensuring that future commissioners have a realistic sense of the required commitment. There was some language on the Shape California's Future website about the level of commitment. Was that adequate? Was it inadequate? What would we recommend for that?

So I'll open it up there. Again, those are -- those are prompts to get you thinking and talking. They're not
intended to be exclusive. If you have anything about the
process of forming the commission or even thoughts about
the composition of the commission, now's the time.
Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'll break the ice. I did
actually watch quite a bit of the applicant review panel
process, and that's a big strength. They were so
careful, considerate, transparent. The amount of work
that they did was amazing. The process -- the materials,
the review that they were taught was presented well.

They had presentations from several of the 2010
commission which went into, you know, the geography. You
really kind of got a feel for how they did things and why
they did things as well as what is the definition of --
you know, how do you deal with the VRA districts? They
were taught all the things that the commissioners were --
would need to do, so that way, they had an idea what
qualities and characteristics they needed to understand
in reviewing all of the applicants.

I further found out that they -- the care with which
they went to make sure that it was completely
independent. There were the Republican group, the
Democratic group, the Independent group, and they
actually had different colors of -- when they printed out
their material, it was in different colored paper so they
could never look at the recommendations that the other
person was making. I mean, they were that careful about it. So I cannot say more -- enough about how well they
handled the transparency and the independency and the Bagley-Keene. It was truly impressive.

I -- you know, I can't -- I can't think of anything that was bad about the process at all, with the only exception being is that those recordings were not readily available to everybody else. I actually kept a couple copies of the documents, but going back to get what -- wait, you know, when did Justin Leda come and talk to them? Where was that? That was really hard to find.

That is something that needs -- I would recommend that that gets immediately put into a separate file that, like, say, the first eight -- you're not going to go back and review everything, but they could quickly find those items because I thought the training was phenomenal and it was lost in the middle of the plethora of all their meetings. So I'll stop there. Then I have things about when we were the first eight as well.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Great. Thank you,
Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Good morning, everyone.

Missing you, too. So what's interesting, I did not watch
the process that Commissioner Andersen just described,
but it sounds like in that process there could be
information that could be distilled to provide a what to
expect as a commissioner if you're applying to do this
role. Because to be honest, I had no idea what to
expect. So I think just, you know, enough to give a high
level where anyone who is considering applying -- and I
don't know at what point in the process that would be
appropriate, but I think there was very little resource.

I mean, I talked to some folks and did my own kind
of due diligence, if you will, on what the commission was
all about, et cetera, et cetera. But I think in terms of
the practicality of what we really faced, even things
like having to set up the organization and -- I mean, I
think just really understanding what kind of tasks,
maybe, or activities beyond drawing the maps because I
think a lot of the focus is on the map aspect of it.

I know outreach was sort of our baby, if you will.
I guess we can take credit for that in terms of elevating
that as a really, really high priority. But again, I had
no idea what that might look like or what the
requirements were going to be, and I think as we go
through this Lesson Learned process, there may be some
very specific key things that we identify as we think
important for anyone joining the commission.
I mean, this is a very -- it's an honorable role to have. It's a very, very important task, and I think the better a group can be prepared will impact the outcome. I think we had an incredible outcome and we found our way, and I think any subsequent commissions would do the same, but I think the whole purpose of us going through this particular exercise of looking at lessons learned is to not have to have the wheel be reinvented without dictating -- I mean, that's not what we're trying to do at all -- but I mean, if you can have some runway, like, some paved runway rather than the dirt road, it can make for a smoother flight. So that's my feedback on this portion.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you and good morning, lovelies. So mines would be, Commissioner Kennedy, a recommendation, perhaps, to do more of -- I'm thinking about the recruitment process at the beginning. I think by sheer chance, I found out about the redistricting commission, and even after finding out about it, again, still could not get my mind wrapped around what it was.

And I know that different ones heard about it on the radio in different piece parts. I'm thinking, perhaps,
now a recommendation that there would be much more usage of social media to be able to talk about it but in a way that's accessible.

The commission should be representative of all of Californians, and I just do not frankly believe we are representative of all Californians. I think that you all are brilliant individuals, and I think that just our -- I think all of our systems of democracy has to be accessible to everyday folk, and I don't believe this process was accessible to everyday folk.

I think that, for the most part, everything from the number of submissions that need to be sent -- that had to be sent in, all of the essays, the public comment, the recommendations from other individuals. If you stop and think about it, different parts of society just does not have that time, that accessibility to computers and friends that also have time to stop and think and write.

And it has nothing to do with whether or not they're qualified to do what we've done. They actually are maybe in the streets. They know the geography. We struggled some sometimes with our perception of who was in what area, and I think that there are those that could have served on this commission and that will serve on future commissions that will be experts where we were not experts in being able to get words out -- word out to
different individuals and be able to represent certain parts of the community.

So as a recommendation, what am I saying in all of that? Two things. Number one, as I've stated, I think maybe most folk are -- you know, of course, we know that there's the whole problem with technology, access to it. But for the greater portion of California, people will engage with social media in some way, you know, shape, or form.

But then also the wording, the terminology. Even after I applied -- and I've told you before I applied and it's like, okay, because the very way it was presented was like, yeah, this probably won't happen. It's a, you know, something that's out there, but you know, something -- oh, okay, whatever, I'll apply and keep moving, but it was not the encouragement that, yes, we're looking for you exactly. We're looking for people like you.

It's like this is -- I applied because you know what? There weren't enough Black folk -- Black women applying, to be truthful. So I'm going to put my name in the hat, I'll apply, and let's just see what happens. Not because I knew what it was, but I felt like if someone else was doing it, I can do it, too. Why not? And then had to learn through the process what exactly it
was.

I feel like that's backwards. I feel like we have to find different words of communication to ensure that everyone knows what it is and know the importance of why they need to participate in drawing, redistricting, the geography in which they live. Even after it got -- the numbers started dwindling down, and I went, oh crap, I better figure out what this is for real that I've applied to.

In interviewing people, even one of -- you know, some of the previous commissioners. I feel like, in retrospect, the information shared was still delivered in a way that was delivered in pride of what the job was, to almost be impressive about how important this job is, but not necessarily the detail needed to understand it and to know that it is accessible and we are looking for you. So I would want to, when it's time, to struggle with what are the right words, what is the accessible approach for everyday people to be able to see themselves in this role that'll be able to serve California.

So recommendation would just be really working on how we're doing the recruitment, where we're doing the recruitment. For some of the other piece parts, I'll let some of the others in the queue respond and then I'll come back just probably one more time in the same
section. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy. And I completely agree with Commissioner Turner and Commissioner Le Mons. Again, I did not listen to any of the meetings. You know, most of us work full-time. The meetings were held during the day. And even if I wasn't working, I'm not sure if I would have tuned in, so I'm not sure how that went. I'm glad that Mr. Andersen did and she had a good feedback from that.

Completely agree that there was a huge underestimate -- estimation of the time commitment, and that's very unfair. It's unfair to all of us to -- in order to be fully engaged, we weren't -- we weren't sold the right bag of goods, I guess, and then we get criticized for it, and that's very, very unfair.

But part of it, too, is I feel that -- and I've talked about this before -- that I feel if we -- if we, along with the state auditor, come up with a better definition of fully functional, we won't have to dedicate so much time in the beginning in terms of the -- I don't want to say menial, but a lot of the administrative work that, honestly, we should not have been required to
perform, and a lot of the outreach. And if, you know, we could have had support from the state auditor until we at least hired our full executive team, that they were up and running to include our outreach and some of -- and help us process the RFPs and the -- our positions and -- I mean, just so much in the upfront that we -- honestly, they shouldn't expect us to have the knowledge or the expertise.

Again, there's 14 of us. I just happen to have background in government, but if we didn't -- I mean, I'm just sitting here going, oh my god, that would have been just very difficult to navigate through that. So thank you for the rest -- the other thirteen of -- going through that challenge.

And I agree with Commissioner Turner. I think the concept redistricting and then commissioner, it's intimidating. So we need to take that away. We need to -- as Commissioner Turner said, we need to say, yeah, we really do want the common Californian that is not into politics, that, you know, maybe doesn't even know who their congressman or person is at this point, but just that is involved in their community and you know, want to draw better lines for Californians.

I also feel it would be helpful to get the state auditor's perspective on the whole recruitment process.
I think that's probably a must. Again, it's their process and I'm sure they've already had their Lessons Learned, but I think it would be helpful to us, and I do know that part of our moving forward is to provide feedback to them on the next recruitment.

But yeah. I was just very disappointed in how they portrayed the amount of time to really do -- you know, to do a good job and be fully involved. It was full-time towards the last few months, and I think that really needs to be communicated. And it was also heavily -- we were heavily involved the entire time because we had so many subcommittees, we didn't have, you know, enough staff, and we're just running along trying to create an organization that will be dismantled in a year.

So it's just a lot upfront that I feel the fourteen commissioners should not have to be required to do that on their own. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Forniciari.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah. Let's see. I agree with what's been said before, so I won't reiterate it too much. I did -- I just want to make a recommendation. I think one of the strengths of the recruitment process, or at least the training of the -- of the -- was the
training of the auditors who were doing the recruiting. And they really got trained, you know, in the kind of nuts and bolts of redistricting, but the big missing piece -- and it's been touched on, but I want to make a recommendation that we do this -- is put together a module that is what does it mean to be on a commission, what does it mean to be a commissioner, what is a commission? You know, and so that it's really clear and really laid out, and you know, and talk about the time commitment in that -- in that module so that we would have an opportunity to train the auditors and then to train the new commissioners when they come on board with that kind of detail.

And you know, as, you know, Trina and Alicia were talking about the recruitment process, I mean, perhaps this is something we'd also like to do ahead of time in a video that would be accessible to folks that they -- so they could better understand what they're getting themselves into. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Forniciari.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you and good to see everybody. For me, I think, certainly recruitment's really critical. But when I think about serving on the
commission, the one thing that comes up is that we are an independent commission, right? So balancing the needs, the infrastructure needs of the commission is important while also maintaining our independence.

So figuring out what -- how to do that, and I think that's probably where the auditor's office -- and I'm -- and I don't know this for sure -- but that's probably where the auditors had struggled with as well. How do -- how does -- how do you create an independent commission while having state staff staffing it, right? And the fear that staff might -- that state staff might influence the process is always a concern.

Given that we are -- we're a commission. The commissioners are supposed to be setting the policy direction and not the staff. And so thinking through some of that, how that -- how we can do that. I think it's possible to do that, and I think we just need to think through how do we create a fully functional independent -- and a fully functional organization that's -- that also ensures that the individuals making the decision is the commission, not a staff, right, so that -- because we do have, in government, civil service that keeps government functioning and makes a lot of -- maybe not policy, but keeps the organizational functioning when there are transitions.
And that's important, too. Just trying to figure out -- I mean, we are different than most commissions, and that's the -- I think that's where I -- and I think others may struggle with that. We don't want to give up our independence. And so how do we -- how do we ensure that?

That being said, the reason I applied -- and I did learn about it over and over again. There was certainly quite a bit of social media and radio and other media maybe out there. And I didn't apply until the last minute, mostly because of the calls from the advocacy groups that there weren't enough people of color on the commission.

And so that's when I said, okay. You know, it was, like, the day before it was due. I'll submit my application and -- but ensuring that we have a diverse pool and one that probably needs to compensate for the fact that there's -- that there are litters -- there are disparities in the state, right? And so you probably need a higher percentage of people of color in the pools in order to get the outcome that we want, which is a representative group at the end. Just some thoughts.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.
Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Good morning, everyone. I hope everyone is well. Good to see everyone. I'm going to -- it would be wonderful to have the state auditor's perspective of what the recruitment process would be, too, because, you know, they might be able to glean some information that we may -- we may have missed. So their perspective, I think, would be -- would be invaluable.

I do wonder -- I do wonder how effective some of this can be in that we do fully disassemble this ship and then hand it up to the -- to the next commission. So I wonder what is some of the rudimentary things that can be passed on from commission to commission?

And I think of -- I think of discussion of what's really required from a commissioner and how that can be relayed into the application and recruitment process. And we have to acknowledge that this was the second iteration of this.

So I think if you look at what the first commission did, what we did, that might be a whole different set of attributes that someone else would be able to take from it. So I think -- I think for 2030, there might be a better idea of what is required for a commissioner that we can -- that we can relay going forward.

As I think of the advertisement in the recruitment,
I wish that some of the things we saw when we were solicitating COI testimony I would have seen during the application process. And a large billboard in my neighborhood asking for people to submit COI testimony may be what needs to be for asking for applicants.

If we're wondering about, you know, of the applicant pool, this all is going to begin from the first -- from the first solicitation. It's almost as if -- it's almost as if to build -- to build our COI input, to build our community input, we want to start in the middle. And it's going to -- it start all the way from the beginning. That's a tool for input at recruitment, and I think that we sort of seg -- we segmented that, and it doesn't have to be.

This -- it's a wrap-around. It's totality. And I don't think that we've reviewed it or we went about it in that -- in that measure. Partly, I guess, it's because we fully disassemble the ship. So yeah. It's a few things. I think we're going to have some recurrent things. I'm going to come back. Not as concise as I would like to be in the moment, but I think there's a -- we have to look at the totality of how this affects each component. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.
I wanted to get myself into the queue in part to respond to what Commissioner Turner was saying, and Commissioner Toledo also kind of referred to it in his remarks as well. One of the things that I was looking at early on in relation to the recruitment process, and I've seen that the Michigan commission, for example, has a set salary.

And it's always seemed to me that one of our barriers to recruiting more kind of common Californians, you know, everyday Californians who aren't specialists in any of this is, if someone came to me at a different point in my life and said, I want you to devote yourself, you know, mostly full-time and eventually more than full-time during a short period to this process, but you know, you're never going to know exactly how much money you're going to be earning from one month to the next, I'd kind of give them a funny look and say, really?

You know, I think some of us had the luxury of, you know, whether it's retirement or a steady income stream that was not, you know, impeded by service on the Commission. But you know, if you look at someone who is already struggling to get by and you say, I want you to, you know, focus on this instead of what it is you're doing to barely get by, but I'm not going to tell you how much you're going to earn, I don't see how that's really
a successful formula.

The Michigan commission has a salary that is set as a percentage of the governor's salary, and I forget whether it's twenty-five percent or something. But anyway, you know, going into this, a person would at least understand what it is that they're going to earn. So I -- you know, I put that on the table as something to think about.

Second of all, I have always wondered since the days in early August when the first eight were picking the final six if it wouldn't have been easier to fill out the Commission if we'd had one more seat. I think that, you know, the composition, the way it is at fourteen with five, five, and four was perhaps perfectly rational at the time that the commission was proposed.

Voter registration numbers have shifted. The whole tone of politics, both in California and in the nation at-large have shifted. You know, I -- and I understand that the 2010 commission was also looking favorably on recommending expansion of the commission to five, five, and five. And we did have a brief discussion on this recently, but I wanted to put it on the table again.

Third, and this has to do, again, with terms of service is the year beginning -- year ending in zero to year ending zero a good formula, or was that simply the
most expedient at the time that the initial initiative
was circulating in 2008 at a point where it was way too
te late to form the first commission in a year ending in
eight?

I mean, would it be better to start the terms of
office in a year ending in nine or in eight or in seven
or even in five? I mean, we're looking from our
perspective at what are we going to do for the next eight
years? I would encourage us also to think about do we
really need to hold on to this for eight years or would
it be better for the 2030 commission -- quote, unquote --
and subsequent commissions to have an earlier start at
this?

So those are the -- those are the three topics that
I would put onto the table at this point. And I'll pass
it over to Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. So my experience
was a little different in that I did know what the
commission did. I remembered voting for it. I kept my
eye on it ever since I voted for it. And after I
finished serving my community as a school board member, I
was trying to figure out what type of commission or how
I -- you know, how I wanted to serve, and I had landed on
commissions.

I knew about commissions because of my leadership
program through HOPE and -- but I'll have to say -- so
most of how I got -- I prepared and stuff was through the
community groups, but I will -- and they did a good job.
But I'll have to say I didn't hear about it from the
community groups.

I put it out there in the universe. I'm in this
new -- my new thing is it's a -- you know, I've been
doing this since I -- when I first applied to be
appointed on the school board, I didn't know if to share
with everybody that I was doing it or if to keep it
quiet. You know, and it was that whole thing like, okay,
if I don't get it, then no one will know. But then if I
do share it, people can help me, give me advice.

And so I learned from that experience that sharing,
even though it's scary that you might fail, is good. So
I had put it out there on social media and my large
network saying, hey, I'm going to apply to the
commission. And then people started sending me the
emails that they were getting from Common Cause or for --
from --

So the piece I want to say is one recommendation is
for the community groups is that they have a very insular
audience. They think it's very broad, but it's
already -- it's those people who already know them and
who they -- they're preaching to the choir many times.
And it's espec -- it's an important choir.

But they need to do more partnering with other
groups like LEAP and HOPE and California LEAP -- other
groups that also -- that have, -- you know, it's always
about looking at your small circles and expanding your
circles. And so the fact that even though I was
completely engaged and have a large network, I never
heard about it from the community groups. I heard -- you
know, I had gone out to search. So that's one
recommendation I have, and that's more towards the
community groups.

And I will say that their training was excellent.
They did a really good job of letting you know what a
commissioner was, what the redistricting was. They had
former commissioners come and talk about their stories.
And from the very beginning, I was overwhelmed by how
much time this took, and I had to make a decision about
my own business within the first few months of us being
commissioners, and I took a step back on my -- on my
business.

I did talk to the community groups since we were
part of the outreach committee. We would be talking
about other things, and I said to them, why weren't you
ever honest in all these trainings? Because I went to
two or three different trainings. I even got -- I even
went through their coaching once it came down to being interviewed, and nobody ever was honest.

And what they said to me was we didn't want to be honest about the time because then people like you wouldn't have applied. And then I also talked to Director Clay -- you know, at the time, Director Claypool, and said, how come people weren't honest about the time? And he's like, well, I've tried to be honest with the auditors, but they're afraid it'll scare people.

And so it was this whole thing about scaring people away from actually applying if they knew 50 percent of your time, you know, during the set up and outreach and then a hundred plus percent of your time during the actual mapping and then twenty-five percent, -- you know, ten to twenty-five percent, you know.

So and then -- and then Claypool said to me, and it was -- and it was true. Director Claypool said to me, but you all still would have applied even if we were honest. You all are the type of people who would have applied. I do feel it needs to be upfront and it needs -- and it needs to be honest, especially for those who work for someone else or works for another company or something because you need to be able to have those honest conversations with your employer.

I remember when Commissioner Le Mons said, I just
started a job and I -- and I had to go to my board and
tell them I was doing this and I and that image hit me
several times during this process of what did he tell his
board? Because we didn't know it was going to take this
much time. So I do want to say as a recommendation there
does need to be more clarity.

And I did listen to some of the sessions. I would
have them -- while I worked out, I listened to sess --
you know, I'd try to -- since I have some flexibility, I
would try to find ways to listen. And I will have to say
that it was good for me to listen to the sessions because
it allowed me to promote how good the recruitment process
was.

My favorite story is that they were looking -- and
no offense to anybody around -- on this commission
because we all made it -- but they were looking at two
candidates. One was a mail -- mailman driver -- was a
mail delivery driver and one was a Ph.D. candidate, and
they're like, look, we have enough people with Ph.D.s on
our pool -- in our pool.

But think about a mail drive -- a mail -- you know, a
mail delivery person. They know maps. They know
community. This person would be excellent. And so I use
that quote all the time and they -- to share with the
outside world on when they were like, oh, they didn't
know what they were doing and stuff.

And so I did think it was important that we -- that
we participate -- that I participated in that reason
because I was able to, as Commissioner Taylor likes to
say, talk about the process. You know, be able to be a
witness to the process. I know I'm not quoting you
correctly, Commissioner Taylor, but that's always been
something you say and I've taken to heart.

And finally, I thought the auditors did a good job.
But let's be honest, they were not diverse. The auditors
only look at the importance of diversity as it came to
political parties, but it was three white people. And
they were all government employees, obviously. They work
for the auditor's office.

I would like to see that process maybe grow, that
pool of people who actually do the review process. Maybe
be three from the auditor's office, one community group
member, and two former commissioners, one from 210 and
one from 220. But to have people on there that reflect
more of the community because obviously they're all from
Sacramento. They all -- you know, there's a lot of
pieces -- they did a great job.

If you watch the last meeting -- if you haven't done
it, I would go back to watch that last meeting because
all three of them actually got really emotional as they
said their last comments. They were really into this for
the right reasons. And at one point, I had asked to
invite them to the final map-signing and you know, with
COVID and time lines, it was hard.

But I do think that the three -- the three auditors
gave up, you know, a whole year -- didn't give up. They
got this amazing opportunity, and they took it very
seriously. But I do think it would be good to have more
than just the auditors do the review process. That's it.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you --
COMMISSIONER SINAY: I (Indiscernible).
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- Commissioner Sinay.
Thanks.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Thank you. I
appreciate all of the comments that have been made and I
agree with pretty much everything that's already been
said, so I'll just try to be additive. I think my
thoughts are three main areas.

First, in terms of recruitment. Reflecting on my
own process, I knew about the commission. I certainly
remember voting for it when it was on the ballot despite
the fact that the organization that I worked for was
opposed to it. I agree with Commissioner Sinay that
organizations can play a very important role in the
recruitment of applicants.

