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CHAIR LE MONS: Good morning, Commissioners. Good morning, California. Welcome to the Citizens Redistricting Commission meeting on this Tuesday, December 22nd. I'd like to do our roll call. Wanda?

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Taylor?

VICE CHAIR TAYLOR: Present.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Toledo?

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Vazquez?

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Fernandez?
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: And Commissioner Le Mons?

CHAIR LE MONS: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Do we have a quorum?

MS. SHEFFIELD: Yes.

CHAIR LE MONS: Great. Thank you so much. So we're going to move into our opening public comment. I'd like to remind you that this public comment is open for any topic that you'd like to talk about. We'd like to start our meeting with hearing from the public.

We are going to have a pretty substantive conversation regarding line drawing. So I ask if you would reserve those comments, if you will, to after agenda item 4. We will be talking about that and opening the floor again for public comment at that time.

So we'll have our opening public comment, then we'll move into general announcements and Commission updates. Then we'll have our executive director's report, which we will be hearing from our executive director, our deputy executive director, and we will be having discussion on
the line drawer.

And then we will move into our interagency -- no, I'm sorry, our interagency agreements, item number 5, is actually going to be tabled for our future meeting. And then we'll move into our data management.

Item number 6, we have a chair rotation schedule.

Item number 7, I'm going to move up the discussion about future meeting items and agendas to just above closed session. We will be going into a closed session today to handle some personnel matters.

We will come back after that closed session, report out. We will then have closing public comment, and that'll be the conclusion of our business day today.

So at this time, I'd like to go to Peter. If you could open the line for public comments.

MR. MANOFF: That'll be Katy will be taking care of that for you today chair.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay, Katy.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Good morning. In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the Commission 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, it is provided on the
livestream feed; 91092377762 for this week's meeting.

When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press the pound key. Once you have dialed in, you'll be placed in a queue from which a moderator will begin unmuting callers to submit their comment.

You will also hear an automatic message to press star 9. Please do this to raise your hand indicating you wish to comment.

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

Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your call.

Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when it is your turn to speak. And again, please turn down the livestream volume. The Commission is taking general public comment at this time.

And we do have one person in the queue at this time.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Please invite them in, Katy.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: If you'll please state and spell your name for the court reporter.

You are live, if you could state and spell your name for the court reporter. There we go, if we could state
and spell your name for the court reporter.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Yes. Good morning. This is Lori, L-O-R-I, Shellenberger, S-H-E-L-L-E-N-B-E-R-G-E-R. And I'm the redistricting consultant for Common Cause. And good morning, everyone. Hopefully you're not hearing my voice in your sleep at this point. I know I call in a lot. I had two really quick comments.

The first is I won't go into the substance regarding the line drawer RFP, but I did want to flag that I sent an email on behalf of a few organizations who had reviewed it over the weekend and discussed it yesterday with some minor feedback.

And I just wanted to flag that and make sure it got to the Commissioners. I emailed that last night, and I will be on listening during your discussion and if it -- and as will, a few of the other folks who participate in that discussion. And so if you have questions during your discussion and you can flag for us, if you need us to call in. Otherwise, I won't call in regarding the substance. I think they're self-explanatory.

The second issue I just wanted to flag was a logistical one and one was to thank staff for getting emails out to the email list about upcoming meetings and the posting of the draft RFP and the RFIs for counsel.

I also wondered if it might be possible, because I
am starting to get inquiries from folks about upcoming meetings. And to the extent you can post the dates of upcoming meetings on the website before everyone breaks for the holidays, I think it would be helpful for folks who are trying to plan for next year.

And those are my comments and just want to wish you all happy holidays and thank you again for your incredible service to the people of California.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Ms. Shellenberger. And I want to confirm, yes, we did receive the email and thank you for those. Thanks to staff and thank you for your participation. We appreciate it.

Katy, any additional callers in the queue?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: No, Chair. That was it.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. We'll wait a minute and give people an opportunity and go from there.

(Pause)

CHAIR LE MONS: Katy, are there any callers in the queue?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: No.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. With that, we're going to move forward. I'd like to bring our attention to agenda item number 3, general announcements from Commissioners or updates, and from staff, any items of interest to Commission.
Does anyone have any announcements or updates they'd like to present? Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I would like to congratulate Commissioner Fernandez on officially being retired.

CHAIR LE MONS: Congratulations, Commissioner Fernandez. You look excited. I hear it's not all that's cracked up to be. We'll wait for details.