Certainly -- despite knowing about the commission, it wasn't really on my radar if organizations hadn't mentioned it to me. So in that sense, it's a little different, I think, from Commissioner Sinay. I remember getting emails on listserv saying, think about applying. You know, I'm affiliated with the Schwarzenegger Institute. They were talking about it.

But again, these are organizations that have always been involved in this process. And I think one of the things that we have innovated in this last two years is the outreach. So we've developed a much bigger list. We've done outreach to so many different community colleges, chambers of commerce, local civic clubs. I'm hoping that that larger list, that larger universe of community folks, is what would be used to do that recruitment, not just the, you know, the large civil rights orgs.

And of course, I want them to still do that work and their circles are important, but I think there's so many more that are out there that have much larger circles, right? I mean, thinking about Trena's comment, right? Like, I'm hoping PICO's a part of this. I'm hoping other -- like, smaller groups that aren't necessarily super-engaged in redistricting are also a part of that
larger recruitment effort.

So maintaining that -- the outreach work that we've set up, I think, is a key part to that recruitment. I didn't -- I was not someone that watched the process. I didn't -- I submitted. I honestly didn't really think a whole lot about it after that. And again, similar to Pedro and Trena, I -- for me, it was an L.A. Times article that came out talking about how their -- the applicant pool was not diverse, and that was why I applied. And I didn't follow the process after, but I have heard, of course, really good things about the applicant review panel and agree. I think this conversation should be in conjunction with them.

A second piece I wanted to raise was about this notion of independence and the first eight and the early days of the commission. I think we struggled, we all did, right, because none of us knew -- like, we were focused on, hey, we're going to draw maps. And then it turned out, oh, we need to learn, like, the State of California HR handbook and finance and what the heck an RFP is for the State of California versus an RFI, and how all of -- you know, can we sub-grant funds?

Like, there were so many administrative pieces that were -- it's ridiculous to think that we would all be able to take it on, and yet we did. And yet we did. But
we certainly had stumbling blocks along the way, and I think that there can be things that should be done to make that easier for the future.

But you know, I heard Pedro loud and clear. Like, this piece around independence matters, right? Because I actually -- I actually feel like, to some extent, you know, Raul and Marion brought really wonderful traits to the table, but they also came from 2010, and with that was a certain perspective of how things need to be done.

And we spent a lot of time, you know, setting the record straight that we weren't going to do things exactly as 2010, and 2030 has to have that same flexibility as well. So I'm concerned about the idea of handing the 2030 commission an infrastructure in advance. I do think, however, and this would be a recommendation, that they have to have more consistent point people at different layers of governance.

Yes, we are independent, but we needed to rely -- we needed to have some -- someone -- to be able to contact someone from the auditor's office at certain points in time. We -- it would have been great if we could have had a liaison with the Department of Finance and didn't have to just wait until we hire someone to be that liaison.

Like, who from the Department of Finance is going to
staff the commission to -- not staff, but be that point person. Who from the Attorney General's Office, right? We're trying to hire major law firms and hire chief counsel for a job that's one year in duration. That was hard, right? Like, can someone from the Attorney General's Office just be available to provide a little bit of guidance to us and recognize that they might lead us astray at the same time, right?

As well as communications. I think that was a key piece early on. I mean, we were getting attacked before the first eight had ever even met in the media and had no ability to say anything. We were getting legal advice, say nothing. And I thought, that's crazy. How can we say nothing on this issue that matters so much? So we definitely need -- there needs to be some more infrastructure in place for 2030, but having it set in stone feels really uncomfortable to me as well.

I don't think that, for example, it was completely neutral how we arrive -- some of the decisions that led to our first executive director hire, for example. And I'm thinking about very specific things. That hiring process didn't need to happen in closed session, and we were advised to do it in closed session, right? Had it not, we would have had a lot more community input on who our first executive director was.
So I do think that the folks that are assigned to the commission do guide in very important ways, and we have to be really cautious about that. And yet, there needs to be a balance as well because that was just crazy.

And then the third piece that I wanted to raise, you know -- and actually, sorry, before I finish up on independence, I wanted to lift up something Commissioner Kennedy said around the start date. I very much support an earlier start date for the next commission. I think, you know, even if it's -- if it's 2029, one of the real values there is that the census would then be -- you know, would then still be ongoing and it would be perhaps easier to connect with the infrastructure that's built around the census count for the State of California and maybe be able to leverage some of that, right?

There's a lot of folks -- and maybe Marcy at some point could speak to this having worked on the census -- but there's a lot of folks that kind of end their trajectory on the census that we could potentially pick up who have a lot of community outreach, who understand what's at stake, understand the process, have that sort of neutral vibe. So I think the time change could really help in creating that bridge.

So the third piece that I wanted to raise is kind of
a broader one, but speaks to, I think, many of these
center concerns generally. Yeah, it's scary how many hours it
takes to go into this process, but I think what the
commission lacks and should not lack any longer because
we've had two very successful commissions over the last
20 years. I think what we lack is a sense of legitimacy
and respect. And I'm not talking about us. I'm talking
about the institution of the California Citizens
Redistricting Commission.

   Our commission is a unicorn, right? We've passed
   maps that went uncontested, and that's something that
   should be upheld, that people should feel good about, you
   know, committing to service. And I'm open to the
   conversation around salary. I think all of that is right
   on. But I think, you know, we also stand in this
   interesting crossroads where we are generally hated by
   Democrats and Republicans throughout the state.

   We get cheap shots from them all the time throughout
   the process because they don't want us to exist. They
   want to have that power themselves. And so I think that
   overall, thinking about ways to, like, build up the
   legitimacy of our commission and the respect for it would
   have -- would help in the long run in terms of
   recruitment, in terms of the folks that would want to
   serve, in terms of the expectations that people have for
this commission. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani. Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. I appreciate everything that everyone else has said. I think in the quest to be additive, it may not always be additive, so I'll just start there. I think I'll start with the -- I guess, the recruitment portion. You know, I guess I'll just add a different perspective to the recruitment perspective in terms of the selection and the state auditors.

While everything that was done -- I mean, there's been lots of comments, and as Commissioner Sadhwani said, cheap shots, pot shots, other things like that lobbed at us even before we started. I do think that at the end of the day, the outcome or the makeup of this commission, while there may be different perspectives that were not fully representative, I still think that they did a really good job.

And maybe this is self-congratulatory, but I think they did a really good job in creating or bringing together a group of people, all of who were open and curious and impartial, and we were not so entrenched in our political beliefs that that made it impossible to get the work of the State done. And I think in terms of the
work that the state auditors did, while they -- while
it's been noted that, you know, they were three, you
know, white folks, they -- I guess maybe because they're
auditors, they did what they were, you know -- they
worked with the parameters that they were given.

And I think if diversity is a greater concern than
that should be one of the stronger -- but I think it was
part of the question. And so I think that they did keep
it in mind. But if it needs to be lifted up higher, I
think then they will follow the instructions as it was
given to them. And so I just wanted to say that because
at the end of the day, what I think was really good, and
while I hear what was said about adding, like, a
community-based organization, my concern about adding a
community-based organization to the selection process is
what happened to us in terms of some of the comments that
we got about the -- perhaps the undue influence of some
of the community-based organizations in our maps.

And I think if that happens in the selection, to
what Commissioner Sadhwani was saying, it was about the
legitimacy of the commission. I think that that leaves
open a question whether or not -- some people will
disagree with what community-based organization is on
there to help with the selection. Not that I don't --
wouldn't, you know, say that they wouldn't be able to,
but I think that those kinds of opportunities open up the commission to those kind of charges.

And that's where I think the state auditor's, being perhaps the neutral party -- neutral party in being apolitical in that sense was useful in this selection process. Now, that doesn't mean that this just doesn't have to be the way it is, but I just thought I'd just add that to that, I guess, area there.

In terms of the recruitment, also, I'll just say, one, I did not watch any of the meetings. In fact, I heard about it through a community-based organization in the same way that some of the others expressed that there were concerns about not having a diverse enough pool. So after a lot of thought, I did apply at the last minute, mostly because I thought, all right, well, at least I'll just be another applicant that is, you know, from a diverse community so at least then the chances of eventually the commission that is seated will become more diverse.

I'll be honest, I didn't think that I was going to, you know, keep making it. So that's why I just didn't pay any attention to it until it became really the last minute. So I thought I'd just share that.

I do want to also say that I think on the lines of what we talked about with the outreach for the COI
testimony, we heard a lot about the use of trusted
messengers, and I think that's also important. And I
want to bring that up in terms of a lot of the other
comments that were made about using different CVLs.

They're wonderful, I think, in terms of being able
to reach communities that may either not pay attention to
this and or perhaps knowing who might be more likely to
want to participate or apply for this process. I
understand what's been said about wanting the everyday
Californian. Honestly, I think of myself as an everyday
Californian. I -- so I do want to say that.

I also, on that, I would say, you know, we can also
be used in the recruitment as well, too. We all have
very diverse networks and we should also be part of that
recruitment process, and I think that's been part of the
suggestions around some of the activities that we'll
continue to do regardless of whatever time frame we end
up landing on.

The other thing I also want to say in terms of just
who we are and then who people in the future may be.
Just keep in mind that who we are today is not
necessarily wholly representative of where we came from,
too. And that, as I said, you know, I feel that I'm a
everyday Californian. I think every one of us is an
everyday Californian. We may do what we do today, but we
also come from different backgrounds, different circumstances, different economic circumstances, different communities.

And I think that doesn't leave when, you know, when we go on to do different other work. And I think that as much was brought into our process as well, too.

So I just feel like I think we just need to remind ourselves about that as well, too.

In terms of the time, I thought I knew how much time it was going to take, but I will be honest, I think the three months -- once we got the census numbers, I think that's the part where we have to be much more real about what the time commitment is going to be. And yes, it may have prevented some of us from applying. It may have made us think twice or maybe three times, maybe even five times, but I think that that needed to be said because, as has been said, if you're working, you're either accountable to somebody or others are accountable to you. And I think in fairness to those that you work with, you have to prepare them, too.

And you know, for three months, this became our full-time job, and I think that became hard because people around us are expecting that, okay, we're serving on this, but we're also going to be maybe doing our other work. And that became really, really challenging. And I
think if we want to get everyday Californians, I think we
do have to be real about that, too, because, you know,
while we may want that diversity not only in terms of
race and ethnicity and region and experiences
economically, even with a salary, even with upfront
salary, there's going to be some people who are going to
say, I can't make this work.

You know, that's the realism of it, but maybe if
they know ahead of time. I guess, maybe then the
question becomes, are there other ways in which we can
make it so that, you know, people of different employment
work kind of statuses and backgrounds and economic
backgrounds can also participate that you don't have to
be in a place where, you know, you'll have an employer
that is going to let you, in a sense, spend what is going
to become at the end about three months away from work.

I was fortunate. I had a board that was incredibly
supportive, but my staff wasn't totally prepared for
this. And so still dealing with some of the, I think,
you know, just kind of catching up with all of them on
that. So I wanted to say that.

Last thing I would say is, I guess just coming from
a place when I first applied and when we first were
selected, the question was always, like, why fourteen?
Why not fifteen? Why not five all the way across? And
I've heard different perspectives as we have had conversations about potentially, you know, going from fourteen to fifteen. I look forward to the further conversations, but you know, I don't know. Maybe it just -- I -- anyways. Maybe I'm missing something.

Last thing is about the fully functional. I appreciate what Sara said. I think that that was a really interesting way to think about it. I was just thinking if we don't have to spend time on, like, how do we, you know, do our time sheets and the TECs, you know, those kind of administrative things? I think then we could have spent time earlier focusing on the things we needed to set up for the line-drawing.

So you know, in terms of the formation part, thinking about some way that does balance the independence with the practicalities of do we really have to be the ones to set up the administrative structure or is there a way in which we can maybe give some training wheels to the commission where instead of just, like, okay, you're all fourteen are seated, you're on your own, maybe just have a little bit more time, maybe about a month more before, you know, we're kind of, you know, thrown off into the wind to fly on our own.

I think once we got the hang of it, we were okay. But there was a -- there was a rough period of time in
the beginning where I think having a little bit more
hand-holding would have been helpful before we decided,
okay, we're good and we could do this on our own now. So
thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner
Akutagawa. We're going into our two-minute drill, so we
actually have nine minutes left, four hands up, and
Commissioner Forniciari has something to say before we go
to break. So please keep it short and sweet.

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Recruitment. We
should start with the census advertising. This is the
redistricting and census need to be wrapped hand-in-hand.
Actually, I'd like to do civic education starting now,
our educational process in -- because the high schoolers
now are going to be almost qualified by the time, you
know, the 2030 comes around.

Newspapers. Not just on social media. Newspapers
are so important. I actually -- I read it in the
newspaper, but all-language newspapers. And then I
really want us to recruit to more geographic areas. And
a lot of, like, you know, we're talking, well, those
community of interest groups, you know, in the Eastern
Sierras.

There weren't any. It was really hard. I mean,
they weren't like -- there really were, you know, two or three. So we need to get somehow, how do we get into the geographical areas? The module of, you know, what it needs the commissioner, how much time it takes, I think we should do like almost a video of a bunch of us and put that in the recruitment as well. You know, like us talking about what it meant.

When I saw in the 2010 commissioners talking about what they're prob -- what they did and how it all went, I realized how much time it was going to make, and that shows -- the process the way it is right now implies that one is actually following all the way through. By the time everyone got that training, I'd had -- I'd had it three times. I knew what VRA districts were about. But that's not realistic.

And then I think we should have on our -- you know, on the, like, the Shape California website, which is, you know, the auditor's website, training. These are things you need to know, and one of those needs to be organizational administrative parts even if that takes a two-day training because that is what we need -- you start out with.

And including that is the time frame of what everything takes. How long does it actually take to get the RFP written and have it get through and actually be
able to hire someone? We didn't really know that until we were already in trouble.

I do want to say, you know, in terms of the independence, that really is a dicey issue because the state auditors did put RFPs together for us and they were even going to say, hey, we can do this stuff and you guys -- you know, then we're going to hand it over to you. You can use it or not.

And the hue and cry that went up was amazing. Oh my God, no, we're independent, can't do that, blah, blah, blah. So it really is a political thing about being independent and having that structure set up for us, I think that's something we really want to delve into a little more to come up with concrete ideas. But that really is an issue of what we set up and we as just liaisons, is it -- this is what we did. Here's like an outline. If you need something like that, we need to spend time on. So thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Anderson.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes. I just wanted to chime in on the issue of independence. I won't repeat everything but I agree. I think that's something we should look a little bit more carefully at. Where do we
feel any recommendations that touch on that nerve if you will, to make sure that we're considering that in the recommendations. So I -- I look forward to that discussion. I appreciate this discussion very, very much.

Also I wanted to speak to the respect that Commissioner Sadhwani raised. And what came to mind when she was talking about that. I don't know, for whatever reason I thought about the military. I don't know why the military. But it was this idea of, you know, we want you. And we're representing our country by those individuals that are drawn to the military and they understand two things that were brought up in this conversation. The cost, which is usually very high. And the seriousness and importance of it. So just as a theme, not that I think we should hear of the military in the U.S., but this idea of respect and care for this task, this very important task. And I think that can help maybe even spark something in the everyday Californian -- I happen to think I'm an every day Californian too, but anyway, that everyday Californian to think, yes, there's some -- these will be something inspirational and aspirational about the promotions that go out.

I didn't necessarily feel any of that. It was more
informational. But I think if we could figure out a way
to -- even if it's just thematically make some
recommendations around those things that might help deal
with some of the issues that I think we've raised. So
that was the additional content. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Le
Mons.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah, I'm just, like,
reflecting back on our experience. And our experience
was so infected by COVID, I wonder whether the next
commission, what their experience will be like. I think
it's -- I mean, what -- I thought we would be travelling
up and down the state, visiting communities, talking with
individuals. I had, you know, and I was trying to plan
for that, right, as -- when everything kind of changed
and -- so I don't know if our experience and our -- what
we went through -- well, I know what -- one think I do
know is our experiences will be very different than the
next commission, right. Ten years from now, technology
so much -- going to be much more advanced.

Hopefully, they're not going to be dealing with
COVID. But they'll be dealing with other issues and
certainly the demographics and the and voter registration
numbers and all that is going to change as well. So I
just, I think our experience was so colored by COVID. The fact that we were able to do this in -- much of our work over -- over Zoom. And that we were able to fit pivot so much. And we were able to do so many things that we might not have been able to do otherwise, right. And so I do worry about -- maybe worry is the wrong word. I do wonder if our experience is -- how that experience is going to impact the next commissioner. How we can give input to the -- so anyways, so those are just things I'm thinking about in terms of our experience. Just because it's -- the reality that we've lived for the past two years. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Taylor; and then back to Commissioner Fornaciari to take us to break.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you. And my views always come from the standpoint of maximum participation. So I would think that this process has to be wrapped into this -- to the census -- into the census. Especially with the standpoint of recruitment and advertisement. And again, with the goal of achieving maximum participation.

And what I'm hearing too from all of our conversation is that time seems to be the most precious
element that we have. And time can -- is an component of
ingdependence. So we have to consider those things to
give the next commission more time, because that could be
a factor there, independence. If not, if it's a shorter
timeframe, I think we have to pass on some sort of
infrastructure to reduce that time so we can spend more
time on the necessity of line drawing. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you very much,
Commissioner Taylor.

Thank to all of you. I think this has been a great
discussion. Good start that we are off to for the next
few days plus the two days next week.

I'll turn it back over to Commissioner Fornaciari
before we go to our first break.

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thanks. And thanks
everyone. This is great discussion. I do like the idea
of including a higher -- sort of a higher purpose in the
recruitment process. I think that's great. I think we
all have a sense of higher purpose but we brought that
ourselves rather than that being included. And I just
want to make one comment to something Commissioner Toledo
said. I think it's a little bit unfortunate that we're
being criticized for not traveling throughout the state
in a once in a century pandemic -- really. With that, I
just -- one more comment.
I just want to make it clear to the public that
public comment will be -- everybody, we will hold public
comment from 4 to 4:30 every day. And so you don't have
to call in early and wait in line. It will be in from 4
to 4:30. So with that, we'll go on our first break and
see you all back at 11:15.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 10:59 a.m.
until 11:15 a.m.)

VICE-CHAIR FORNACIARI: Welcome back California, to
the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. Before
I turn it over to my colleague, Commissioner Yee to
continue with the Lessons Learned subcommittee work, I'm
going -- I'm want to make a -- I want to clarify a
statement I made at the end of the -- before the break.

As far as public comment goes. We will begin taking
public comment at 4 p.m. We will recess or adjourn the
meeting when we have gotten through all of the callers.
That may be before 4:30. But at 4 p.m. is the time to
call in to provide public comment. So with that, I will
turn it over to Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair. And it's so
good to be with you all. I have missed you, also.
Commissioner Kennedy and I will officiate these sessions
facilitating the comments. And so we are now moving to
our second topic, which is topic 2B on the run of show
but I think you're following the prompts.

So this is Support and Staffing. Overlap somewhat with
the first topic we've been discussing.

So Support and Staffing includes the support we got
from the auditor's office as we became fully functional.
The early steps we took to become compliant with Form
700, defensive driver training and all that, you might
remember. The yearly implementation of the per diem and
the tech process, which was much of the way, as I recall,
we actually didn't get any per diem payments until the
new year. So after getting started in August.

Staffing levels early and then eventual. We ended
up a rather larger staff than 2010 had. And some
thoughts about that. The website situation, early on.
And then as it developed. And then as it stands now.
Our use of retired annuitants, temporary staff, and
consultants. And then the staff situation as we find
ourselves now and going into the coming eight years.
That's about all of that.

So I'm happy to open it up to your thoughts and
evaluating the path we took with Support and Staffing and
then recommendations for 2030 with Support and Staffing.
Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I've got kind of more of a
procedural question. I know this has been answered so I
apologize for asking again but when are we doing our subcommittee reports because I think our subcommittee, Commissioner Yee, may give some input into 2030 and staffing. I just think that that kind of input -- the information we have comes from Director Pane is important.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Tomorrow morning is the business meeting -- portion of this meeting. So that's when subcommittee reports will happen.


COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee. Just two things. I've been a bit of a broken record from the beginning on the need for a definition of fully functional. And if that means that we need to figure out who gets to establish regulations related to our work, because regulations are where some of those key definitions are located, I think that needs to be a priority.

In my mind, and as one of the colleagues mentioned earlier, the -- I think it was Commissioner Sadhwani, the inability of the first eight to make any public statement, a) because one interpretation was the only work that we were authorized to undertake was to select the final six. And that making public statements was not part of what the first eight were authorized to do, I
think was a major problem.

And second of all, I think that, you know, as colleagues said earlier also, we really have to think in terms of having a full core staff, including communications directors, spokesperson, whatever the role is going to be called. I don't consider a body fully functional unless it has that function. And we were left drifting and hanging without that. And I think that we could have done much better had we had that.

Second of all, on the admin issues, you know, I think this is where we, yes, need to understand the importance of the independence of the commission, but as someone mentioned in the last segment, you know, there are certain things that are just basic. And I don't think they really infringe on any independence. And as you said, you know, not being paid for the first four months, you know, it's demotivating, demoralizing, and creates headaches that commissioners frankly shouldn't have to do deal with.