Any other announcements? Okay. Seeing no hands for further announcements or updates at this time, I'd like to move to the executive director's report, agenda item number four. Director Claypool.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Good morning, Commissioners, and happy holidays. This will be a brief report by me, but just on staffing, we continue to receive the interest in the positions that we posted. And we will be reviewing the two positions for budget and for an accounting position next week.

And we will be running all of this up through our finance and administration subcommittee. And also I will have a budget report for you in our next meeting that will encompass all of the expenditures through December.

Right now, I'd like to pass this over to Alvaro for his report on outreach.

MR. HERNANDEZ: Thank you, director. Good morning, Commissioners. This is week 2 for me, and it feels like
I've been here much longer than that, unfortunately.

I've been working my way in getting information to develop the strategic plan that I'll be running through the different committees. Hopefully, I have something by the next Commission meeting for you to take a look at. Also in regards to the language services, there was a question how long will it take? With the small business contract for the language services, it will take anywhere between three to four weeks to get that into place.

One of the things that has come up in regards to that is what languages we will be looking at. So we'll have to have a further discussion on that. Marcy Kaplan shared that the census group had the California top twelve languages that they focus on. So we'll have that conversation at a later time. But I just wanted to put it out there.

In regards to the grants recommendations, I'm working on that as well, to put together the information I've received from the subcommittee and as to the pros and cons of either farming it out or doing it in-house, and recommendations on what you should consider, at least. That's the extent of my report. Director?

MR. CLAYPOOL: So the only other item that needs to be discussed now is the line drawer -- coming up under my report, is the line drawer RFP, we sent it out for the
CHAIR LE MONS: Excuse me, I'm sorry to interrupt you, Direct Claypool. I just want to give Commissioners an opportunity to ask any questions before we dive into this piece.

If they have any questions about what was shared so far by either yourself or Deputy Executive Director Hernandez. Commissioners, do you have any questions?

Okay, with that, please continue, Director Claypool.

MR. CLAYPOOL: So coming up under my report is the line drawer RFP. We sent it out as you know, on Friday. We've received public comment that should have been distributed to all of you. And I'd just like to open it up to the Commission for questions or edits or reviews of that document.

CHAIR LE MONS: Have all the Commissioners had an opportunity to review the email that Ms. Shellenberger referenced? We did receive that. I see nods. Okay, wonderful.

MR. CLAYPOOL: What we could do, Chair, is we could go through that document very quickly just bullet by bullet if that is something you'd like to do, or?

CHAIR LE MONS: I'd like the subcommittee to guide the direction of this discussion. This has been something they've shepherded from the beginning. So I'll
defer to them in terms of how they'd like to handle the feedback and this discussion.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you, Chair Le Mons.

Commissioner Andersen, feel free to jump in at any point. You know, we've definitely taken our time putting this together. It's been in progress for many weeks now and we're very excited to have a draft to share with you all. We welcome all of your feedback.

I did receive the email from Ms. Shellenberger last night. I have kind of skimmed it, but I'll certainly spend more time later today going through it in detail. It looks like a number of great suggestions that have been raised and areas where things need to be clarified. So I certainly appreciate receiving all of that feedback and very much open to additional feedback.

Is it helpful for the Commission for us to go through the RFP? My sense is it's been posted, but you know, I don't know if, Jane, if you have anything you want to add to kind of this new draft.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: The only thing I thought, if we'd like, in Ms. Shellenberger's comments, there are a few items which we may want to talk about as a Commission. And there are a couple things we could just sort of almost kind of walk through that and then catch -- hit a few ideas just to confirm, this is what --
that this is indeed the Commission's ideas.

But other than that, unless if a Commissioner has some particular items that they'd like to talk about right away, I suggest we deal with those immediately. We don't have to walk through the entire document if people don't have many comments.

But we could indeed address Ms. Shellenberger's, which as I said, a couple of them are items that we probably want to bring to your attention anyway.

So with that, are there any questions from the Commissioners specifically that we could address right away?

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy. You're on mute.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I made the point last time and it hasn't been reflected. And I just want to go on record again and saying that in my mind, the footnote at the bottom of page 1 and the text that it relates to need to be flipped.

I mean, the Supreme Court of the State of California in its ruling said that we have until the 15th of December. Now, if you want to put a footnote saying that the original constitutional deadline was the 15th of August, that's fine, but the ruling of the Supreme Court says the Commission is directed to approve and certify
the final statewide maps with the Secretary of State by no later than December 15th 2021. That's pretty clear. So I just really believe that we need to make that clear in the RFP. Thanks.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That item did come up in Ms. Shellenberger's comment, in terms of making sure that it is indeed obvious to the line drawer that there is indeed the possibility that you might -- this might -- work might get delayed all the way through that date.