And if the 2030 commission is on as tight a timeline as they might be, they really need not to have those headaches. So I think we do need to ensure that not only administrative policies are in place, that the 2030 commission can change at its leisure, but we were basically being told that, you know, we didn't have
polices yet and so we couldn't do things until we came up with policies. And I think -- I don't think I would have seen it as an infringement on our independence to have received basic administrative policies form the 2010 commission that would have enabled us to be paid on time and submit travel expense claims and be reimbursed in a timely manner, et cetera, you know, in the knowledge that we had the authority to change those at any point in time. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, this is a great example of -- of you come up with much better solutions when you get input from lots of different perspectives. So this is really interesting conversation and you know, I had my idea of what fully functional is or could be -- could look like. You know but there were some underlying assumptions that I had.

And one thing that someone brought up, I'm sorry, I don't remember who it was, is, you know, maybe the commission gets stood up earlier in time. And then they have -- then the next commission would have time to sort of ramp things up in a more, I don't know leisurely base if you will. Although that's probably not optimum because they would expect they'd want to get -- jump
right into outreach.

But nonetheless, I mean, you know, fully functional, there has to be some infrastructure in place. I agree with Commissioner Kennedy. There need to be some basic infrastructure in place to get the commission started. And then, of course, they can, you know, has to be open-ended enough to have the commission change it, you know however they'd want it to be but at least have some basic infrastructure in place.

I do think it's interesting that, you know, looking through the input and the recommendations we got from the community organizations that wrote in, their recommendation about the current CRC should create templates for job descriptions for senior staff for use by the next commission but the auditors should not do that. But you know, I think that there's room for us to lay a lot of the groundwork there and hand it off to the next commission. I mean, we could even go as far as posting for those jobs before we -- before we're, you know, we move from office kind of thing.

But I think, you know, a lot of it's all coupled together is why I bring this up. You know, if we go with the timeframe that's there now, I would expect we want to do more. If we're going to propose that there's a longer timeframe, maybe there's less we can do. So -- yeah, and
I have a recommendation -- I'm rambling. Sorry, I'll stop.

COMMISSIONER YEE: All good.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. Yeah, I just wanted to clarify. And I guess maybe I should have waited for this section to talk about the fully functional. And it has nothing to do with in terms of wanting to say auditor provide more support longer. It has nothing to do with independence. It has more to do with some of the administrative functions. I'm not talking about having them, you know, doing any of the hiring for us. That's -- that would -- or for the new commission. That would be for the commission. But it's more of processing our positions. Processing our per diems. Assisting us to process the recruitment and the posting and collecting the applications. Because I remember many, many times, I hope you remember as well, Raul saying there's only one of me and his list was just exhaustive. So he did the best he could, which we're very grateful for.

But also it does hinder you in terms of how quickly you can move forward and concentrate on, you know, what we really should have been doing from the get go, which is this hiring our executive staff, getting our racially
polarized voting analyst, and our VRA, and all of those
other crucial steps that, looking back now, we should
have done then, but were working on all of this
administrative tech functions.

And then also, I notice that there's been about us
potentially, the 2020 commission providing some sort of
infrastructure for the 2030 but then we also have to
think about, would that be considered independent or not?
Is that something that maybe the 2030 should do in terms
of the RFPs and maybe some of the positions as well.
Some of these support positions.

I think that's just my main -- the main piece of it.
It just took too long for us to get started because we
had to take care of all of these administrative type
functions instead of really getting into what our role
was, which was the outreach and the engagement and the
legal and the contracts and hiring positions.

And I had one more thing. And we do have more staff
than what the 2010. And quite a bit of our staffing had
to do with the outreach. And I would definitely
recommend that we have -- that the 2030 have at least
that level of staffing, if not more. I would have --
honestly, I feel that could have used additional support
when we got down to the, you know, 30 plus input that we
receive, it would have been very helpful to have
additional outreach staff to help us decipher all that
information and to summarize it for us.

It does tend to be a little overwhelming, to try to
keep up with that when you’re receiving a thousand a day.
Which I'm grateful for Californians for reaching out and
providing input. But I think we also need to find a
better way to handle all of that input and be able to use
that. And I think staffing could help us that.

And I’m trying to think if there's anything else on
this one -- I think that's good for now. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. And I’m trying to
remember back to when we first started this work. And I
think back to the COVID situation, I mean, not meeting in
person. And meeting, I think it took a while to build up
trust. And I think, amongst the commissioners, the trust
that was needed to get to -- eventually became unanimous.
But it's a long haul. I mean, most of our decisions were
done pretty collaboratively and pretty unanimously. But
it did take a while for us to trust one another and to
get to that level. And not -- and having to meeting in --
over Zoom made it difficult, I think.

I think having been meeting in person, maybe it
would have expedited that process of getting to know one
another and learn about one another and build the trust a little bit quicker. That being said, we couldn't control it. We were in the middle of a pandemic. But ensuring that the commission has enough trust or has enough time to build relationships.

    Maybe do the training, education process so that they -- so as they begin to do their work, they're able to do it more effectively, because it's hard to do it if you don't know -- it's hard to hire an executive director and it's hard to make these very important decisions when you haven't really built strong ties with the folks you're working with. And certainly the Zoom situation didn't help.

    COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

    Commissioner Sadhwani.

    COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I think you're -- I agree a lot of everything that's been said. I agree with Commissioner Fernandez on this, right, like, we're not handing the 2030 commission an executive director or executive management by any means. But there are administrative pieces that if that could be floated by the state auditors office in advance. And I'm thinking on my list, and I'd be curious to hear other folks, issues around finance, HR, tech broadly define, right, I mean, we were given these, for lack of a better word,
crappy old computers and cell phones. And we spent months and months going round and round just to get a contract in place to get a cell phone that would work, right?

Like, that shouldn't -- it shouldn't have been that hard, right? And then Raul was also -- Raul was doing all of those things and coordinating our meetings, right? He set up our first set of meetings, which actually, I have feelings about, and training for the commissioners. And I think that those are two pieces. The coordination of meetings and the training of commissioners on what is redistricting. How does this process work? To me, those are the two pieces that are -- that we need to be most concerned about in terms of independence, right?

For example, the trainings that we received pointed us down the direction of, we're going to hire a line drawer and do live line drawing, like, that's what 2010 did. There could be other models of doing this, right? Other states have done things differently. Other states have had two different mapping, you know, mapping groups come up with different maps and you think about them. Ten years from now you could come up with, like, fifteen different automated maps and use those as starting points. We could be thinking about the data management component as a part of line drawing, right?
But -- so I think that, like, who sets up those trainings and the coordination of meetings is the really sensitive piece. But there's all these admin pieces around finance, HR, tech, setting up the contracts with ASL interpreters, with Kristian and the videography team. That stuff just needs to get done, right? So that commissioners aren't fumbling around and unable to get --

I remember, I think it was Commissioner Kennedy, you were trying to get, like, into the building or a rental car and you were, like, I just need an ID that says I'm a part of this commission. And it was, like, no one could do that, right?

Those are the things that need to be taken care of that are really apolitical as far as I'm concerned. And we can get into it on budgeting and finance and maybe there's greater considerations there. But to me, it's like a coordination of meetings, the trainings that go into the commissioners -- when the commissioners early on. That's the sensitive piece. And because it sets up your expectations. And it sets up the type of executive team that you're going to want, right?

Maybe in the future they want someone who's going to draw maps by hand, I don't know, right? But they have the right to do that ten years from now if they want to. But that would maybe they need a different kind of
executive director, right? Different kind of legal team. And think that separating out what a commission needs to get started might be helpful in terms of moving this conversation forward. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And I -- if I can, sorry, I'll just stand by my earlier comment. But I do think having liaisons at particular points of government would be really helpful. Our independence needs -- we need to be independent from the legislature largely and members of Congress. Look at the governor's office can provide some level of support for something that we're doing or the, you know, the state auditors or the attorney general, right? I mean, we were trying to get -- put together that Amicus brief in the beginning. And we ended up developing a relationship. But it was largely because, thankfully we had relationships amongst us commissioners. There could just be a liaison assigned to us in advance.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, thank you. These are all great ideas. This is -- thank you very much for this whole conversation. It's really valuable. There were, you know, I recommend that we actually, in terms of, you
know, our recommendation is that there are temporary personnel to staffing. Knowing full well these people will be replaced. Where they, you know, if they come from the state auditors, they come from other places, because you do need a framework, you know, essentially all the admin things we've been talking about. You know, the Form 700, how do you do the per diem, blah, blah, blah. All that sort of stuff.

But again, that whole training session of that should be before we become commissioners. You know, that, I mean, as in each time we get a training thing on that, what it's involved. Because the biggest part, I thought, in terms of the of hiring staffing, we didn't know what they were really going to end up doing. And it's because we had had no training. We had no concept of the whole overview of the whole process. We knew the specifics about mapping. We knew the specifics about, you know the VRA districts. We knew the specifics about the tasks we were going to do, you know, as commissioners. But how the whole thing came together, we had no training.

And that's -- we really, really need that. But as you say, There's so much that we could have -- could have been set up ahead of time. And I think if we have, you know, like, we have the admin people, well, then, we
replace. Even if that is -- because we did sort of have
a commission, I mean a communications contract that we
sort of used that was sort of set up. And then we
replaced. But that should be more as an official, even
it's someone else's.

I understand this is, you know, as I think
Commissioner Sadhwani said earlier, they do shape the
commission though. We have to be very careful about that
in terms of where they come from, where, you know, who
gets replaced. I think we need more training in terms of
the overall -- there's admin, how the whole thing puts
together and the -- including the timeframe of things.
Because again, the states auditor knew and they can set
up RFPs for all our different consultants, which everyone
just, you know, we tossed. Essentially, most of used
that as a baseplate for what we ended up doing.

But we had no idea of how all these pieces fit
together. And that's something that the initial eight,
as well as the full commission need. Now, because it
would -- it does help in terms of picking the six and
then putting the whole group together. Doing that
training.

And I do want to say about the COVID. This was
really hard. Any other people we talked to about, hey,
you're doing what? You haven't met anybody. Most of you
are masked and your picking a slate of six other people
to fill out the commission? Uh, you know, that's insane.
That was very, very, hard. If people could get together
for a meeting beforehand, meet who they are, know what
they're saying, that really, really, really would have
helped. The liaisons with the government bodies I think
is an excellent idea, all the way through. Now, that
would really help things.

And then, this is sort of a particular thing. About
the staffing. We've had fantastic staff. We're really
blessed. Oh, we do need to be careful of the -- a lot of
them all came from Southern California which had a
different bent to it. And there is a sensitivity about,
oh there's southern California versus northern
California, you know, we all know that. We need to be a
little more aware of that in terms of, as a
recommendation for staffing. It's another consideration.
Consider it again. Instead of geographical
considerations.

That, I can't, I don't want to lose sight of that in
our -- that was one of the criteria in the first things,
you know, in terms of your -- the geographic -- respect
for geographic diversity, too. And which I thought, I
think we all did very well. But that did not come across
in the recruitments and then in the number of applicants.
You know, we really saw how -- well, we really saw how
the numbers dwindled and how there just weren't people in
certain areas. So I think that would help.

And then, because the reason is, in terms of
outreach, it made it a lot harder. And when all the
outreach people are from particular areas of the state
and don't know the other areas, it made it harder.

On staffing, and this will be my last point. We did
have more staff than the 2010 because we did more. You
know, they were able to farm a lot of that out in terms
of the outreach. And some of the recommendations in the
Common Cause, which are very good, but they do require
more staffing. And I think we need to pay attention to
that because a lot of things they said that, if this is
to be more timely, we would have needed more staff. But
I think there's a good recommendation. But like, you
know, that all the notes and all the things being taken --
the average Californian is not going to be able to do
the work and then document everything they did
afterwards. You know, in terms of -- you're talking
about a huge time crunch. That would -- think of
everything we did. Then we have to stop and write
everything up afterwards.

That, I mean, it would have -- the amount of time
the -- individually would have spent would have been much
bigger. And there are other recommendations in the --
from Common Cause, which I think are very good. About
staffing, when to have more people in terms of the
outreach staff. But it does require more staff, which I
think we should be putting into the 2030 commission and
in terms of budgeting. Because that's important.

Oh, one other -- I'm sorry, I did say this, but I
have one other thing. The timeframe, it's very -- I do
think we should start earlier. And one of the primary
reasons is, we lost a bunch of the 2010 commission
because we said, yes, we are going to wait and re -- you
know, reallocate all the -- the incarcerated people. And
we're going to pass that recommendation on to the 2030.
You lose a month in doing that because when you get the
census data in, you can't just start to work. And that
is really important if they're trying to make that August
15 deadline. So I don't know how they're going to get
it. If we can push the August 15 deadline a bit. And
that's is accordingly a Constitutional thing.

So but -- in terms of, I want us to name that and
bring it forward because that's something that we could
get a lot of pushback on. But it is very important to do
that every time. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Commissioner Kennedy.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

First of all, to endorse what Commissioner Sadhwani said and see if I can expand on it a bit. When we're talking about independence, yes, independence is important but we have to look at independence from what. And the key, the critical element is for the commission to remain independent -- as independent as possible from those who essentially are the subject or potential beneficiaries of the work of the commission.

I have to say that, you know, yes, every commission should be able to make its own decisions but in my mind, that's always been kind of like, well, each legislature can modify what came form the previous legislature. It doesn't mean that everybody gets fired all the way down to the maintenance staff in the Capitol and you start over and develop new polices and new procedures and then you can hire staff, no. I mean let's be a little more realistic about this and understand that independence is more focused on independence from the legislature, independence from the Board of Equalization, independence from members of Congress and not nearly as much independence from the previous commission.

Any commission will always have the ability to supersede decisions of a previous commission. Now, that should be adequate. But if we go overboard in trying to
leave a clean slate, I think we doom future commissioners
to failure or at least to very depleting struggles that
they really shouldn't have to go through. So I would
just encourage us to think about independence in terms of
independence from what.

Second of all, I agree with Commissioner Fernandez.
Research staff, I might call them. People to help us
sift through all of that data, you know. Professors have
research assistants to go through data where we're, you
know, I can foresee future commissions will have at least
as much public input as we had and having a research
staff -- doesn't necessarily have to be one per
commissioner but at least, you know, enough staff to help
go through and make sense of all of the data that's
coming in. And I think it would be prudent.

And to Commissioner Toledo's point, you know, my
sense is that one of the things that helped us build
trust was having as many subcommittees as we had. And
the opportunity to work together in different
combinations. I think my experience, my perception on --
were that, you know, the work in subcommittees
contributed quite significantly to the level of trust
that we were able to build. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Director Kaplan.
DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Thank you.

All right. Thank you so much. And I just want to preface this with really highlighting how extraordinary the staff was that I worked with along with all of you. I think there's a few factors in looking at 2030 that I think over the course of the next ten years will also help with these recommendations for 2030 in terms of staffing. I think that the technology is going to be, hopefully, be much more advanced. We were creating a process for appointments. We were creating structures that didn't really exist that we had to piecemeal together that took an extraordinary amount of staff time on the backend.

And so that may not be the case. There may be in, you know, closer to 2030, technologies that are really going to allow for these hybrid type meetings and that will allow you to leverage staff in other ways. I think additionally, looking at whether 2030 is really going to have the sufficient funds to do an expansive contracting effort for outreach will also perhaps indicate how staff are used for outreach. That being said, I think there are ways to further expand, particularly from the outreach lens, just thinking through kind of where were areas that we were missing or would have been helpful to have had more focused staff for. And I think one around
accessibility. That was a lens that was carried through in all of the outreach team. And within outreach goals of the commission to really focus on accessibility.

However, having targeted staff that are specifically focused on language access, on the use of technology, to really further expand an ensure that, you know, even if the commission is creating language materials that communities that need those are targeted specifically -- and so having more staff dedicated to that.

I also really want to highlight how, you know, this has been a remarkable experience for me and I know or the whole outreach team. We all came away with an experience of a lifetime. And skills that will allow us to further grow in future positions as well. But I think, you know, there were so many roles that each of the outreach staff played, whether it was notetaking or meeting facilitation, and so some of that -- some of those efforts that could be what many of you have also mentioned, the data, you know, reviewing input and helping to consolidate some of the input that the commission got, other ways to have additional staffing that can support with that as well.

And then also, just highlighting the importance of the trust and comradery. I think we were afforded this longer time period which really allowed for that trust to
grow with -- amongst staff and commissioners and even across staff. And I know it was very intentional with my team and the, you know, especially the outreach coordinator that in every meeting that she held with staff that there was time relief through this remote world to really build the relationships.

    And I think from the executive team, whether it was Me and Fredy, Anthony and Alvaro, and really having this time together in person to build that trust really allowed us to work more effectively together. And I think there were so many times where we could foresee an issue. And because we had worked so closely together, could really come up with solutions because of that. And I think when -- 2030 is going to have a much more condensed time period if they are going to have a larger staff, what are ways to really ensure that that trust is there so that folks can do their work effectively as well. Thank you.

    COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

    Commissioner Sinay.

    COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. Those were really good points, Director Kaplan, thank you. Two things, and this may have been from the last conversation -- which maybe it should have been in the last conversation. But it hit me when we were having the conversation about
independence. The auditor went to Director Claypool and
Director Claypool set up the whole process for the
application process, the selection process, and then made
the recommendations of who should be staffing.

I could see why they would think that that was the
best person to go to, to do that. And you know, looking
forward in 20 -- I could see where their perspective is.
And then we've got our perspective. So we don't, you
know, it -- so taking out who the person was, they may do
the same this time around, going to Director Hernandez
and saying, hey, can you help us set this all up. And
I'm not sure that was, you know, because of what we went
through, I don't think that that's the best process on
how -- the best person or the best way to set up the
future. And it has nothing to do with Director
Hernandez. But just in what we have experienced.

And so on that independence piece, we do need to
think through not just independence from us, the
commissioners, the 2020 commissioners, but also
independence from the staff, the 2020 staff. And how
that's to allow 2030 to, you know, move forward. I
think, you know, we did mention, you know, Commissioner
Sadhwani said, you know, the executive director position
should be in opened session. It should not be in closed
session. That, you know, and I know -- and I would say
the same thing for the whole executive team. Because the community knows these folks. And I know that we had talked.

So I just think that I agree with that. But I do want us to think through how do we ensure that the 2030 commission is getting the full independence. Not just from commissioners but also from 2020 staff. And what recommendations we may have on who the auditors should work with or how, you know, because you do need some folks in there for that.

The other thing I want to say is the most frustrating thing for me was how long it took to post jobs, to hire folks. There was this fear of using up our budget or something is what it felt like. And so my recommendation is that the 2030 commission hire as soon as they think they're going to need someone. Sooner is better. If they're not necessarily out, you know, there's work to be done and there will always be work to be done. And the outreach staff should have been on by January -- all, he whole team. And not having people until June was really tough, or not, you know, I know they went from January to June. But we really -- that hiring earlier would have been really critical -- would have been really helpful. They did an amazing job and I'm sure they all have some new gray hairs. Even some of
them who were 20 years away from having gray hairs. And I will always be thankful for the work they did and how much I learned from them.

But I do think that I would recommend for 2030 to please be kind and fair to your staff and hire them earlier and that that would have been really the best thing.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you. I don't have the answer to my thoughts right here. But I know that we're bound by the limitations of Bagley-Keene. And I know, as Commissioner Sinay and I attempt to bring some training forward, we're limited to everything having to be done in public. So I wonder if there's anyway that we could sort of address having some critical training. When I say critical training, training that's related to our own biases, our own trains of thought.

If we could have some of this outside of the public eye. Not that we're trying to hide anything on -- trying to put something into a back room. But in talking to some of the facilitators that deal with some of that -- and I think that can be an aide to our own thinking so that we don't approach things form a singular approach -- none of the facilitators wanted to do that in the scope
of the public. There's critical issues that maybe all of us may not want exposed as we learn and adapt and try to be able to approach redistricting from a unbiased standpoint. If that's possible.

But I'm just wondering if, as we contemplate this and bring training forward, training to have us -- have a open mind, a broad purview, if we're able to do it outside of the public purview but have that curriculum, perhaps, made available to the public so that we're free to express and explore as we learn to think critically.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Any thoughts on staffing now and for the next eight years? As well as anything else about -- asking for support or staffing. And mostly what I'm completely amazed at is how 2010 pulled it off, starting with even less than -- starting with nothing and with half the time we had. Appreciating everyone's good comments.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

And I had a call I had to take so I don't know if I missed the time period or not. But I had my -- I wanted to just say, Plus One for me in the area, I don't know if you've moved on for Support and Staffing, under the
Independence Plus One with Sadhwani and Kennedy and yes, on the research staff. The part that I wanted to just state for me, which felt like an absolute weakness is the state's systems re: per diem, the TEC and all of that. Bring one hired in that's not a government employee -- I felt like it is absolutely above -- beyond what someone should be expected to recall just in this year.

I think, as a recommendation, that there needs to be staff hired that will just navigate, that will handle, that will take care of all of the complexities of what has to happen for government reporting. It is not the norm for the rest of the world outside of state staff and government. And I think it takes way too much time trying to figure out. It's too particular. You have to finesse it, make sure it -- it gets bounced back. I felt like there should have been many more hours billed on my part just trying to figure out the system.

And so I wanted to state that unequivocally, that indeed, if the government system, as large as it is, since it doesn't -- everybody says, this is just the way it is, it's, like, that's great. You government employees that have learned to deal with the antiquated systems, that's great. But I think if new people coming in is expected to utilize those systems with the specifics of what has to happen, there needs to be a
hired person that handles that and should be able to submit dates and times. And someone else take care of it and deal with those systems unless they're going to be up updated or changed.

So I just wanted to add that into -- I believe it is a weakness for all nongovernment employees and a recommendation that we need to hire staffing to handle it for this process. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, for sure. You know, that was an inconvenience for some and actually, a real hardship for others. And so -- and should not need to be.

Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

Two things. We at least statutorily have some exemption from civil service requirements. You know, to me I think need to contemplate, are there other areas where we need to seek similar exemptions? And it's not an attempt to completely get out from under reasonable regulation of work done with state taxpayers money, you know. I always want to respect that.

But at the same time, everyone has to understand the unique nature of this work. You know, if -- I mean, I always say if a bridge doesn't get built, you know, in time, what's the downside? Well, you know, people are
inconvenienced a bit longer having to take the long way around. But if districts aren't completed in time, you know, that's a whole a different category of problem that you have. Everyone from governor, legislators, future commissioners, attorney general, everybody has to understand the very unique nature of the work of this commission. And need to look at areas where, you know, maybe similarly, to the exemptions that we have in relation to civil service requirements, we could seek other exemptions, you know, or special frameworks may be a better way to put it.

We're, as I said, we're not looking to get out from under any reasonable control. We just need all of the controls to recognize what happens in an extremely timebound, high-pressure environment. You know, we're tripped up by procurement rules that, you know, are fine for different types of work. But simply aren't fine for something as timebound and politically sensitive as this.

You know, there was mention earlier even that, you know, of course, we're subject to Bagley-Keene. Well, you know, I read Bagley-Keene a number of times. I know that there are exceptions to Bagley-Keene for this commission when it's doing that. Or that commission when it's doing the other. You know, are there topics or are there areas that we need to think about proposing changes
to ensure that we are living within the spirit of open

government while recognizing the nature of the work of

this commission in the future. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: First of all, Amen to what

Commissioner Turner said. And then also what

Commissioner Kennedy said. We do need a couple very

specific exceptions similar to other commissions in the

course of their work that they -- they have certain

things which they have to do in private because, you

know, like the engineers when you're -- well, without

getting into details, there are certain things -- I

didn't mean we need to spend time on that.

One of those items that came up over and over again

-- oh we have to -- only established this two years ago,

I think it was. And I don't have the name of it. But it

was -- remember the purchasing authority, which had to be

established for the particular person. And that held us

up from getting new computers, getting new phones, you

now getting even the software to do some of the things

that wanted to do -- oh, we can't do that because we

don't have authority to just go in and buy it. And I

don't know the name of it. We have to look that up.

But that, we need to set up ahead of time so we can
just hand it to the 2030 commission. And all of the
hiring should have been done earlier. With the exception
of -- and it's because Sara (ph.) and I rammed that RFP
through, is the line drawers. And if the line drawers
were onboard on time. And everybody else -- God, it
should have been done earlier. And it was because you
didn't have that training of the overview. Of the
training on the admin. And the state's admin. And how
that evolved. And the timeframe of it all. And a full
overview. And I would recommend that we request the
commission, the 2030 commission start earlier so they can
do he stuff ahead of when they need to be running. And
when they need to be actually taking off.

They need to be able to establish things before
that. And that includes the -- let's see -- rats, I lost
it right there. I'll come back to it. Anyway -- but
yeah. It's a -- the -- ahead of time, so they can get
these things done and change with and -- oh, and transfer
over the temporary personnel to the people that we hire,
but already knowing that process of how it's going to end
up going. Right. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

MS. SADHWANI: Yeah, I just -- I have a different
recollection of those early days. Would it have been
nice to hire people earlier? Yes, absolutely. But I --
we did, actually, hire our first executive director and
the beginning portions. We did hire a chief counsel, and
we did hire Freddie early on in Communications. And I
think we were on track. My view of it, however, is that
I do feel like -- and you all can tell me if you feel
differently about this. But I feel like we were set up,
right, to make that first hire, right, to make that first
executive director hire. And that slowed everything down
and led to a very difficult place for us as a commission
to have to make important changes to our leadership
structure that then weigh laid everything else, right?
We were about to hire outside counsel when, you know,
things shifted within the organization. So I don't think
that the timeline of hiring was necessarily -- this is
where, to me, it comes back to the independence piece,
because -- sorry about that. There's work going on here.

There is -- because I don't think that we were being
set up to actually be that independent. I think we were
being led toward an executive director who had very
specific thoughts about how this work should be done, and
I'm not sure how independent they really were, right? So
I -- the independence piece is really important to me,
because that's the foundation upon which those hires can
be made in a timely process. And I think that's a really
key difference in how I see the last two years was that
the -- yes, it would have been nice to do those hires
sooner, but there's a structure of how that has to	happen. And we didn't have that structure in place,
because of the handoff from being established and being
let low -- by the auditor's office and what that looked
like.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I do.

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you. I
remember to have my points.

But I do want -- agree, that we literally were two
different commissions essentially from when we switched
executive director. And that -- that's what really
started moving from that point forward. So Mr. Sadhwani
has a very good point. The point I wanted to make, which
I skipped, was the outreach and the communities of
interest -- it starts earlier. We were the first ones to
do that, and most people there are like, well, then, no,
you don't do anything until the lines are drawn, and then
you start -- oh, now I have input. And we started that
process earlier, and that was really not understood by
most of California, quite frankly. A lot of people are
like, well, no, until you actually have the numbers and
start putting the numbers forward, we don't have anything
to say. But we really really pushed -- tried to push that, and I think that is what really needs to happen ahead of time; the outreach, the communications, because to get that idea -- you know who your community is. You don't have to wait for the actually census data to give us what your community is. And we did get participation in that, but it, you know, bulk -- as the bulk of it, and that's always going to come in towards the end. But doing more and getting that idea out -- we actually have a lot of people go yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah. But you're not going to pay any attention until I'm talking to you in person, and you know, the -- all of our bits that came in in dribbles and drabs at first, then it started really pouring in the door. I think we really need to push that ahead of time and show the importance of that. And that only until we had a bunch of information, people go --oh, God, now we actually have to build up how to manage that information. And the 2030 Commission will not have that time to do that. We had the luxury of a little bit more time to set that up. They won't have that. So I think we do need to start them earlier and get that part of it going ahead of time before the census data gets there. Because then, you know, as you -- as we all know, once you actually have those and you start drawing lines, it goes, you know,
like 24-hours a day. So I really think we need to give them that input, and we can't emphasize it enough. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

I'll insert myself here with two points. First point, our website, you know, you might -- you'll recall early on, that was just a huge problem, you know, inheriting a website that was almost unupdatable and you know, having just a tiny fraction of roles, time to work on that. And so our recommendation going forward is to include staffing, you know, to keep the website fully up-to-date. And of course, 10 years from now, who knows what that kind of technology will look like. But to, you know, have that up-to-date and in place when 2030 gets seated and -- so they have a fully-functional website, someone to get it right up to speed right from the beginning when they start meeting. On the early hires, wow, I don't know. Different thoughts and feeling. You know, I think we went about as fast as we could have at the time. And there were very mixed feelings on the Commission about the fact that the auditor's office had circulated some job descriptions that we had not written, you know, and so we took some time to sort out our feelings about that. But you know, looking back, I think we had the freedom -- we had the freedom to do what we
wanted, you know. I -- you know, yes, we inherited some staff in 2010, and there were mixed feelings about that, but you know, in the end, we had the freedom. And we learned things later, you know, that led to very different feelings about people we hired. But at the time, I don't know how differently I could, you know, I can imagine us doing things. It -- you know, with the commission we had then. And if we had changed things quite a bit and you know, let's say not inherited those job descriptions or insisted on all new steps, that would have led to other problems, you know, that we would have been talking about and other ways that we would have gotten or held up and delayed. So, you know, yes, it was a mixed bag, but anything we would have done would have been a mixed bag. And in the end, we sorted it out, thankfully, and it all did work out. But given what we knew at the time, I'm not sure how differently -- how much better things could have been. You know.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, and just kind of going off of that, I agree in many ways, and I definitely think we got it sorted out. We got ourselves back on much better track, and we were able to work together. And I think in many ways, the disruption that we had had, I think it was back in like February or 2021, actually was
that team building experience that I think we needed in many ways that brought us trust amongst each other as commissioners. But in terms of the information that we had, I do feel like we weren't given all of the information. And I mentioned this earlier. The executive director hire, it's an important one, and we were advised to not release the names, to have it all conducted in closed session. I don't think that that was the right course of action. I -- and over the course of many months later, we heard from many groups and former commissioners saying if we had only known who your applicants were, we would have been providing public comment. And so, I think that just as commissioners, we had to go through that public process. I do think that we need to put some thought into what are the -- California's HR practices for an executive director hire, because I think there are confidentiality concerns for individuals who might be leaving their jobs, and I would want to certainly be sensitive to that in whatever way possible. But I think the way that we were set up the first time did not -- specifically did not allow for public comment that we probably needed, and I would have wanted. But I didn't know at the time to push back on the counsel that we were being given or the -- what seemed like something so helpful. Right? I didn't
really understand all of the contours of why we were
getting so much public feedback about get rid of all of
the job descriptions that were circulated. I mean we
ultimately put out our own job description for several of
the positions. They were basically, the same. It's like
to me it didn't make sense. But as we went forward
several months, it was an eye-opening experience. Like
oh, right, these are folks -- an executive director is
someone who -- is already known, right, oftentimes within
the state government, within the redistricting process.
It's important that we get feedback on those top
executive hires that we didn't get. And so, that's where
to me, this -- there's that tension, in terms of that
handoff of the prior commission, the state auditor's
office and then to the next commission. There's this
lack of continuity, and there's an opportunity to
influence the new commission, because there's information
that's dropped through throughout the process.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. And I just want
to build a little bit on what Commissioner Sadhwani and
others have said about conducting the Executive SAP
interviews in public. I have a concern with that. I'm
okay with publishing a list of potential candidates. I'm
uncomfortable with actually conducting the interviews in public open forum, because, you know, obviously, you have your set of questions, and whoever goes last, you know, obviously has an advantage. And again, there is the, as Commissioner Sadhwani said, the confidentiality and trying to be as respectful as we can to the candidates. So I'm kind of torn between the two. I -- I'm for publishing a list so that we can receive feedback, which would be a great idea. And part of it, too, and I believe Commissioner Toledo and others have talked about this, building trust. And Commissioner Sadhwani mentioned the February team building that came, you know. But I think because of the lack of trust that we had in each other and maybe respect, we -- there were actually things that have come up prior to that, they were just kind of like oh, it's okay, just let it go. And I think what I would like to tell the 2030 is, you know, be more voiceful. Listen to the -- you know, watch those red flags, and -- because they're telling you something. So I think that's maybe just my recommendation for the 2030 is to trust yourself and to remember that you are the boss. It's not the executive director that's the boss. It's not the executive team that's the boss. So anyway, that's kind of what my -- because I felt that once we hired the executive director, because this is not our
full-time job, they kind of got to decide what's important, in terms of what we're going to process. You know, what's going to go next? Oh, this job got posted, but that job didn't get posted, or this job, we finally got the position for it, but we haven't gotten it for this other classification that we wanted. So yes, we just have to remember we get to be -- what are they, the conductors? We get to decide how the train is moving. So we just have to continue to remember that. And -- I was going to have one more thing. And the outreach. It's been brought up a few times. And we -- I know I personally pushed to have them hired earlier, and kept getting pushback saying, oh, but the census is delayed. Regardless of the census being delayed, there's so much work that they could have helped us on with our regional, with our outreach to the regions, because that would have been their full-time job. This -- we have jobs. We have other full-time jobs, and then we're trying to do this as well. There is plenty of work from the get-go to hire the outreach, to start -- the sooner the better to start getting that information, the education, and the outreach. So I think that was it. But thank you all for this information. It great -- it's a great conversation.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Commissioner Andersen.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I totally agree with what's being said. I have one comment to add is we also were sort of told, okay, making -- okay, you're totally independent, don't talk to these people, including the 2010 Commission. There was like well, you can't talk to them. You could only -- only if they come and talk in front of the entire, you know, the -- they have a meeting, and then they got like three minutes or something. I really felt we lost on that. And I would recommend that we propose a panel where the -- you know, the 2020 come here -- the previous commission comes, and it is a whole panel and then the new commission can ask whatever they want and do that for like, you know, an entire meeting. Because -- or you know, half of whatever, because the things that came up that I gathered later talking to some of the commissioners when -- commissioners when I was looking for references for some of the consultants, I wish I'd known earlier. I really do. And it would have -- it wasn't that oh, God, you know, and something was held back, but it gave you a flavor for what was going to happen and how things could work together, which we didn't have the benefit of. We started, you know, raw and couldn't talk to anybody, put your blinders on and go, which was not helpful. So I would recommend that we try to say, you know, put a panel
in or something for the next commission. And put that in
like, you know, regulations or whatever, because that
would be very helpful. And it doesn't necessarily -- at
that point you know to take it or leave it point of the -
- you can, oh, I appreciate what they said, huh, but I
don't think that. And -- which I mean is ahead of time,
before like early in the process. So when we're trying
to set up things, we can go, oh, I see, that's what they
do, and that's why -- and -- huh. Well, I don't think
that, or I agree with that. But we didn't even have that
benefit of information. And that, I feel, hindered us in
many ways. And again on that also with the archives,
yes, there was the 2010 stuff out there, but it was,
well, good luck finding whatever you need out of all of
that information. And so, I think, as a group today, we
need to try to set up how that gets sorted and what --
even if it's just like this is what this information is.
This is where you find this information. And then if
people want to use it or not it's up to them. But you
know, what kind of training do they have? What was the
admin problems? How did they, you know, what was the
timeline of things, and have it so you can quickly --
it's almost like an index type of thing is what we do
need for the next commission going forward. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.
Commissioner (sic) Kaplan.

DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Thank you. I also just want to highlight and just really agree on that earlier timeframe to bring on staff, should the 2030 Commission have a larger outreach staff and just to provide some additional context on really what it takes to stand up a team. And there was some extensive amount of time that was spent with recruitment, with creating a rubric for applicant review, creating a rubric and scoring for interviewing and really finding, you know, given the pandemic and finding quality candidates with the pay scale that was also provided. We had four lead staff and then four support staff, and it was very challenging to find staffing for the support staff also, given the pay scale. And so, I think, you know, if it's reviewing that further and providing some more recommendations for 2030, or again, like with the job descriptions, helping with providing some sample templates. Because throughout that whole process, I was also, you know, supporting with outreach and had one staff person at that time, and so, it was a lot to get through. And so, I think that earlier on, some of that can start as well will help to expedite it -- expedite.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. It's interesting, Commissioner Andersen, that you said that you -- that we were told not to speak to the 2010 Commission, because I actually did go to legal counsel and ask, and yes, as some of you may remember, we did, as part of our outreach subcommittee, invite a commissioner to come to speak to us. And I had also talked to a couple of other of the commissioners. You know, I think the lesson learned for me is -- as we're thinking about how we're writing this report is if you read between the lines knowing what we know now, the report that 2010 wrote is -- it -- you can see some of the stuff that we wish they would have been more overt about. And so, I would ask that we -- of course, we want to be diplomatic and stuff, but I also think we really need to give a, you know, as we're writing this, we need to be honest and give 2030 really a -- the help that they -- not the help or what -- the guidance that, I, you know, I keep calling it like of guideposts, like if you're on a hiking trail, to help them ask the right questions and ask -- and think things through. Because the 2010 report was okay, but it was very diplomatic. And later on, reading it, I was like, oh, that's what they were saying. And so, yes, there was a lot of issues with their executive, you know, staff relations and it was, you know, all the way around. I
had heard that, you know, when it came time to hire. But
it -- that whole thing is -- so I just ask if we are
writing this, we stay away from writing it academically,
we stay away from writing it legalese, we stay away from
writing it bureaucracy. We write it as we speak, and we
share -- we have something there, so it sounds like
they're hearing it from us. And it's their choice if
they want to invite us or not to come and speak. I don't
want to require us to be there, but let our voices, as
friends and colleagues and someone who's been there, come
out in the report and really watch our language, watch
our wording and all that and make it really written as,
hey, this is what we learned, and we hope it's helpful.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I agree with all of
that. And I think that's the thing is that we can be
available to the next commissioner, but I think we should
also, as Commissioner Sinay was laying out, and I think
Commissioner Andersen was saying this too, like we can be
a resource, if they want us to be. And I want to be
really clear that, you know, I wouldn't want to try and
influence the next commission in any way, shape, or form.
Right? Like I -- it's one thing to be resource and
something else to, you know, try to exert some influence
over the next process. And I don't think that that would be our role. It was unfortunate, I think, when some of the 2010 Commissioners, you know, started -- rather than even attempting to talk to us or writing op eds and such things, you know. And yet at the same time, I thought like, for example, in the very beginning, Angela and Chedda, super helpful, and helping, you know, Russell and I think through the VRA component and the RFPs and what all goes into that. So I think, you know, I think having the spirit of being a resource to the next commission is great. To that end, the one piece that I just wanted to lift was actually towards training. I think that's our session later. I'm not going to be able to be here after lunch, unfortunately, so I just wanted to mention it now. Much of the training that we received when we were first seated was based on experts who were a part of the 2010 process. And that was really helpful to understand the 2010 process. But there's a lot of other experts who are out there. And I do think that compiling a list for the next commission of folks who work in the redistricting space either as practitioners, academics, whatever, some of them are going to be more partisan leaning. We can even help try and identifying that -- identify that for them. But having trainings that are only based on folks who have been involved and potentially, you know,
financially benefited from the process in the past does kind of set up a -- an odd, I don't know, set of expectations. And there's so many different folks out there. And you know, Russell and I and the VRA subcommittee had done several conversations with other folks who had served as special masters in redistricting, who had all sorts of other kinds of expertise. Some of them we were able to bring to the commission to talk, you know, with the full commission. Some -- other times, that didn't make sense to do so. But just to put -- compile a list of folks nationally who could be available to the next commission. You know, when it comes to VRA, for the -- the 2030 Commission isn't going to need to rely on David Becker's expertise for the VRA. There's all sorts of VRA experts out there. And I think just helping, you know, who some of those potential experts they could draw upon where they are, some of that contact info would be, hopefully, a resource for the next commission.

   COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

   Commissioner Andersen.

   COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, the one think I want to say -- I agree with everything that's been said -- is we -- most worthy is that this report actually gets to the 2030 Commission, because, while Commissioner Sinay
said yes, you know, I knew about the 2010 report and stuff, I didn't, not until we were like in it. And it was -- literally that's part of, you know, what documentation, like well, there's kind of this out there. And I -- having conversations with one of the 2010 commission -- commissioners, there were issues about trying to get that report to us. That cannot happen. You know, we need to make sure that, you know, the next commission has the ability to go uh-huh, uh-huh, I don't like that. But make sure that they have that information, however, we do that, because, as Commissioner Sadhwani just said, it's a resource. And you know, that's my point of the panel. Everything is that -- I felt we didn't have the resources that were available, which we really want to make sure we can do everything possible to make sure that 2030 does. Because, again, you know, you -- we want them to learn what -- to take the good things that we did, toss the bad, and improve. We want that to continue all the way through as the whole process, which I want -- I really want us to make sure that the resources that we could offer get through and that we do that. And one last thing is the -- we did -- there were two very different tones of instructions that they weren't -- the first eight got and then the next six got. I mean very
different, you know, in terms of, you know, yeah, you can say this. Now we were told you can't talk to anybody. And all of a sudden, sure you can go out and talk to these people. I go -- and I'm going like, what? I mean there were different times we could have say -- look, no, no, no, you have to watch out who you're talking to. So a few things like that, you know, just some subtle things that these are things, I think, we would like to smooth through for the 2030 commission, having, you know, had -- and oh, I think the term I was thinking of is learn from past experience. That's what we want to push forward. You know, we are a resource. Please learned from our past experiences and toss what you don't want. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Anything else on support and staffing?

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I don't have anything specific at this point, but I did want to encourage colleagues to share thoughts on the staffing for the outyears. I know that we've already submitted kind of a budget forecast for that period, but I do think it's important for us to be looking at what staff is going to be needed for us to do what when during these outyears. Thank you.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Commissioner Vasquez.