So a reworking of how exactly that's written to make sure that encompasses that very real possibility, given the time line of when the census data gets there, that is certainly something we could just slightly rewrite. And I think that was a good point. Ms. Shellenberger brings it up when we have anticipated time for meetings to make sure that that gets modified. That it's obvious that it could go that late. So thank you, Commissioner Kennedy. I think that is something that we should slightly modify.

CHAIR LE MONS: So I have a question for Commissioner Kennedy. Commissioner Kennedy, do you feel like what Commissioner Andersen has put forward is representative of your perspective on this?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: My objection is really to that last sentence of item I(A)(3), where it says "completed district maps and the accompanying reports
must be submitted to the California Secretary of State's office no later than August 15".

You know, I think that needs to read no later than December 15 2021. And then if you want to footnote and say, this was based on the California Supreme Court ruling extending the deadline from the original constitutional deadline of August 15 and that, you know, depending on when the Commission receives the data, the Commission is encouraged to expedite the process. But I think we need to reflect the Supreme Court ruling.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. See, I think Commissioner Kennedy is saying something a little bit different. I just want to remind the Commissioners that we've had a pretty robust discussion about the deadline and we as a Commission have already agreed that August will be our deadline.

So I do think that there should be some kind of footnote that says that is the decision of the Commission and if we want to reference the meeting in which we made that decision, we should do that. And we can also add the statement that the Supreme Court issued.

So it sounds like that could clear this up where we have agreed as a Commission on a deadline date, which should be reflected. The point about the potential extension will also be necessary because it may get
extended, which we've also agreed in choosing the August
date that we were willing to extend based upon when we
get the data, and what the Supreme Court ruled.

So those three key pieces of information will be
included in the footnote. And then hopefully that
addresses all the concerns and respects the decision that
the Commission made previously in choosing the deadline
date. Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, again, I go back to the
"must be submitted no later than August 15th". That is
the first thing that needs to be changed and the footnote
can be changed to reflect everything else that you've
mentioned. But I think the number one thing is to change
the body text.

CHAIR LE MONS: And you're saying that that should
be changed to December -- to the December date? Is that
what you're saying, Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Not necessarily.

CHAIR LE MONS: Or are you concerned about the word
"must" or are you concerned about the date?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, it's the "must". If
we're going to say must, the must is December 15th. You
know, we can reference our decision.

CHAIR LE MONS: I understand.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: We can reference our decision
to stick with the original timeline and the fact that it may be extended at the Commission's discretion. But the Supreme Court ruling is clear in my mind.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Commissioner Sadhwani, I know you had your hand up.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I would just say -- thank you, Commissioner Kennedy. I don't have a problem removing the "must". I understand that this is most certainly a point of contention for some, certainly as well as the public.

My understanding from our previous conversations was that we were, as a Commission utilizing August 15th as our working deadline. And when we know if the census data -- I mean, it's highly likely that the census data will be late, but we don't know that for sure yet.

So as of right now, we have prepared this based on that August 15th. I can -- I certainly understand, you know, removing the word "must". But if you look down later on page 15 of the document, you'll also see that we have anticipated time frames including public hearings and mid-July to early August being the preparation of final maps for August 15th as our deadline.

There, we added an asterisk just reminding them that this is, again, this is an anticipated time frame and that it may change. So I don't have a problem removing
"must" but my understanding is that we already had this conversation as a Commission that August 15th was our working deadline. And that's what we were using.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: So let's say, the Commission intends to submit maps by August 15th, but I don't think we can say "must" because we are not required to submit them by August 15.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And I'm fine removing "must".

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Turner. Okay, Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I believe we have enough information to rearrange a little bit like the original deadline, the Commissioners' intent, and reference the Supreme Court deadlines.

We just need to rearrange those two items and make sure it's consistent all the way through, which evidently one portion in the far end of the report, it's a little vague.

So we need to -- that's what Ms. Shellenberger was referring to. So I think I have enough information there to make the slight modifications.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Do Commissioners feel like we need to have our counsel look at our closing -- whatever
language we come up with there, or not necessary?
Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That's already -- anything that we modify or change, it does go through our legal counsel.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.
Okay. So it sounds like this was one of the key points. Going back to the plan, it sounds like Commissioner Andersen recommended first asking Commissioners if they had any specific things that they wanted to address.

We began with the one that Commissioner Kennedy raised. I'm going to ask for additional comments or concerns that Commissioners have, at which point we'll turn it back over to Director Claypool to hit the highlights of the public comment that we received in writing, and Commissioner Andersen as well, who has identified, there are key things that she feels the Commissioners should weigh in on. So with that plan, Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I'm happy to defer, if someone else has another issue.