CHAIR VASQUEZ: Hi all. Thanks. Sorry I've only been able to listen in on the last hour of the conversation, and have appreciated everyone's comments. And they generally align with my own perspectives. I did just want to -- before I actually forget it -- wanted to note a possible strategy for us to consider along the idea or this tent that we're trying to thread with having an executive director go through some sort of more public vetting process while also protecting our confidentiality. One way, again, not a perfect solution, but a solution to consider would be to release the name of our final candidate before we send them an offer. So we let them know, you know, part of the process will be then, you know, you get to the very, very finish line, but before we extend an offer and finalize the contract that you, you know, we have to release your name, and maybe we have a, you know, a opportunity for public comment for a week or what have you. And so, while that doesn't totally absolve them of the risk that they could, you know, have their employer know that they're applying for this job, I feel like if you're that close to getting an executive leadership position within state government that, you know, that's sort of the tradeoff you -- we
might consider asking candidates to make. So we wouldn't have -- in this potential solution, not every sort of final candidate has their name released, but the final, final candidate, the one that we feel like based on interviews and references, et cetera, is the final candidate. That candidate then their name would be released and folks, you know, the community would have an opportunity for a shot at least providing us any additional information. So that's all. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, I like that.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, I like that as well, except I would like to -- and as Commissioner Vasquez was speaking and just having listened to others, the process for selecting the commissioners is absolutely open and transparent. All the information is out there. Our interviews are out there. The public writes in comments. And I really think the selection of the executive team should be the same way. And I get that, you know, we got to be confidential and all that, but you know what, applying to the Commission was also a risk for all the folks who applied of the Commission based on their staff. You know, their employer and such could be like what the heck are they doing and whatnot. And so, I think I would like to see the whole process be transparent from
selecting commissioners, selecting staff, and you know, and I'm talking about just the executive staff but also, you know, other pieces of it. I really feel strongly that -- and allowing people to leave comments, just like they did with the, you know, with the applicants to the Commission. It -- so, anyway, I hear what people are saying about it being -- but the -- about, you know, respecting folks, and their -- and they have another job, but I also say this is very different, and we need to think about it very differently. And we need the input from the greater community, because making a mistake is very costly. And in the future, folks won't have that time to make mistakes.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Commissioner Vasquez.

CHAIR VASQUEZ: Yeah, thanks Commissioner Sinay.

I think I agree with you sort of in principle. And I think in practicality my concern is that by creating a too public of process we will unnecessarily limit our potential candidate pool to folks who are comfortable, who are either, you know, contract-based workers who don't have a full-time employer, or you know, retired individuals and not folks who maybe have some essential experience either in the community, as community leaders of, you know, organizations or state agencies. You know,
because they would be really risking their livelihoods to apply for this position in such a public way. I don't think -- or at least I think there was definitely a lesser disincentive on commissioners to apply, because there wasn't the expectation -- at least the explicit expectation that you would resign from your full-time jobs. And most of us did not, although retrospectively, that was ill-advised. But yeah, so I agree with you in principle. I just -- I think in practicality, the more public we get, the more we may limit our candidate pool, which we already, you know, I'll be honest, I wasn't thrilled with the amount of quality applicants for many of the positions that we floated.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Commissioner Andersen is next. But a reminder, we're down to our last six or seven minutes here. And the question of staffing on the outyears is still open. So remember the 2010 Commission had a one half time position for most of those outyears. What are our thoughts about what we should do?

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: The candidate pools, the one issue I want to say is we really needed to broaden who we advertise to, because that was a real issue. At first it turned out that a lot of the notices, they were only
going to those people in -- who were already employed by
the state. And that was -- I was really surprised when I
found that out. I was like, are you kidding me? What
about everybody else in California? And this was at the
executive and consultant level, things like that. So
that is a big issue that we need to broaden the candidate
pool, in terms of how we advertise for the candidate --
the -- each of these positions. In terms of staffing for
the -- next year, we need -- basically what they had last
time is they had someone to maintain everything and kind
of just keep tabs of stuff. We have in charge of -- we
got to keep the website completely up-to-date, as well
as, you know, staffing. What do we do? Things like
that. So I Think -- we definitely need more than a half
a person or you know, the time. I would say probably,
you know, two people. I don't know if you have three
quarters of the time, something like that. But yes, we
do need that, because -- and it -- one of them has to be
a technical, you know, keeping that website up-to-date,
and the other has to be admin and covering everything.
So that was my recommendation.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And I'm looking for that
right now.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

I want us to -- I would like us to consider also that some of these functions could be contracted out. If there's something that we don't need a fulltime person for, for years, you know, are there appropriate contracting mechanisms that we have access to that could get us the talent that we need for the purposes that we need them? Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And I don't have any answers on this, but I do -- wanted to just add to the list of, you know, continuing to have access to legal counsel. One of the things that I think came up for 20 -- the 2010 Commission, as we got closer, you know, they were involved in writing an amicus briefing in other Supreme Court cases. They were involved in the Padilla case to extend the timeline, given COVID. So I think having access to legal counsel, whether that's budget, you know, having the budget to be in touch with folks as needed. I don't know if we're going to need any legal counsel also, as we continue to think about changes to that. We came to that problem likely forthcoming, given COVID considerations. I mean Anthony is, obviously, amazing. I don't know if we can keep him forever, but I just
wanted to put that on the table, as well.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, thank you.

I just wanted -- this is a good conversation in terms of staffing for the remaining of our term -- remainder of our term. And just as a reminder, as part of the long-term activities and the budget proposal that we submitted, we did request one full time, like a staff level for support for the Commission. And also -- we also put funding in there for legal counsel. So thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani, and also, for IT technical support to support our website and other technical issues. So you guys have come up with wonderful ideas, and we do have that funding in there. It's not for full-time positions though. It's basically part time. And then also as Commissioner Kennedy mentioned, we also put in there -- the funding can be for -- to be contracted out, or it could be for a staff person, or it could be for an RA. You know, it's just funding that's in there that we can decide how we're going to use that funding. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Good to know.


Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I do have one last thing. I
do think continuity is important in this. So I do think
would need to have at least one person, you know,
continuous. Like, the one thing about when you contract
things out, it's like, okay, here it is. Now who do I
give it to? And there is a -- an importance in the
continuity, in terms of you don't have to -- you
understanding what has happened before. So I'm --
directly I'm the continent -- a continuous person.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, just real quick. I
recall when we were doing staffing, there was a grave
concern that we had as far as diversity. And we had a
lot of conversation, particularly around executive
director trying to ensure that we were broadening
opportunity for more than what was typically applying for
the positions, and being older white men. And in that --
I'm naming it now from a staffing perspective that
perhaps I wonder if we would consider even, if nothing
else, one of the earlier conversations we talked about
writing up some sort of job description or requirements
for a job and maybe not to hand or spoon feed the next
Commission, but maybe so to share with some of the other
groups and what have you that says that this is going to
come around again, and these will be positions that are
available. And here are some things, perhaps that you
can do to prepare people to apply for the position. It
was a -- it was really important for us, and we did not
want to get caught into rehiring those that's just been
exposed to the process. But it also was difficult to
find people that had qualifications specifically for the
process. So I just wanted to name that as something I
think may be helpful, but to be able to use those
descriptions for purpose of just communicating what will
be available in 2030 so that people can prepare
themselves for the positions. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

And with that, we are right up against our lunch
break, so thank you for these thoughts. We'll have a
break until 1:30. At that point, Commissioner Kennedy
will be back to lead us in a discussion on training and
teambuilding.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: So --

COMMISSIONER YEE: And with that --

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah, one thing. Sorry to
interrupt. The session, the afternoon session says it's
an hour and 45 minutes. We're going to fix -- we're
fixing the typo. It'll go from 1:30 to 3:00.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Very good. Thanks.

Okay. Have a great lunch everyone.
(Whereupon, a recess was held from 12:46 p.m.
until 1:29 p.m.)

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Welcome back from lunch,
everyone. At this point, I'll turn it over to
Commissioner Kennedy to continue with lessons learned.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner
Fornaciari.

Okay, so we are now moving on to the next topic,
which is Training and Team Building. And as you can see
from the prompts, we are looking for thoughts on topics
of training, presenters who participated in the training,
the timing of training sessions, use of reports and other
materials from the 2010 Commission, how we adapted to
pandemic regulations and realities, particularly in
relation to the team building, using social occasions,
video lunches and such, and commissioner games as team
building exercises, anything that we wish we had done or
had done differently. And again, these are prompts.
These are to get you thinking, but we're happy to take
input on anything related to training of the
commissioners or staff, team building among the
commissioners or the commissioners and staff. So opening
the floor to input from colleagues.

Commissioner Fernandez.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'll get the ball rolling, as Commissioner Anderson likes to say.

I think for the training for me, the initial training that we had when we were all seated in August, it was just too much. It was -- what was it like seven days or something? But it was it was too much information at one time. It's like when you start a job, and they give you two weeks of training, and then like six months later, you're like, oh, I wish I would have had that training now, because now I know more. So I -- for me, I feel like it would have been nice to have a really, really high overview, maybe early on and then maybe more specific training when we're more established and more comfortable in what our roles are and responsibilities and we have more information, we've done outreach. I think, for me, that -- that's the only thing. I appreciate the training, but it was just a lot at one time.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. Thank you. I think in addition to that, I'd like to share that I feel like it was a lot of training in the beginning. I also frequently felt that the training was not training. I
felt that the training was more of a review. And for a
lot of -- they were presentations, a lot of information
that was kind of spoken at us. And from a true training
perspective, it lacked the opportunity to engage back and
forth, to try on, to practice, so that -- because, of
course, things sound great when an expert trainer
delivers it. It makes sense. And then when I have to
restate what they said later on my own at some different
time period, it's like that was kind of presentation
mode, not necessarily a good training. I think along the
same lines with training and team building. I loved an
earlier comment about the benefit of the subcommittees
for team building. I thought that was great. I also
think, along the same lines for training, we kept looking
for experts to train. And, again, down the same vein, I
think that training needs to be delivered at different
levels. Recommendation would perhaps be even to start
out with a kind of a pretest of all of the individual
commissioners. We come from a lot of different
backgrounds, and so for someone that has been around VRO,
been around, you don't even know what people don't know.
It all comes second nature to you. And so, even if
you're trying to explain it, you explain it at a level of
assumption as opposed to what may be factual for the
audience that you're presenting to. So I'm thinking a
pretest from everyone would be able on their own
individually, would really give any train or even the
greater commission a good sense of where the knowledge
level is and be able to train to that level or even break
off and have different types of trainings. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner
Turner. I think that's a fantastic idea. I mean I'm
accustomed to seeing, you know, skills assessments, gap
assessments, et cetera, as a baseline. And I think that
that is really a wise counsel from you for us.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah, thank you for that,
Commissioner Turner.

I know that there were several times that we had
asked, you know, what training do people or do we want.
You know, should we create guidelines or that then -- and
there was really a pushback a lot of times. And it was
from all the commissioners. No, no, no. We know what
we're doing, you know, when it was calling the colleague.
But I think if we would have done a pre- and posttest, we
would have known what materials we could create, what
trainers could bring, in all those different pieces. But
we also have to acknowledge that we as commissioners
didn't always -- weren't open to what we didn't know as
well. Some commissioners were much better than that.
Other commissioners, yeah. And so, there may -- maybe a recommendation is some topics that we know will be very definite needed and helpful for the next commission. The -- and, yeah, I don't know. But I just remember several times saying, okay, we can bring this person, and people were like, no. And I know that people are like tired. There was -- meetings were long and whatnot. But later we would hear the opposite. Oh, well, we -- I've never done outreach. This was all new to me. And I was like, well, we asked the -- you know. So I just want to think through how do we set it? How do we share what training is based -- what the foundational training you need or understanding? Let's take training as a way to get there. Understanding is really the outcome. How do you get to a foundational understanding, a collective understanding of certain of these things so that you can implement them without having people feel like they have to raise their hand or speak up or whatnot? If they don't feel -- if they feel like they're the only ones who doesn't -- who weren't there? As we went along, I think we're all okay to say hey, I don't know this or what not. But at the very beginning, we're all still like, no, no, I'm okay, okay.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.
Commissioner Fornaciari.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yes. So maybe a more real time approach to training would be appropriate, you know, start off with the bigger picture, but then get a little more in-depth in what the commissioners need to know now. Not, you know, how to draw a map in, you know, on day one when they're not going to do it in four or five or six months or whatever it is. Right. What we -- what the commissioners need to know on day one is, you know, how to be a commissioner, what, you know, how to hire in the state environment and those kinds of things. So, you know, focus the rollout of the training and the lecturing as needed. I think one of the things that -- so I've said this before, I'll just say it again. I think that we got a hyper, hyper conservative interpretation of Bagley-Keene from the council at the State Auditor's Office, and it left us feeling like, I think, in some ways we couldn't, you know, get together socially as much as maybe we should have. I think the -- I think it would have been really good if, you know, instead of seven days of training, we did, you know, some kind of team building work. I do appreciate Derek's perspective on it, you know, and get some legal guidance on whether, you know, what can be done, you know, outside of a public meeting in the context of team building. I do believe we got
feedback from some other groups very early on that we
should be doing team building on our own, and so, you
know, just provide that guidance to the next commission.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner
Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Another part to
that is you don't know what you don't know all the time.
Some of our initial trainers presented so matter of
factly. Like, yes, this is -- this -- and almost as if
they were bored with the topic. And so, whereas I think
different from me, many of the commissioners were
intrigued by and felt that the presentations, the
training was good, I never was really impressed by them
as trainers. Just because you have knowledge of
something does not make you a trainer. And a lot of the
presentations, I'll still say, that was made, was like,
you know, very commonplace. This is how it works. This
is what we should do. And this is what we know, and this
how -- you know, and so, from that, that does not elicit
a desire to participate or to ask questions as well.
And, yes, I absolutely could have taken -- I -- been
accountable to stop the entire process and continue to
ask questions. There is something to public learning,
learning in a fishbowl, that requires a certain level of
vulnerability for all the world to see. Well, maybe I should have learned that in 8th grade history or American government or somewhere. It's like, well, shoot. Okay, let me do research on my own. However, the -- with the -- someone mentioned about drinking from like a fire hydrant. You know, you think you're going to follow up and look up some things later to connect the dots, and some of that just did not happen. And then even how one training related to the next train. So I just -- I definitely felt that that was lacking for me. I also believe that there should be next go round some sort of soft skills training just in how to relate to each other. We had a few different opportunities to totally fall apart in just in interactions. And there was so much, I guess, focus on the mechanics of, I think, because things, again, has to be in public. I don't know. I feel like there almost seems to be a way around that. And I think someone mentioned that earlier. I was just coming back from the call I had to take. But there seems like there needs to be a way around having every interaction in public. There just does need to be a space or time for us to meet. And whether we have to sign some sort of a document that says we will not talk commission business, we need to meet each other to be able to build that trust level a lot quicker than what we
did. I think we had to dance around issues so very carefully, because I just don't, you know, one just didn't know the intent of the other. And so, I think a train -- more training or trainings, in addition to what we did do around some of the soft skills, how to interact with people, teaching people to mean what they say. We've set a lot of ground rules. We didn't necessarily always follow ground rules. But what I loved was the -- I did love the lunches that we had where we were able to share and talk about, you know, just family and kids and trips and whatever else, because they made a difference. They absolutely made a difference. So I thought that was pretty good to help as much as possible along the lines of team building. And I wished we would have had opportunity to do more of that or taken the opportunity to do more of that. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Sorry for going twice, but I forgot to mention a couple of things. Early on, it was very academic, the training and the terms that they used. You have no idea how many times I was Googling the definitions. And I've said it a hundred times, English is my second language. And so, I think
next time around, they need to do a better job of using basic language so that every Californian can understand what they're talking about and doesn't have to, you know, don't have to look at the definitions every three minutes. Also, and I appreciate what Commissioner Turner said, because I wrote this down. Sometimes you don't know. Exactly. Sometimes -- at the beginning, I don't know what I should know. And it's not until I'm six months in that I know what or I have a feeling of what additional training I should have. But I did want to -- I wasn't sure if this was a place or not, Commissioner Kennedy, but I did want to add that the panels that we had and incarcerated population, education, language axis, labor, business. All of those panels I thought for me personally were beneficial because you got to see, like, the impact and where it really matters and how it will affect what we do with the lines. And I don't know, for me, it just really was impactful, and it was additive -- you know, added to my understanding of the entire process. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Perfect, and yes, this is the time to -- for comments about those panels, so thank you for bringing that up.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair -- or thank you,
Commissioner Kennedy. I agree with everyone, everything that's been said so far.

I want to emphasize the need for early socializing. You know, I think we did pretty good considering everything that went on with the pandemic and using Zoom. But I remember what a difference it made when we did have our first in-person meetings. And it's just -- it's hard to remember now what it was like before that, you know, before we actually met most -- each other in person. So some way to do that early on -- hopefully, there'll be no pandemic ten years from now, and we'll just be able to meet together and travel together, as 2010 was able to.

The early trainings, I agree with everything everyone has said. I want to also say, though, you know, I understood why the trainings that were selected were selected and kind of why they picked who they picked. You know, trying to put something together from scratch, I mean, that was much better than leaving it to us to figure out, you know, from scratch what training to find, how to find it, where to get it, you know? You know, maybe we would have made different choices in the end, but in the time available, you know, before we had to do a lot more business, you know, I was glad as much was provided as was provided, even with all the shortcomings that people have noted. I just wanted to say that.
One other thing -- this has to do with website, you know, and this applies to the 2010 website we inherited as well as our website right up till today. You know, still not having that one page on the website where all key documents are collected, you know, all the policies, all the major reports, you know, all those different things, the chair rotation, I mean, just all the most basic and frequently-referred-to stuff that a lot of us found piecemeal here and there, but you know, it was not in one place for everyone to get right from the beginning. So just to have one place to collect all those would have been helpful.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

I've put myself in the queue with a couple of thoughts. One is I had organized the geography panel fairly late in the process because I kept feeling that I needed more, and it might be useful to colleagues to have more on the -- on just the basic physical geography of California. So you know, I would say that should go earlier in the process as an intro.

I was very frustrated because I was trying to organize a panel with somebody from a city, somebody from a county, and somebody from a metropolitan planning organization, and I just -- I kept getting noes from the
people that I was reaching out to. And I don't know whether we need to recommend reaching out to California League of Cities, California Association of Counties, and others earlier and planting a seed and maybe coming back later and trying to harvest the product of earlier-planted seeds. I do think that having perspective from cities, counties, and metropolitan planning organizations fairly early in the process could have been useful.

Likewise, I think, you know, more training or briefing, and maybe that's a distinction that we need to make. Are we looking for or talking about briefings, or are we talking about training?

If we're talking about real training, then in the long term, I might even suggest we look at exploring the possibility of going through a process of quote/unquote localizing a standard tool that we now use in the international elections community to train election staff, and it's called BRIDGE Basic Resources in Democracy, Governance, and Elections, BRIDGE.

And BRIDGE was developed initially by the Australian Electoral Commission with participation from the UN and I believe, the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, based in Stockholm, as specifically an adult-learning tool for individuals starting in election-related work or careers. And there is a module
on boundary delimitation. I don't think that -- I'm not
talking right now about delivering the full BRIDGE
curriculum. That's quite extensive. But we could look
at possibilities of coming up with a quote/unquote
localized version of the boundary delimitation module of
BRIDGE that would use adult-learning techniques to convey
the terminology, the skills that are needed for this
process.

You know, I thought that we didn't get information
that would have been useful to us about things like
LAFCO's local area -- Local Agency Formation Commissions
that each county has a LAFCO because, you know, we could
have taken local districts into greater account in our
work if we had known more about LAFCOs and the work that
they do, the types of districts that are out there in
each of the 58 counties.

Likewise, DUC is Disadvantaged Unincorporated
Communities. I wasn't aware of the term, but I live in
one, you know, and knowing about Disadvantaged
Unincorporated Communities, spheres of influence, that
each incorporated city has a, you know, sphere of
influence, I think that may be something that the LAFCO
does is review and approve spheres of influence. I think
we need -- or future commissions need a lot more about,
you know, the LAFCO process, spheres of influence,
Disadvantage Unincorporated Communities, et cetera.
And finally, I've been thinking that the future commissions could really benefit from a full-blown simulation with a fictitious jurisdiction with complete census data, you know, of course, made up for the fictitious entity. But you know, look at building a full-blown, week-long simulation rather than -- I mean, we had, I think, half of an afternoon at some point where we went through some of this, but I don't think we learned at that point the difference between a trade and a rotation, you know, a two-way trade between jurisdictions versus moving population from here to here, from here to here, and from here back to here. Those are things that we picked up along the way. And I think if we had gone into the process with more knowledge of some of those tricks of the trade, as it were, that it would have been very helpful to us.

Moving on to Commissioner Fornaciari.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: I originally raised my hand to talk about the panels and see, you know, what folks thought. I'm glad to hear that folks found -- those who have spoke about them found the panels useful. I thought they were useful as well. I like the additional suggestions for maybe other panels or other lectures or -- and I've got to say, I love the geography lecture.
And I wouldn't call it a lecture. Made me think I was back in college.

You know, I think -- I kind of like the timing, Commissioner Kennedy, of that because wasn't it about time we started getting feedback, or we'd already gotten some feedback from folks. You know, I mean, for instance, you know, there were folks in two different cities claiming the cities are really connected together by a lot of different, you know -- but there's a mountain in between that maybe we didn't know about. And you know, I thought it was pretty good timing, but just go back to the, you know, all we're doing is really making recommendations to the next commission on what they might want to consider doing.

But back to training, you know, I think we can recommend a sort of a cadence or you know, timing of when they ought to think about, you know, high-level training for a specific topic. And then as they get closer, maybe they want to get more in depth. And like you suggested, Commissioner Kennedy, maybe a really more in-depth mapping exercise, but -- you know, instead of the drinking from the firehose thing. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

Commissioner Akutagawa.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, thank you. And everything that everyone has said is -- I absolutely also agree with.

I guess I'll start with the team building part. I guess maybe it's more, I guess, a comment than anything. I mean, 2030 is probably going to have different circumstances than we are given, you know, the pandemic that we were in, and so we were forced into trying to get to know each other, connect with each other over Zoom. Although I have to say, I mean -- you know, given the circumstances, I mean, we actually ended up doing pretty well. It took us a lot longer, and it would have been nice to have been able to have traveled through and really get to know each other better. But I think given the circumstances, you know, we did what we could, and I think we ended up in a good -- in a fairly good place.

But I do -- I guess the only thing I would say is whatever the next commission does that they do spend the time to intentionally build teams. I know that at the beginning when we first met, we did talk about trying to do so. I think perhaps for the reasons that Commissioner Fornaciari mentioned that, you know, maybe because of Bagley-Keene and other things like that, we were being very careful about how we did that.

But I think we know, you know, spending that time
for the team building is going to be really important, especially building trust. And whatever tools they'll have to use during, you know, ten years from now or eight years from now, you know, may hopefully help to facilitate building that trust a lot faster as well, too.

On the training side, I absolutely agree with what Commissioner Turner said about it was not training. I think when I came in, I was thinking that we were going to do more, I guess, like whether it's small group things, even if using Zoom -- and I guess -- I don't know, I guess this just comes from not having known better at the time, but it was just all straight presentation. And I think maybe using those words will help calibrate our expectations. Either that or, you know, as part of the lessons learned, we recommend also that whoever is going to be engaged to be "a presenter" or trainer, if we want to use that word, that we do ask them to utilize some of the other tools. And again, the technology might be different, but they could have easily have used polls, you know, on Zoom so that it is still public. It would help us -- or help them to also understand, you know, what our levels of knowledge would be on certain things.

The other thing -- and I think this got mentioned, but I thought I'd lift this up again -- I think it would
be helpful to think about, let's do a high-level executive summary overview of the topics first, especially at the very beginning, but then come back. Ask that person or somebody else to come back and do the deeper dive when we've had a chance to settle in a little bit more, we're in a better place to ask more detailed questions and have a more informed conversation with that person.

Let's see. And lastly, I'm realizing that, Commissioner Kennedy, I thought we were all pretty, you know, well aware of a lot of things, but your sharing of the DUC and the LAFCO -- you know, I do recall the sphere of influence, and I remember when you were talking about it I thought that that was really interesting. I think having more intentional conversations about some of those things would be helpful to know at least so that we're aware and would be able to keep those in mind as well, too. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Good afternoon. Hopefully everyone can hear me. Can you hear me correct?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: We can hear you.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you.
Commissioner Kennedy, I couldn't agree with you more. I feel that there should be a practical component prior to us building those maps. It seems that earlier we were using the visualizations as a way to step into that -- to that area of line drawing. So perhaps a simulation, example, or practical app could get us to a point to where we're better using that time for things that we can use, or we're not experimenting in that moment, but we're actually being productive.

I felt that we were funneled into thinking that there's only one way to line draw or to build maps. I think that we should be giving -- be given alternatives. You know, there's -- through our research now we see that there's other ways to build maps. Commissioner Sadhwani picked up on it earlier when she said we could work off of a computer-generated map. Maybe we do -- have a period of time where we do one method and do another method. So I think we don't want to get funneled into one method of doing something or make a decision as to what method we want to choose.

I believe it would have been nice to get a little bit more training or explanation as to what goes into building a VRA district or the components of a VRA district. It seemed like we were totally reliant on our counsel. So it'd be nice if we had more components of
that, from my opinion. And much like Commissioner Turner said, it's tough to learn trigonometry in front of the state. So yeah, I think acknowledging that we have to expose some of those weaknesses earlier so that we can go forward. It's human nature to want to sort of not expose those. So just acknowledge that we have to learn in front of the state absent any other way around Bagley-Keene. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I couldn't agree with everybody more.

The piece that was really missing in our training was how all these pieces fit together. We actually had some really good sections that were, wow, okay, it's a lot of information, and then we couldn't go back to it. And so I really think that idea of a full overview -- actually, kind of like the way Commissioner Kennedy led -- started this out. This is what we're talking about. This is where we're going to go. This is what we're thinking of, something like that to really -- and then and now -- now we're going to give you this is what a VRA district is and then come back to it as we get to that in the time frame. And even if in that overview,
you go, okay, now -- which we didn't have a whole thing
about organization and state procedures. You're going to
be trained about how to do this; this is what you're
going to end up doing first; you know, and you'll be
hiring people; this is what our, you know, RFPs are;
there's a difference between RFP. Remember we had to
figure all that out like, okay, what's an RFQ, what's an
RFP? Most of us hadn't even heard of that stuff. And it
really was -- it's like, well, wait, wait a second. I'm
still trying to figure out VRA. Wait. Now we're talking
about RFQ. It was a bit too much all at once because it
was really detailed all at once. So if we have those
good sections that we can also refer back to.

And then we did try -- Commissioner Sadhwani and I
tried to do training, and we tried to do a mapping. And
we didn't really get to do that much of it. It was very
short. It was like, oh, here's half a day, and that's
that. And in our training of mapping, that was also kind
of half a day early. And again, as Commissioner Turner
said, we didn't really get to try things and go, okay,
let's do the whole thing through and through.

The idea of bringing up let's make up a totally
manufactured, you know, Planet Z with districts and
stuff, that was talked about and talked about, and then
it's like, well, when do we, how do we, and it didn't
happen. And I really recommend that we do those specific training, an actual -- I also like the point where there's training, and then there's the lecture portion. We got pretty good lecture portions, but we didn't have enough training on several different things.

And last point is that geographical, you know, panel and stuff, that was very good. We needed more of it.

And I really like the idea of the specifics of, you know, the districts like Commissioner Kennedy was talking about. Also, we didn't really realize that, oh, we kind of need to know what neighborhoods are until we were mapping. And then whose neighborhoods do you respect and whose do you not, in terms of, you know, that certain cities have neighborhoods already set up.

The other part that I thought was actually very helpful, which we got, and from a -- again, a different perspective was the whole water resources and the environment. You know, how do the trees affect the jobs and the areas and where the pollution areas are, because that does affect people, where people can live. And that whole thing with, you know, the watersheds and where the rivers are, the geographical portion, I thought, was very handy. And it's very different than who the different people are, which we need both because we need all of that. You need who the different -- you know, I thought
our panels were very good. We probably could have used a
few more. But again, time was of the essence.

And that's where I think -- again, I'm going to say
that I think this -- the next commission should start a
bit earlier so they can have this kind of training in
terms of the outreach of perspectives of how we set up
the panels. You know, we had a chance to do all that,
which I don't know if the 2030 commission will do -- will
have that.

One thing, though, I also want to bring up is COVID.
We had a really hard time talking to each other, and I'm
assuming that from the 2030 on that probably won't
happen. They'll probably be able to get together, which
will make things much smoother and much easier.

However, they're going to spend a whole lot of time
traveling when they can't be doing stuff. I mean,
they'll be talking to each other, yes, but they won't be
able to be researching things and looking at other stuff
because they'll literally be traveling back and forth.
And so in that respect, we do need to try to think of,
you know, in terms -- this is the -- you know, how our
experience will be different from the next and how we can
help them. It's hard for us to imagine not having the
time like, you know, well, we're done with the meeting.
We're done, and you, you know, go off and do your thing
at your house. They're going to have to like we did when we were traveling. Then you've got to go back to the hotel. You can't get this done because you don't have the proper, you know, Wi-Fi. You can't get it, maybe, printed. That sort of thing will happen as well. And that's something I think we need to give them a whole perspective of, again, because their time will be shorter. So those are some items I wanted to bring up. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Listening to all of this, I'm wondering, I mean, the -- we did not have a position that I would call a training coordinator. It seems like, you know, Raul and Marion (ph.) did what they could to organize those early briefings and so forth before we, as commissioners, could take on more of the task and organize some of these panels. Do colleagues see scope for a training coordinator for the early phases, and if so, how would something like that work? Just, you know, I think we need to think about how to actuate some of these very good suggestions other than just leaving them behind in the lessons learned report.

Second of all, I mentioned the BRIDGE project earlier. That's BRIDGE, B-R-I-D-G-E dash project dot
org, if you want to find out more about it. As I say, it was purposely developed by election professionals with deep experience in adult-learning methodologies to introduce usually new election staff to the topics that they would be dealing with.

BRIDGE actually grew out of a project that I was involved in, which was the ACE Project, Administration and Cost of Elections, A-C-E Project, one word, dot org, which was the first ever electronic encyclopedia -- online encyclopedia on election administration. And again, boundary delimitation was a topic area. The difference being ACE was intended to be more of an encyclopedia, a reference work, somewhere to go if you want to look something up.

But what got me thinking about this was the mention earlier of kind of an executive summary, because what we did when we set up ACE was we structured it hierarchically so that if you wanted an overview of a topic or if you wanted just an overview of the election administration in general, you could just cruise along the highest-level files and get a very basic executive-level understanding of each of the nine topic areas that we had initially. If you then wanted to drill deeper, we had, you know, layer after layer after layer going into greater and greater and greater detail. But yeah, we
structured it understanding that some people only needed that high-level, executive-summary-type treatment of topics where other people were going to want much more detail on what they were looking at. Yeah, that's it.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think this builds on what you said, or it's saying it again but in different words. But one of the things in having spoken to commissioners at other independent redistricting commissions, a lot of them wanted to sit in on our trainings, or they were replicating the trainings or whatnot. And it does feel like if they're -- you know, we don't all start at the same time. But if there was -- you know, the National League of Cities has a training, but it's more for cities and officials and stuff. But maybe it's a redistricting hub, the data hub -- redistricting data hub that, you know, they've had funding. You know, they can get funding for stuff like this. But somewhere where, you know, there's going to be more and more independent redistricting commissions. And some of this is California focused, but some of it is more -- is broader. And that's an opportunity.

Again, though, when you do a lot of these -- they're not trainings. They're lectures, right, because there might be webinars and whatnot. But they may be -- you
know, it just feels like if they -- instead of us trying
to take it on or the CRC hiring someone to coordinate
training, it really feels like this is much bigger than
us. And I know that a lot of the local groups were
looking to us for some of that, and we couldn't provide
it. And this will come up again. I'll bring it up again
when we're talking about the tools that we created, the
mapping tools, and COIs that we were seeing. And so
sometimes we need to think about as much as we were
learning as we were going, others still thought that we
were the experts and were looking up to us. I was like,
good luck. But just, you know, who could -- who has the
expertise already who could take the next ten years to
start -- you know, kind of create some of this curriculum
and stuff instead of us thinking about how do we do it
and wait till 2030 actually implements it?

So I apologize if that's exactly what you were
saying, Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: No, it wasn't. It's very
helpful, and I'll comment on it further after
Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, the one thing I forgot
to mention is the staff also needs to have access to the
training because I remember when we first hired people
they had specific -- they knew what their specific job
was, but they didn't understand how any of the rest of it was working. And I was trying to give people, you know, connections or links to previous training that they could see and see what was going on. So I believe -- or Commissioner Kennedy, we were talking about how you have sort of higher levels of, you know, here's a little blurb about this is what, you know, all the different tasks are that you can then get into as you need to. The staff needs access to that so they understand why they're being asked to do these certain things and how it all fits together. So I just want to bring that up and help the staff also be considered.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thanks. Yeah, that's a great point. I want to go back to the point that Commissioner Sinay was making and say, you know, I've been thinking that maybe, you know, just as the 2010 commission got external funding from the -- from Harvard's Ash Center to travel and talk in other states about their work and the value of citizen redistricting, perhaps -- and we've been looking to see if there's kind of a similar mission that we could go on in the out years, maybe working with National Conference of State Legislatures or you know, U.S. Conference of Mayors or you know, National Association of Counties, some of these or all of them together, you know, maybe working with them, going for a
grant, and working with these organizations to build a
full-blown training simulation for citizen redistricting
bodies could be something that we consider.

Director Kaplan.

DIRECTOR KAPLAN: I just want to follow up on
Commissioner Andersen's note that staff did go through
all the trainings that commissioners went through. We
worked with various commissioners to identify some of the
initial training, so that was really helpful for the
onboarding and also just to have additional background
and context for all of you as well. The additional
trainings that you had through the process when we did
have outreach staff on board, I did flag for staff to be
tuning in to particular commission meetings for that. So
thank you for highlighting that. It was really helpful
for them to get some of that background context.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Perfect. Thanks.

Any further thoughts on social activities that we
wish we had done or how COVID impacted us or the use of
reports and materials from the 2010 commission?

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. Yes, COVID impacted
us, so therefore we had to do things virtually. We don't
know where things will go in ten years, but I do have a
gut feeling that a lot of stuff is going to stay virtual.
I hear that piece often in a lot of the circles I'm running. Oh, I'm so much happier now that meetings are virtual and all that.

So even in our report, though, we know that 2010 -- that 2030 will be different. I think it is important to highlight have a meeting all in person as soon as possible, just so that you can all get to know each other. And I would also highlight make sure you do some silly games and guessing games like I'm -- I'll always be thankful for Commissioner Yee for setting up some of those. And you know -- and there are many more that kept coming to mind after the fact. But those are all -- they're important to be -- and it's important for us to be reminded that as high -- as important as the purpose is of what we're doing, that you're human -- that we're human. That, you know, commissioners are human, and commissioners need that human connection, and that you actually have to purposely go out to create that. You have to be intentional in creating that trust and that connection.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, thank you. Also, along with the trainings, there was in discussions -- because
we talked about it a lot -- the meetings went on and on and as discussions and crosstalk and what have you. I think there were some pearls that were dropped, some things that were lost in the process that we didn't get back to. And I'm thinking of it because we talked about, you know, you've mentioned about we said definitely maybe we can go through a simulation, and maybe we can -- we threw out a lot of maybes and how about. And because there was so much to learn, so much to discuss, so many decisions to be made, I think some of those got dropped, and perhaps if we would have gone through something -- kept some kind of running check, you know, Commissioners, do we all agree this is something that we maybe should look into. And then yes, if it is. Perhaps, to have someone that's tasked with tracking it as a follow-up to get back to it to ensure that it's not dropped or lost.

I'm grateful for the paperwork that the -- kind of job aid or help aids that Commissioner Yee provided. One such discussion we had, though, was talking about how would we differentiate; what would the decision look like when there was a conflict when we had competing ideas. And I don't know if we all -- if we got all the way down to that portion of it, and it would have been helpful towards the end of our line drawing, when basically it really got down to one type community wanted something
different than another, you know, and just based on how
many people. And to honor one request almost felt like
ignoring or disenfranchising a different, you know,
community or what have you.

But we never did fully that -- in my recollection,
have the conversation that says all things considered
equal, now what? What are we going to do after VRA
requirements, after we've gone through, you know, all of
the legalities? What is our thought process? Is it now
the loudest commissioner, the ones that want to keep
coming back and talking the longest? Is it, you know --
and so things like that, I think, got dropped because we
lifted that, what would we do, and then we went on with
other conversation.

And so that's just another example, and I'm certain
there were more. But some sort of, you know, if we were
in a room together, we could put it on, you know -- on a,
you know, poster board, whiteboard, you know, to give
parking lot, and we'll get back to that. Some things, I
think, just got dropped that really could have been
advantageous to the process and decision making. Thank
you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner
Turner.

Commissioner Sinay.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: It would be great at the beginning -- and this would be a training -- learning how to facilitate meetings, how to set up agendas, how, you know -- especially if there is that rotating -- yeah, the rotating chair piece is kept. But I think it's as important for staff as it is for commissioners just kind of to have that.

And I know in 2010 -- and I did share it with someone -- they had created -- they had a whole folder for whatever new chair came on board. It had all sorts of prompts and helpers for them to be able to read through it. And there was -- they had kind of created cheat sheets on how to -- so that there was more, you know, uniform from one chair to the other.

But you know, just that whole idea, you know, that when you're a chair, what's the difference between leading, facilitating, engaging other folks, creating a safe environment for everybody to participate, making sure -- even with Bagley-Keene, making sure that everybody's engaging how to -- you know, all those different things, that would have been really helpful to have all the way along.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Great. Anything else at this point? Training and team building.

Commissioner Sinay.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. There will be new technologies in the future, and so how to use the different tools. Like, we used Morrow a couple of times for meetings, and it was kind of hard to train -- you know, do a training in addition to how we were using it. So just for 2030 to think through to make sure that all commissioners and staff are trained on whatever great technology and tool there is so everybody can use it equally and feel comfortable with it.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thanks for that. Yeah, I think I had mentioned at one point that it would have been helpful to have some serious hands-on training for commissioners on the mapping software that we had access to that we could have -- we could have come up with our own plans or districts and bring them in -- already in electronic format rather than just ideas in our heads. I felt like that was a significant miss on our part.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, and to break my own belief of being repetitive, yes, Commissioner Kennedy, for those that were early adopters on that system, it was great. But I think we ended up bombarding them with, listen, here's my thought, can you draw it for me, can you figure it out? So that training is more than a
suggestion. It's crucial that we are all very grounded and understand how to do that. The technology is there, but yeah -- and hats off and thank you for the four or five of you that were experts in it. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, I'll get more into this when we do really talk more about the mapping, but there was a real desire to have that, and there was real pushback against it. We've been told no, no, no, no, no, if the commissioners start drawing things, then everyone's going to want their own idea, and it'll be a, you know, no, no, I like this one. I don't like that one. But I agree. It would have been much better for us to understand the software to be able to make changes because it actually would have facilitated our live line drawing. We would have understood what this means, and we didn't. And it wasn't till later on in the process when we'd actually almost all of us had a bit of a go at trying it ourselves that we understood so much more.

And so I understand the push -- you know, the original pushback. It was like, no, we weren't even going to get the ability to use any of it, but it really proved invaluable in terms of actually getting stuff done and accomplishing things. And I totally agree it was unfortunately that there were a lot of other ideas out
there, but whatever happened to get presented is what we
kind of ended up going with because we didn't have the
time to do other options, and it would have been nice to
have a couple of different options out there.

So these are things that I will definitely bring up
as we talk more seriously about the mapping process. But
I really am glad that this did come up because in terms
of training, I think that you -- we really could have
done that. And I really wish we pushed harder for that.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thanks, Commissioner
Andersen.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, thank you, because the
other part I forgot to say about that is towards the end,
it almost became prohibitive in participating in the
process. When we started running out of time, if you
didn't know how to map it or make quick use of the
mapping software, you were at a disadvantage, and it was,
like, you know, tell us, what do you want to go from this
to this? What's the numbers? What's the -- and it's
like, you know, this is the thought I have, and I may not
have it. And so if you didn't get in the queue to get
someone to help you map it using the tool, it was almost
like you lost opportunity to participate unless you said,
well, no, I don't have those exact numbers, but this is
what I want to try anyway, you know? So it went from a
suggestion to I don't want us to have it, to suggestion
to have it, to kind of use it to where you better know
how to do it at this point, because we don't have time to
do the other slower way, so yeah. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you.

Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you. It might just be
me, but you know, I think it would have been helpful had
we all maybe received a map at some point in this. We
got all kinds of materials. None of us got a map. And
some of us are visual learners, want to actually feel and
touch. So you know, whether or not they're maps of
districts or something, but maybe a map of California
should be included with our crap -- excuse me -- with our
stuff.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Hey --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- Taylor.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- I gave you one.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I did contact Riverside and
San Bernardino Counties. All of San Bernardino's GIS
stuff is on their website, and Riverside actually
customized a map for me that I had here in my office so
that I could, you know -- and this San Bernardino County
map that I have beside me is enormous. Of course, the
county's enormous to start with, but you know, being able
to download it onto a USB -- and I took it to my local
print shop and had them print this for me on their large-
format printer. Yeah, it certainly -- things like that
do help.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, thank you. And I
appreciate what Commissioner Turner said, because I tried
my best, and I don't think I quite fully got the GIS, but
I agree.

I meant to say earlier that I think if we could do
some kind of -- or if we -- not that we'll be doing it in
2030. But if we could have had some kind of training on
the QGIS earlier.

And I understand what Commissioner Andersen said,
and I think that that may have led to some of the --
maybe the later delays on it. But I think just knowing
upfront that we should recommend to the next commission
that getting -- and with everybody make -- literally
making everybody sit in front of their laptops and like
practice all of the -- I think we just have to do it.
And not just assume that, oh, I'm tech savvy, so I could
do it. There are just little things that just -- I think
unless we're doing it together, I think it would have
been hard.

And I think that also would have helped ensure that maybe we didn't go through so many visualization rounds and instead of the visualization rounds, we just got down to the line drawing so that then we could have done maybe an earlier round of draft maps to get responses and feedback and then do a second round of draft maps to get responses and feedback. Because I felt like as much as the visualizations were helpful, I felt like, you know, we were giving direction a little bit in a vacuum. And so that just made it tough.

And so on that note, too -- and I think, Commissioner Kennedy, you mentioned doing like a week-long simulation. You know, I don't know if this is possible, but I think it would be helpful really early on for maybe the next commission to do like a week-long simulation of what it would be like to do line drawing, using maybe the COI testimony that we used, using maybe the census numbers that we used, and letting them draw -- you know, just get the experience of drawing the maps with the line drawers.

I think the half a day was really just kind of like really literally scratching the surface. It was interesting, but it would have been helpful to have had more because I don't think you really realize the kind of
tradeoffs that we do have to start making.

And I think, Commissioner Kennedy, you're the one that said, you know, like switching and swapping and all these kind of things, you don't get it until you actually start looking at all the volumes of data and what we're trying to accomplish and so many competing, you know, kind of inputs that we're trying to honor. And so I think allowing the next commission or recommending to the next commission that they give themselves that experience so that when they go into the actual line drawing after they get the census numbers, they're that much better prepared, and then they could think about how they manage their time because I think that's what it all came down to, too, is some time management. And if they know how much more challenging it's going to be, they may make different decisions about how they manage time. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Great. Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah, back to the question of training on QGIS mapping software. I mean, who knows how things will be in eight years. I mean, that's forever in computer time. So maybe it won't even be an issue then.

But I don't know how it would have gone over if we
had forced everyone to become minimally proficient in
that, you know? It would have taken a long time. I
never did.

Another option, and one we kind of used, was also
subject to this kind of unevenness among commissioners
was access to mappers outside of meetings, right? And if
we'd had more access to more mappers and a more
structured way and then they could develop options, you
know, proposed maps, you know, surely much more easily
than even we could if we'd been trained, you know, that
could have worked, too. And it did work fractionally.
You know, some of us were able to get access to mappers,
but it was very uneven, and it was not systematic and
would need to be if we went -- wanted them -- if 2030
wanted to go that route. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thanks.

Commissioner Taylor reminded me that one of my big
pet peeves at the very beginning was that we got this
huge binder with almost nothing in it. And I always
thought things would come, and they never came, and I
would at different times say, hey, you know, I just got a
map from the AAA -- a map of California through AAA.
It's really good. Could you guys maybe get a -- first, I
asked if they had a map, and it was crickets. But we may want to give a good outline of what should be in a manual besides Bagley-Keene, and not everything has to go in the manual.

I just kept hoping that we would be getting packets and with three-hole punched and we were putting it in or something. You know, I eventually ended up creating my own with past -- you know, everyone's past -- all the different reports there were, not just the ones that, you know -- so I have all the different reports as well as maps as well as the Bagley-Keene.

You know, there was just all sorts of different pieces, you know, all the presentations we had that were given to us, but then the more detailed -- because I sometimes wish they would have given us a presentation and then an article to read -- that we could go back to and read because I'm someone who has to go back and forth to, like, finally really -- I capture it, but something better than what -- than an empty binder that just had Bagley-Keene.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Great. Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

And anything else?

Okay, if there's nothing else on training and team building, what I am going to suggest is that we go ahead
and get started on finances. We have twenty-four minutes
now until the break and another forty-five minutes after
the break before public comment. We might actually be
able to finish with finances and then start tomorrow with
admin and finance.

The distinction between those is maybe subtle, but
finances we're talking about kind of the big picture, you
know, how much this cost, the process of getting money
from the State, budget cycles, reporting cycles,
expenditure monitoring, admin and finances more on our
internal processes.

So as I say, unless there's something else on
training and team building or if anyone has anything else
on the earlier topics, then I would suggest that we go
ahead and jump into finances.

And if that's the case, I'll -- Commissioner
Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, no, I was going to
start on finances, or did you --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, I'm going to hand over
the moderating of this topic to Commissioner Yee, and
away we go. Thanks, everybody.

COMMISSIONER YEE: And away we go. Okay,
Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: As being the one half of
the subcommittee, I guess I'll get started.

I will just say my biggest frustration with the finances was the lack of the expenditure information to be able to track, which is why we weren't able to bring the budget information and expenditure information to the commission as often as Commissioner Fornaciari and I would have liked to. Working through the Department of General Services to get the information, apparently that wasn't working, and I didn't have an -- I didn't have time to delve into it more than I should.

So with that, my recommendation would be that one, we need to develop some -- or the next commission should develop some expectations in terms of the agreement between the Commission and Department of General Services, if that's going to be the entity that you would contract with. And then two, to hire the budget person as soon as possible after the executive team, only because we really need to get a handle on that on the budget information as soon as possible so that we can establish a reporting mechanism.

I was looking at it. What I'm used to in government was every month we would update the budget and our expenditure and project out so that if there were shortfalls, we could elevate that. And honestly, it's just been a very cumbersome process, very frustrating
process. And I know Commissioner Fornaciari has felt my
frustration many a times. And we need direct access
to -- it's called the FI$Cal system, so if you want to --
that's like your banking system. We would need -- my
recommendation is to obtain direct access to that, so
we're not relying on a separate agency for that
information, and that would show our expenditure
information to date.

I think I will just stop there because I think I
could probably ramble on forever. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner
Fernandez.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: I think another area that
was really super challenging and actually continues to be
really challenging is this idea that, you know, we're
given a budget, and then we have to go ask for permission
to spend it and justify why we're -- I mean, in gory
detail why we're asking for the amount of money we're
asking for and then negotiate back and forth as to how
much they're going to actually give us -- or how much
permission we're going to get to spend this money. And I
mean, it was an enormous amount of time for everyone
involved, and frankly, it seems to be unnecessary work.

You know, I know there needs to be oversight by the
State, and they want to see what we're doing. And seeing what we're doing is fine, but having, you know, the subcommittee -- I mean, we spent our time on it -- but down the road, Raul and the budget person, hours and hours and hours and hours and back and forth.

And so I'll just make it real simple. We just need to get -- you know, with the budget allocation should come permission to spend it without this extra just really wasted effort in between. So I think that would go a long way. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, thank you, and thank you to Commissioner Fornaciari for highlighting that.

And I've mentioned this many times as the other agencies that I've worked for, we've never had to request to use the funding that we've already justified. Even the funding, if you'll recall, we went forward, and we justified increasing our budget. Even wanting to use that funds that we -- those funds that we had already justified what we were going to use for, and they approved them, we still had to request that the funding -- the funds be released, and then, as Commissioner Fornaciari noted, it's a lot of work.
And that information or that requirement is actually in the Budget Act. So I think I will work on that piece to see how we can maybe not have that language in the Budget Act, where we have to say, you know, mother, may I, you know, spend the money that you've already said that we should have.

And I was looking at something else. And the initial allocations, I'm hopeful that Commissioner Fornaciari and I will be drafting a report that will go to the legislature. And at that point, we would like to specify which fund -- what part of the funding -- total funding that we have should be used at least as a base for the 2030 Commission, instead of having them go all the way back to what the initial government code language says. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER: Thank you. Commissioner Fernandez, I'm wondering if you could also comment a bit on delegated authority and remind us how that works and whether that's germane.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I did -- Commissioner Andersen was --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I thought I --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- talking about it --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- had my handouts.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- but didn't know the
exact terminology --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Exactly.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- for it. And so that is normally State agencies, if you have specific individuals that are trained in the State procurement process, you have delegated authority to certain dollar amounts so that you don't have to go through this RFP process that goes through the Department of General Services.

And there's different levels, and I'm trying to remember what corrections was. It was probably pretty high, like 250,000 or half a million where you don't have to go through this two-month process.

And I do know that we were trying to get that, and I'm not -- right now it's really frustrating because there was promises made that it was going to be done for our -- for the commission, and it did not happen. And my frustration is that once maybe certain individuals were hired, they kind of -- they got hired, and we had to go through the RFP process, which is unfortunate.

So yes, that's definitely something we want to keep on the radar for the 2030 Commission. That or also something in our potential legislation would be to have exemption from the contracting and procurement restrictions of the government restrictions, similar to what Census has where they can issue grants. They can
issue contracts to a certain extent. Thanks.

Did that help, Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. That made sense. Yes.

Thank you so much.

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you very much for that. That's exactly what I was going to lead into. And I do want to make the distinction -- that is for, like, procurement of equipment -- our computers -- that sort of stuff. It does not mean that we're saying, oh, no, we're not -- now, we don't have to do that. We can go out and just pick whatever consultant we want. I mean, I want to make sure that's clear. And there were steps that we really had to go through that we never should've had to go through, involving not only the finance, but many other -- many other items -- that's why I think we really do need to look at either regulation and/or the different changes in terms of constitutional, code, law, and regulations.

And that delegated authority -- that also has to do with our office and everything in the office; is that correct? I think that was -- I mean, in terms of -- we didn't have -- early on, we didn't actually have -- we could only do, I think, up to $5,000. Period. And that was it. Even that amount, which I know there are
hinderances -- and if it wasn't the reason, that's what we were told was the reason on different things. So I'd like to get all that clarified for the 2030 commission.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Commissioner Fornaciari.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: I'm going to put Director Kaplan on the spot, and I'd like to -- Marcy if you could share kind of what you shared with us the other day at the budget meeting about the delegated authority that the Census had and kind of the scope of that -- and just how they ended up using it and what the constraints were. That would be awesome.

DIRECTOR KAPLAN: They had a procurement exemption, and they didn't use this for everything. The bulk of the funding that was distributed was distributed through a competitive RFP. So over -- I don't remember the exact amount, but of the $187,000,000, a vast majority of that funding was distributed through that RFP process, but there was some of the work that I oversaw which was sectors that didn't really have a defined scope when I was brought on, as well as areas where they got no funding request for a particular area. So there was like statewide funding that census distributed for different categories, like targeting particular populations. There was a handful of those, including Middle Eastern North African, the homeless population zero to five where no
statewide entity had applied for those funds, and so the office used that procurement exemption to identify entities to fund.

And there was like an internal process that got created on how to justify and the research and background that went into funding those entities. They had it, but it wasn't utilized for the bulk of that. I think I had shared the language in the past with Raul and the subcommittee, but I can pull that language if that's helpful as well. I don't know -- was that helpful, or did you have more --

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: No, that's it. I just --

DIRECTOR KAPLAN: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: I just wanted you to share kind of the big -- the sort of the big picture of what it was all about and how it was used. I mean, kind of if you think about it in the context of our Commission, right, when we found out we couldn't distribute the money, maybe we could've reacted a little more quickly in getting the money out to other entities. But for the most part, organizations like this would use -- even if you had an exemption -- you would use the normal process. But just have that in your pocket if you need it.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thanks for that. I'm wondering about changing the subject a little. This overall
funding level. I mean, my impression was that that was never a limiting factor for our work. I mean, it might have been harder to get the money than it should've been, but money was never limiting otherwise. We didn't come up against a budget limit and say, oh, we can't do something we need to do, because we don't have money for that. I'm wondering if Commissioners Fornaciari or Fernandez can comment on whether that's an accurate perception or whether it might not be?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I think the language is clear as to -- we're supposed to be provided the funding that's required to perform our functions, correct. But part of it also is -- it still has to go through the Department of Finance if we request additional funding, and then it has to go to the legislature and the governor's budget.

So theoretically, there's always a possibility that it may be denied, but I definitely would want the funding to be at a high enough level so that we don't have to track it every few months. Does that make sense? So we don't have to keep going forward every few months to request additional funding. Or part of that, too, is like Commissioner Fornaciari mentioned, is to request for that funding to be released for our use. So I didn't feel that it was going to be difficult to obtain that.
additional funding. It's just the workload.

And part of it, too, Commissioner Yee, is there's quite a bit of workload that goes on behind the scenes in terms of coming up with that information and the expenditures and working with other agencies, so it does take time away from our staff on each of those efforts. And not only our staff, but our subcommittee as well, but I do feel that that's why I think it's crucial that when Commissioner Fornaciari and I put the, I guess, End of Redistricting Report together, we want to make sure that there's funding identified for the 2030 that will be sufficient for them to at least carry them on for the year versus what we received. It wasn't close to what we eventually needed.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. Yeah. Very good. And could you remind us, too -- I mean, since that's what we want to leave the 2030 -- how do we get our initial numbers? Did those come from 2010? For instance, I remember the litigation -- post-maps litigation budgeted allocation, which we ended up not using so far, thankfully -- but it was a great number. There was, like, plenty of money. I was like, oh, where did that number come from?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It does come from the legislature. It also comes from, I believe part of it is
the 2010 also had a report -- a year-end report that had some of the funding as well. So it's almost like a -- if you read some of the budget language, it'll say specifically, now, this amount of the budget that's been appropriated will be used for the following Commission. So there's portions of it -- like, for example, the COVID funding -- they specifically stated that that piece of additional funding that we received would not be part of the base for the 2030. But some of the other budget allocations will be used as a base. And I believe they also -- it's base plus cola, I think. Something like that. So it's kind of complicated.

COMMISSIONER YEE: So complicated. Thank you.

Okay. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to just say -- and I know that Director Kaplan has her hand up -- but earlier we were told that salaries were low, especially as we went down to some of the staff. And we had conversations back and forth about -- we're asking people to give us just six months or just twelve months or eighteen months, and really make sure that we get the quality -- we got amazing quality staff -- but I don't want us to walk away thinking that the budget was okay or that we had plenty of funding because there was always more that could've been done and we could've expanded our
outreach. We could've done all those pieces.

I also thought that there was a culture by staff of not wanting to spend money and that it was constantly difficult to say, hey, let's meet in person or that there was always this feeling of yeah, okay, but even asking for the report -- can we get printed versions of the report -- and well, it's online. And I really do recommend that we -- I think a recommendation is spend the money you need to get the work done as soon as you can and not to be afraid of going -- I don't know what the culture is in government around budgets and around how success is looked upon, but I really do feel that -- and I said earlier -- but that we did need to spend money earlier and hire people earlier to get things done.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

DIRECTOR KAPLAN: I guess one recommendation I would have in terms of the budget is really looking at an increase in the dollars for just overall promotion of the effort. I think obviously we weren't able to do the outreach contracts, but even the public awareness campaign that was done through media -- even with the ethnic media contract that we have, for example, it was just a hundred thousand that really had a broad reach.

But really if the goal is to engage all Californians in
this process, really looking at what is a realistic
figure that is going to at least allow for a touch to a
majority of Californians. And I think that there are
other state campaigns to look at and over the course of
the next ten years to also see what is a realistic budget
to really engage all Californians in the process? If you
are constrained with those dollars, how do you really
make this an effective process where you truly are
engaging all Californians in this process? And so I
think that's a big thing to also look at in terms of how
is 2030 funded to really ensure that this is a process
that is allowing for all Californians to participate and
to know about what's happening.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you. Down to our last
three minutes for this session, but we'll continue with
this topic after the break. Commissioner Fornaciari?

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah. A few things. I'll
try to make it quick. I just want to be clear that
Commissioner Fernandez and I are going in a dark room and
writing this report by ourselves, right? So we are
working with staff and you all will get a chance to
review it and approve it and provide plenty of feedback
before this goes forward. But it's a requirement that
the Commission write this report and give it to the
Department of Finance. Right? Or is it the legislature?
I don't remember who, but for next time. So we'll all have a chance to provide feedback and review.

And too, Director Kaplan, there's been a number of comments that we should've hired earlier, and I don't want that -- and I agree -- and I don't want that to sound like a criticism of you because I know you were doing everything you could do to keep your head above water. I mean, you were trying to do the job of your entire staff by yourself, and hire your staff. And so I just wanted to make sure you know we appreciate you and all the hard work. I just think that maybe there's something we can do to help the next Commission to be better prepared. Maybe we can have job postings written up or whatever -- to pull that trigger more quickly.

And then finally -- so I guess this is for Commissioner Fernandez -- isn't the pay scale for the jobs related to the job slot or whatever it is? And then, if that's the case, then should we consider recategorizing these jobs or something to make them more appealing? I don't know. I'm just throwing it out there as how do we be more effective?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Good timing. So first of all, I'll answer Commissioner Fornaciari's question. Yes, so the level of funding will be based on the duties
of the position and the responsibilities. And
definitely, if you'll recall, there's usually a wide
range. Again, our positions are exempt. And as I said
for outreach, I think next time those classifications
need to be even broader because you've got to do
everything. And definitely I would recommend that they
be at a higher level, which of course, would have a
higher funding associated with that. But yeah, I do
believe we can -- what we started out as initial duties
or responsibilities for the outreach kind of went out the
window after month one as they took on so many other
responsibilities. Commissioner Fornaciari?

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay. So I seem to recall
that when we started we inherited a certain number of
slots or whatever, then we added more and that took
months. So is it kind of -- I mean, is this something we
need to do and make sure is in -- at least a framework is
in place to help out -- to help them get started, or?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. So whatever we
established -- because we did establish quite a few
positions, including the -- what is it -- the deputy
executive director, as well as all of the outreach
positions -- so whatever we've -- it's my understanding
whatever we've established, this Commission will carry
forward to the next Commission. So if there's additional
positions, I'm not sure if we have the ability now to fill those or to establish those positions or maybe just make recommendations. But they should be starting with the base that we left with, which is additional positions than what we started with in 2020. So that was one piece of it.

The second piece of my response to -- I think it was Commissioner Sinay -- and you mentioned in terms of the budgeting around government. We could probably go back to our meetings in November, December, January where every meeting I said we need to hire. We have the funding for the outreach positions, and there was pushback from our executive director -- both executive directors, so I'm not going to give one a pass. And I'm not sure why there was pushback. We had funding. And that's something that should be Lessons Learned, is we need -- and I believe we even gave directive, but it wasn't followed through, so that's something maybe for us also.

Now that I'm thinking of like the -- I mean, think of how many times we've given directives or direction, but we never really tracked it all and nobody ever came back to make sure it was done. So I think at some point in time we need to have someone that's going to track all of this. And that's what -- I'm going to go back to my
school board -- that's what we started to have our
superintendent track, was any time any of us make a
request for anything -- be it transcripts, right,
Commissioner Kennedy -- transcripts or filling
positions -- it went on a spreadsheet and every single
meeting the executive director -- or the superintendent
needed to report on the status of each of those and they
remained on the list until it was completed. So
Commissioner Sinay, I'm going to say, we had the funding
for it. We continued to fight to get those positions
filled and get those part of it, too, but the
contracts -- it is lengthy.

But I will state that part of state government is
what we call salary savings, so if you don't fill your
positions, you've got savings, and we need to ensure that
future executive directors and administrators do not have
that mindset of keeping positions vacant so you can use
that funding for something else. No, we need those --
the reason we justified those positions is because we
need them now. We don't need them in four months or
playing catch up.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Right.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So the funding was there.

It's just sometimes you need to change the mentality
of -- we have funding, and if we require additional
funding, there's a mechanism for us to go forward to
request that funding.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: I just have to jump in.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I hope I -- I hope I
answered that.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: I have to jump in right now.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: We're late on our break.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Exactly.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: So 3:18. Thanks.
COMMISSIONER YEE: And we'll continue with finance.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Welcome back to the
Citizen's Redistricting Commissioner meeting. All is
right with the world. We got our five-minute call-out
from Kristian to warn us we had five minutes to go. So
seems like things are back to the old normal. So anyway,
back to Russell -- Commissioner Yee, sorry.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Chair. Okay, we
continue on the topic of finances, and thoughts on
budget, revision cycles, monitoring and reporting,
funding levels -- all of that. Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.
And this is perhaps more apropos of the next topic area,
but just to follow up on what Commissioner Fernandez was
describing, my sense where I would like to see things go is for us to have a full range of approved positions available to the 2030 Commission, and then they decide how they want to use them. If there are some that they don't want to use, then they don't use them, but certainly based on what Commissioner Fernandez was saying, it would be much better for the Commission to have positions available that they didn't need rather than not have the positions available that they do need. And again, going back to the fact that this Commission is very unique in terms of time boundedness and political sensitivity -- I think that that should be something that we should propose. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Let's see, maybe we should have Commissioner Fernandez reclarify that then. As I understood her, we can only carry over positions we have already established -- or that we established in the course of our work. We can recommend, but cannot now add new positions that we did not have, even if we think 2030 needs them. We can say, that's a great idea. Maybe you should establish with that, too, but we can't pre-establish that from our work.

Commissioner Fernandez, maybe you can clarify that?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I think what I said was I wasn't sure if we could. The issue after the fact, like
we're doing now, is we had to justify the positions that we did establish in terms of what the duties were because we were still in the process of creating the mapping process, right. So I don't know. I think I ended with, I'm not sure if we can establish new positions for future Commissions, but I would at least recommend if there are some positions -- like, for example, the deputy executive director position that we established -- that was a new position that our executive director had. But then once he vacated it, we never filled it.

So one, that position -- so any positions that you have, you could also reclassify. So like, the next Commission could decide we don't need this position, but we could reclassify it. Because the more difficult part is establishing a position. Once you have a position, it's easier to reclassify it, if that makes sense. So again, that's one position that we had and it was only filled for a few months because we had -- Commissioner Fornaciari and I -- we actually asked Executive Director Hernandez if he felt he needed to fill that position and at that point he felt he didn't have to. I mean, in hindsight I -- I mean, I kept pushing for him to fill it because I think there was a need for it, but there's only so much you can do.

But I think it would be very challenging at this
point to try to add any additional positions, especially because now we're downsizing, right. We're downsizing. Staff are being, I guess, laid off, if you want to say that. And I just think it would be challenging -- it would be difficult for us to explain why we need the position. And again, 2030 -- we may think that's a good position to have, but 2030 may think otherwise, so.

COMMISSIONER YEE: So let's say, a position mentioned earlier -- the idea of a training coordinator -- so we would just recommend that. Just put that in our Lessons Learned recommendations, but nothing further. It would be up to 2030 whether to pursue that.

Okay. Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. This is exactly what I was going to talk about. In terms of our staffing, I remember the tree that we were given. Like, well, here's a little tree of the staff. And I noticed right away that, boy, that tree has a missing branch. We didn't have anyone about data management. And what I kept on saying, look, we need tech people because that's -- they're dealing with all the technical aspects of our data, et cetera, et cetera. And I got this glazed over look because I understand now, after the fact, that tech for state means the computer repair guy or your computer programmer.
And that's not what we were talking about. And we ended up at the end, a lot of the -- as we've been calling it research, the data management, the people who came in and helped, basically, put our entire -- our tool together and then research it and went back and forth -- that ended up being a lot of the outreach people got shifted over to that. And I know we brought in several different people and we needed to establish that earlier.

And I know in terms of establishing positions, I'd really like us to have a list of who we ended up with that we really needed at the end. Like, we had the other -- well, the other poll -- we had all the different -- our data management people and people who actually put together our -- created our entire website and we all researched and went through over and over again. We have a list of those positions and then -- because those were needed -- and in terms of them we can actually classify that -- because that was never on our original tree and they were vital to getting everything done as we completed everything. So I don't want -- I don't want that to get lost.

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

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee. I wanted to follow up and say, yes, I understand it might
be difficult. Yes, I understand that this might not be the best time for it. Maybe we think of doing it in 2027 or 2028. I really think that it would be enormously helpful to the 2030 Commission if we did go through an exercise to establish more positions. I think between us, given all of our experience this time around, including staff experience -- we can come up with descriptions and justifications and then it's up to the 2030 Commission as to whether they fill them or not.

But we need to -- we need to do the hard work to convince the legislature, Department of Finance, whoever else is necessary to convince -- that the 2030 Commission isn't going to have the luxury of time that we had. When they need staff, they're going to need to bring people on as quickly as possible and not be stuck trying to push the stone up the hill to get a position established that we could've gotten established before they take on this. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

Commissioner Fornaciari.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yeah. I just wanted to follow up with Commissioner Fernandez. So you said it's easier to reclassify a position than to establish a position. So we have four positions that were field -- something field -- like the lowest level of field --
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Field support?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Field staff -- field, yeah. So conceivably, we could have those positions reclassified at a higher level with -- so would we need to be writing job descriptions that would support that, or -- I mean, could we conceivably do that, I guess? To leave behind?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I'll just go ahead and answer yes, so we can --

COMMISSIONER YEE: Sure. Go ahead, please.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. Normally, what would happen is you have a copy of the prior duty statement and you'd have one of your proposed duty statement that would have the higher duties or responsibilities for that position as justification for why it needs to be -- we call it upgraded. So we could do that ahead of time. And I was just going to --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And it has to go through some process to get approved outside of the Commission? Or the Commission can do it themselves?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. There is California Human Resources Department that oversees all of those reclassifications, I believe. If not, maybe DGS, but it wouldn't just be us. It would have to go forward. When I was at Corrections, we'd have to go to the Department
of Finance and they would be -- they would be the ones to approve it. Again, for future if there's also delegated authority for HR where, with corrections, we could upgrade or downgrade to a certain amount. I don't believe we have the delegated authority as a Commission.

And second thing, I just wanted to respond to Commissioner Andersen in terms of a listing of positions. I think it's important to have a listing of authorized positions and then also a listing of contractors. Because, again, the IT -- those were contracted positions. So I think that's really important to differentiate between both, because, as Commissioner Kennedy mentioned, we may want to see if maybe some of those contracted positions, we want to make them established positions. I hope that wasn't too confusing. But we'll put that down on a to-do list. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, yes. Please, do.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you for that. Following up on that, I'd also like -- and it probably doesn't even need to be said -- but in talking to our staff in terms of what positions they had but what they wished they really could've had is -- and either people did everything and forever and it would've -- if they said, yeah, ideally, we would've had three people this
level, this task, and not have to switch everybody over. So I'd really appreciate that, and I really appreciate the staff giving all the time they did and all of the input they might be able to give us.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen. Any other thoughts on finance? Wow. We're just bombing along here.

Commissioner Kennedy, shall we move on to admin finance? And if so, please take it away.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Very good. Okay. So under this we're looking to discuss financial, organizational and personnel policies and reporting, financial controls, contracting, recruitment, procurement, the org chart, our public comment policy, computers, cell phones, cyber security, office space, any other policies, any other admin and finance issues. So as I said earlier, this is largely more internal-looking whereas the previous topic was more external-looking. Again, anything that falls under admin finance, policies, those sorts of things, those are now fair game at this point in the process.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy. I'm interested in hearing from the Admin and Finance Subcommittee just how it was kind of generally, the workload. Should there have been more than one
committee for this range of tasks? How did it go and what might have made it better?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee. Commissioner Fernandez, Commissioner Fornaciari, would you like to respond?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Or do you want some time?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Let me think. At times it did seem to be a bit overwhelming because it was just different phases. Like, at some points it was policies, right, that took a lot of our time. At some points, it was the budget side of it. And then at some point, it was the staffing in terms of reviewing applications and resumes and all of that information, but I don't -- I mean, for me I thought it was okay. Again, it just depended on when those busy times were.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Fornaciari, anything to add on that?

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Yes. Scope creep. Big time scope creep in the job. We signed up to monitor the budget, and next thing you know we're reviewing resumes. Well, everything rolled downhill to us. And so I -- I mean, I think that just a clear set of expectations for the rule would be good. I mean, it was fine. We didn't mind doing it, and at times it was a lot of work and
other times it wasn't. It was just -- the hardest part
was the whole budget thing and just trying to get it
going and figured out.

      And I know it's on everybody's mind -- it's on my
mind, too -- there should've been way more reporting.
But we just didn't have the information to report. And
it can't be like that. And then later it got so busy we
slipped. Whatever, we have enough money, we're not going
to worry about that for three months. But I mean,
there's got to be better mechanisms for getting the
information that's needed for reporting. It was a bit of
a challenge to kind of help the staff see what the
Commission needed -- what information the Commission
needed -- and that was a big challenge for a while.

      And so I think part of what Commissioner Fernandez
and I would like to do is sort of leave behind in Lessons
Learned kind of a framework of what the reporting should
look like and how often it should be and that kind of
thing. And certainly, of course, feedback from everyone
else. But it was frustrating at times just to not be
able to even get the information we needed to know where
things stood.

      COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right. Thank you. I'll come
back to you on anything else.

      At this point, Commissioner Turner?
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. So the budgeting and the reporting. What I wanted to say about that is, because of how we had to be set up with the subcommittees, I think that for me there was almost a reduction of ownership and may be true for some of the other subcommittees as well. But because of the lack of reporting, the long time before we would see any adjustment, it almost felt unreal -- to really feel like I had an fiduciary responsibility over the budget and the numbers. Because, not being a part of the subcommittee, not getting regular feedback, everything being delayed, not seeing an actual this was an expense -- this was the budget -- this was an expense, this is what's left -- not seeing that in a timely manner, that not being made available on a regular basis -- we just kind of stepped back from it after a while.

And so that to me the whole process needs to be tightened. I don't know what part of it had to do with the way the government cycles and how long it takes things. And I know that was a big part of it. And between our subcommittee trying to getting information, and Raul when he was trying to get information, and then Alvaro, and waiting on things to come -- after a while it was like, okay, spend the money, do what we got to do and wherever it falls, it falls. It just seemed like it lost
its importance. And we're talking about something of huge importance -- money, budget, right? And so for me that whole process -- I felt a little bit removed from in comparison to everything else that we had to get accomplished.

And then I want to skip to the cell phones and computers. Oh my. Yeah. In retrospect, again, I'm not certain this supposedly powerful old machine that we have -- it just felt, I don't know about the -- it seems like -- yeah -- cell phones. I don't know that we need cell phones. I don't know. I know there has to be a separation or something, but all of that seemed like a lot of added and extra expense that makes me really wonder, is there a different way to separate Commission cell phones from our cell phones and be able to contact. That just seemed like that it was extra.

The office space, admin finance -- I don't know if it's here and I did not see it anywhere else, but when it got to those centers where we spent money on that I think they were underutilized -- I would want to -- from a finance standpoint -- really take a look to see the benefit of continuing to have those access centers. And if it yielded some result, yes, but for the money that was spent to set it up and keep it running I just would want to know if there, indeed, was the payoff or the
benefit that we'd like to see. Oh, I'll come back for
some of the other parts -- that's at the top of my mind
now.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you,
Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. I just want to
respond briefly to Commissioner Turner. In terms of the
access center, that was a statewide database cost. They
were the ones that filled them, so it is their cost. But
again, that's a good question to ask them. I think they
should be a part of our Lessons Learned as well, because
there's some issues there. And I did want to go through
the admin piece of it. In terms of the policies, my
recommendation Lessons Learned would be to -- for the
2030 Commission -- is to do those as soon as possible. I
think Commissioner Fornaciari and I -- we kind of did a
couple along the way, kind of as needed. But let's not
wait until we need them. Let's establish those -- I
would recommend that the 2030 establish those policies as
soon as possible so that they are all operating under the
same -- with the same information.

In terms of contracting and procurement, we already
talked about that in terms of wanting to be exempt from
the state requirements. But again, that does not mean
that every single contract and purchase would be exempt. We wouldn't go through the process. It just means -- like, for example, at the end -- towards the end when we figured out that we couldn't use -- we couldn't issue grant funds and we wanted to have some media spots -- it took a long time to be able to finalize those contracts versus being able to initiate them pretty quickly, would've been much more effective for our outreach efforts.

In terms of recruitment, that's what I was leaning towards early on in terms of having the state auditor remain as a support to help with the recruitment process. And what I mean with that -- what I mean by that is posting the information and gathering the applications, not necessarily going through the applications, but at least doing that piece of it to get that ball rolling.

In terms of cell phone and computers, my recommendation is to buy a newer smart phone, not a cheap -- I mean, it felt like for both, it was a waste of money in terms of what was initially purchased for the Commissioners and it should be more something that's updated cell phone. And also computer -- one that's going to be able to have the bandwidth of having the line drawing program on our computers. And that should be what's purchased from the beginning instead of purchasing
it twice.

And in terms of office space, the governor is supposed to provide the office space for the Commission so we don't have expenditures associated with that, which is a great thing. And Commissioner Turner, I hear you about the budget. To be honest with you, I'm not comfortable with the information that we have right now that Commissioner Fornaciari and I -- that was shared with us yesterday in terms of what the projected expenditures and what we've been receiving. And needless to say, that's been the most frustrating piece of the Finance and Administrative Subcommittee has been the budget piece of it. Because we should have a better handle on it and we don't, which is very concerning to me. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

DIRECTOR KAPLAN: I just wanted to raise office space. I know we're in a remote world, but there was a need for office space in L.A. There was a lot of evening meetings and weekends where it was hard. and I had put in requests internally and that didn't really pan out. And I think if there is going to be an outreach infrastructure like 2020 had for 2030 to explore, just
some satellite offices or temporary space that can be used. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Director Kaplan. As far as policies, I mean -- and this goes back to, I think, something that I said earlier -- to me, policies should make the transition from one set of Commissioners to another. I think maybe we need to look at the California Citizens Redistricting Commission in a couple of different ways. One is looking at it as an institution separate from the other way, which was looking at it as a body of fourteen people plus its staff, recognizing that yes, we downsize, we go dormant, whatever.

But even on things like delegated authority -- I think I was speaking with Raul or Director Claypool at one point about some of these things -- we need to find a way to retain them between one group of Commissioners and another group of Commissioners. In other words, we need to -- we need to have a what we might call a legal personality that is always in existence whether or not there are fourteen people on staff actively working. That the California Citizens Redistricting Commission writ large should always exist, should always have certain authorities, et cetera, that may not be exercised at certain points in time, but to avoid having to go
through the entire process of reinventing the wheel every
single time. It's a waste of time; it's a waste of
taxpayer's money, and it really causes enormous harm to
the process. It takes up way too much time. So I think
we need to be looking creatively at ways to maintain the
legal personality of the California Citizens
Redistricting Commission independent of the fourteen
individuals who are sitting on the Commission. With
that, I'll call on Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you. I'm going
to talk a little bit about the contracting from two
perspectives -- what we had to buy, like the cell phones
and computers. Now, my understanding was actually the
original stuff we got -- that was actually just part
of -- was essentially loaned to us. It doesn't belong to
us. We got it and then returned it. And then that was
going to be reused by other people in the state
government. But then in terms of what we ended up
buying, the whole idea with the computers we have right
now is they do have the capacity to run the full mapping
software, which is why they are -- they're a little
bit -- they're a bigger screen but a little heavier. And
then it was like, yeah, but we don't want you to do that.
So there was kind of a miscue on that.

Then the actual, though, what I want to get into
more in that part is the contracting we had to do to get all our consultants and things on board. We were really -- there needs to be some sort of training on the whole process and what's involved in that. You remember when we had to go through the RFPs and RFQs back and forth -- what's a one, what's a two? And that sort of thing. And then I'm just going to give you a quick -- when Sara and I were putting together the line drawing one, we actually spoke with a whole bunch of different line drawers who opposed each other -- and from other states -- about what do you think we should put in there? What should we not put in there? And we used that information to tailor the -- there's kind of the basic portion that the auditors wrote, and then we modified it -- a lot of that.

So we could get the data management part -- the whole computing and how they're helping us back on the maps. Things like that that we tailored. So I want to give that to the 2030 Commission, knowing full well that they'll have to redo this because of technology changes and the practice changes. I think I've mentioned that the live line drawing people said, what are you doing? But that was the way to do that in open session. There will be other ways to do that in 2030. And each of our -- we're talking about writing job descriptions and
writing some of these contracts to go ahead for the 2030.
I want us to do that, and then kind of also have a
document to go with them to say, these are things that
you need to do to update it. Because that would've been
extremely helpful from our perspective. And again, I say
what about the time frame -- I think we have down here --
our org charts with the time frame of it all -- that's
something we need to do with contracting. This is when
you need to have this because here's the lead time
involved. Because some of these -- some of these things
that we really do want to do open process, because it
is -- to make sure that the entire California knows what
we're doing, and it's open and transparent. So that is
why you do these certain -- the bids and that sort of
stuff. I think it's very important, but it takes a lot
of time. So thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner
Andersen. Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Not sure if this is where to
talk about it or not, but at some point I would like us
to discuss the pros and the cons of outreach, making the
grants versus how we did spend the money. Because we've
never really stopped to analyze -- okay, did it make
sense to spend that money doing bus stops and all that.
We just keep saying, okay, let's make sure that we make
sure that we have the -- we have both in the budget. But we haven't really stopped to ask the question of what would be the most effective way. And if it would be -- and the reason I thought about as for this area is we've said, okay, can we try to get the census the -- get the same criteria that the census has where they can make grants and this and that. That's fine, but I would like to leave in the recommendations what are the pros -- what are the strengths and the weaknesses of making grants to community groups, and what are the strengths and weaknesses of purchasing -- of buying ads and buying media? I think that's what it's called -- buying media -- and we were just so busy we haven't had time to have that conversation.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. Thanks for that. That would be under the outreach topic which is currently set for Saturday. Given that we're running ahead right now, we might get to it Friday afternoon, but I'm anticipating that that will be quite an extended discussion. We've got a lot to talk about, strengths and weaknesses, innovations and recommendations. So we're looking forward to that discussion either Friday afternoon or Saturday. Welcome back, Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen?
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Just one sort of overarching thing about policies and procedures, set down how we do things -- a much older fellow than I was when I was young gave me very good advice about watch out what rules you set because those will hang you. And it's very true. If we make very rigid -- we're going to do things like this and this and this, and then it turns out that's really not the best way to do it, then you have a problem. So I'd like us to be -- keep in mind the areas where we can be very specific and where we need to have a general -- this is the idea of what we're trying to do without saying, and you shall do A, B, C, D -- but more of a general -- this is the intent. That is the reason behind what we want to do. This is the direction that we'd like to go without spelling out exactly every single thing every step of the way. Sometimes you need to, but let's keep that in mind. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: No?

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: I think in response to that, the --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: -- I mean, with regard to
the policy manual, for instance, I mean, I agree with Commissioner Kennedy. In my mind, that's the policy of the Commission at this point, and when the new Commission comes on board, it's their policy, but they're free to change it in any way they want. And what we're, I think what we're -- in my mind what we're trying to do here with this Lessons Learned is give some guidance, some roadmaps, some strong suggestions on how they might do things, some other words of wisdom. But it's completely up to the next Commission.

And now that -- oh, org chart. I don't even know if we have an updated org chart. I don't even know where it would be, but I think we need to -- I think we need to make sure we get one and kind of look at what that looks like and what the jobs are that go with the -- the job structure and all that and think about how we might think of making some changes. So I guess we could bug Alvaro tomorrow or maybe Marcy knows what it is. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. That would be perfect to make sure that we have that between now and tomorrow. We can continue this discussion tomorrow. We're not going to close it out right now when we get to 4 o'clock and public comment.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you. Yes, I'm glancing at
the current policy manual. And so as I understand it --
so this wouldn't actually be binding -- would not be
binding on 2030 unless they decided to adopt it. But I
mean, it's up to them whether to adopt it or not or to
adopt parts of it or whatever. Noticing we had a policy
on annual reviews for all employees and then sometimes
when that came up, we thought that was a good idea and
other times we thought, actually, it was a waste of time.
So probably, I don't know, maybe 2030 can just figure
that out for themselves, but we seemed to have some
difference of opinion when it actually came to doing
that. One report item just came to mind. We never saw
any report on Commissioner per diems. I don't know if I
actually want to see that or not, but that would
certainly be an area of oversight we probably should
exercise at some point. I just wanted to mention that.
Thanks.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. On what Commissioner
Fornaciari was saying about the org chart and updating
it -- I also think it would be really handy to give them
an updated Gantt chart of really laying everything out
when -- it's going to be interesting for our own sake for
comparison of what we thought and then what we ended up
doing. I think it will be very illuminating, to say the least.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: That is the plan. Thank you for the reminder, Commissioner Andersen. When we sunsetted the Gantt Chart Subcommittee, I said that that would be subsumed under Lessons Learned. So it will be part of the report.

Commissioner Sinay, did you have something? No?

Okay.

Just before we go to public comment and taking off on Commissioner Yee's comment about not seeing a report on per diems, I would have to say that I was frustrated throughout with the level of reporting in general. I mean, when I've managed staff in the past, including field offices and so forth, I basically said I need a report every week. Here are the topics to report on, and just give us an update on each of these topics. And it's an update, and I felt a lot of times that we were getting reports on accomplishments but not all of the work that was going into achieving those things on a day to day or week to week basis.

I think we all agreed early on that we didn't want to reach in and micromanage, but at the same time -- and this, I think, it goes back to, I believe it was Commissioner Turner's point -- maybe Commissioner
Sinay -- if something was assigned to the executive
director and the executive director never reported back
on it, we lost sight of it. And I'm just accustomed to
managing with a much higher level of reporting on a
routine basis, understanding that those reports can be
good news; they could be bad news; they can be we tried,
but it wasn't possible, whatever. I've spoken with
Director Kaplan about this. I feel like there's an
enormous amount of work that the outreach staff did that
I at least, was never aware of.

I mean, in some ways I felt it, but I never saw or
heard the kind of reporting that would've given me a
clearer more comprehensive understanding of what was
going on in the background. And again, it's not that we
needed it in order to reach in and try to manage what was
going on in the background -- I just would've been
interested and probably excited to hear all of what was
going on in the background.

With that, we're at 4 o'clock. As I said, we will
resume tomorrow after the business meeting, still on this
admin and finance topic. So I would encourage everyone
to be thinking about this overnight if there are
additional topics that you want to bring up, additional
recommendations, strengths and weaknesses, whatever it
may be. We will come back to this topic tomorrow after
the business meeting and then, since we are ahead of
schedule on this, I would propose that we continue
tomorrow after we close out this topic, that we will go
ahead and continue with legal and then agenda setting,
internal communications and subcommittees. So with that,
I turn it over -- back over to Commissioner Fornaciari.
Thanks, everyone.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thank you, Commissioner
Kennedy and Commissioner Yee, for facilitating this
discussion. I think it's been really, really fruitful,
and we've learned a lot. Kristian, I don't know if you
or Katy are going to call for general public comment,
please.

MR. MANOFF: Katy's here to help us with that today,
Chair.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: The MVP of the whole
redistricting Commission, Katy. Yeah, go ahead, Katy.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you so much, Chair.

In order to maximize transparency and public
participation in our process, the Commissioners will be
taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the
telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is
(877) 853-5247. When prompted to enter the meeting ID
number provided on the livestream feed, it is
85298300771, for this meeting. When prompted to enter a
participant ID, simply press the pound key. Once you have dialed in, you will be placed in a queue.

To indicate you wish to comment, please press star nine. This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it is your turn to speak, you will hear a message that says, the host would like you to talk, and to press star six to speak. If you would like to give your name, please state and spell it for the record. You are not required to provide your name to give public comment. Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your call. Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when it is your turn to speak, and again, please turn down the livestream volume. And Chair, we do not have anyone in the queue at this time.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Okay, thanks. Yeah. Just let me know when the livestream's done.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Will do.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thank you. In the interim -- let's see. So tomorrow, we will begin with a business meeting in the morning, and that is -- who knows how long it's going to go exactly, but when we're done with that, we will take up the Lessons Learned exercise again. We are a bit ahead of schedule, and we may continue to be ahead of schedule. We do our best to
inform the public of the time when we're going to talk about certain topics, but I think we're being super-efficient with this. And so we're a little bit ahead. So we will do our best to keep on track here. And I don't know if there are any other announcements we need to make at this point.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Chair, the instructions are complete, and we do not have anyone in the queue.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: Thanks, Katy.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: You're welcome.

VICE CHAIR FORNACIARI: All right. Is there anything anyone else has at this point? All right. Well, I will recess the meeting at this point, and we'll see you all tomorrow at 9:30. Thanks.

(Whereupon, the CRC Business Meeting/Lessons Learned meeting adjourned at 4:05 p.m.)
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