CHAIR LE MONS: It's all yours, Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. Page 3 under "Geographic Database for Redistricting". That first
paragraph, "Redistricting Database", I don't understand
the purpose of the first sentence. I mean, it seems to
me that the purpose of that paragraph is to say the 2020
census data used shall be that of the California
Statewide Database located at the University of
California Berkeley School of Law. So I would propose to
eliminate the first sentence under "Redistricting
Database".

CHAIR LE MONS: Does any members of the subcommittee
or staff have an explanation to Commissioner Kennedy on
his point?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: We did discuss this and it
was not quite clear. I think we are looking for a little
bit more information about the certified population data.
I think that might be a particular title, and we did not
have an answer to that yet. I believe that's either, if
counsel could look into that one and or just do a quick
check with Ms. Mac Donald.

CHAIR LE MONS: Director Claypool?

MR. CLAYPOOL: And I would just ask our counsel,
didn't we use "certified 2020 U.S. census data", because
that is in fact what will come from the U.S. Census
Bureau, is a certified copy?

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes, that's correct. And the only
caveat of why we made it that the Commission can adjust
it is in case the data that is certified excludes undocumented immigrants, in which case we believe that under California law, those have to be added back in. So it would not be actually using the certified. It would be certified as modified.

CHAIR LE MONS: And Commissioner Kennedy, does that handle your clarification?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I guess I'm wondering if what we're going to end up with, in any and every case, isn't in fact the data from the Statewide Database. And if that's the case, I'm not understanding why we need that previous sentence. It seems to raise the possibility that we might not use the data from the Statewide Database. That first sentence seems to raise that possibility.

CHAIR LE MONS: Director Claypool?

MR. CLAYPOOL: So it's my understanding that there may be a clash -- and again, I'm going to defer to our attorneys, but there may be a clash between the census data as it's presented to the State of California and the requirements of the State of California with regards to the information that they can use. And I'd just ask Kary, is that how you understand it, that there could be a difference between the two?

MS. MARSHALL: Yes.
CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, I'm still on mute.

Sorry, not on mute. Also the idea here is the rest of
the sentence is required because there's the population
data and we also need particular subgroups of it.

So now all of this data is at the Statewide
Database. That's where it's supposed to get it. But
what particular things we're looking for are the whole
piece of the data, and then the population subgroups.

And because there's a little bit of things you don't
necessarily have to use. Basically, we want to make sure
that they're using the part that's at the Statewide
Database that we want. So that was where we were talking
about the redistricting database. I mean, you --

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- we do say it again,
you're right, in terms of the next of "Data
Requirements".

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. So staff, you'll work with
counsel to consider Commissioner Kennedy's point and the
feedback that's been given, and explanation of that point
to make sure that it is clear for the intent of the
Commission? Thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just had a quick question
for Commissioner Sadhwani. You mentioned that you
reviewed the public comments from Ms. Shellenberger. Did
you say you were making changes based on that because I
had a couple questions that also were in that public
comment, so I didn't know if I needed to go through that
or if they're already being taken into consideration.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I've only had a chance to
review that in brief. So we will -- I will take a closer
look at all of those. You are welcome to raise any or
highlight any key points, of course.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Thank you, actually,
Commissioner Fernandez; that is some of the items that I
thought we should talk about because some of the items
she mentions here are our Commission items that we could
indeed -- that's up to the Commission to decide. So if
you want to bring any of those up now, please do.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. I just had a couple
of them. She talked about, or that item was on page 2,
when you talk about the page length, it was two to five
pages. And I also felt that that might be a little
restrictive. You might want to increase that.

And then the other one was -- I'm looking really
quick. Oh, on page 6, j, where you talk about "any
request for a written or verbal report must be responded
to within twenty-four hours". I thought that that might be restrictive. I would want at least a reply and an estimate as to when they can get that report, because it really does depend on what kind of report we're requesting.

I don't know if twenty-four hours would be possible for some reports that we may need. And at this point, of course, I don't know which reports we're going to need, but just in case, especially if you need a whole new redo of the explanations of the draft maps.

And just a minor thing, just throughout the whole document, we reference COI sometimes as community of interest, sometimes communities of interest, sometimes it's COI, sometimes it's COIs, sometimes it's COI's, so if we could just be consistent, that'd be great.

But thank you so much. I mean, just very good document. I know you put a lot of time into it, so I appreciate it. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Director Claypool?

MR. CLAYPOOL: Commissioner Fernandez, could you tell me again the first point you made? I didn't get it. I came in on 6, j, and twenty-four hours.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, it had to do with the page length.
MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Is that the one?

MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: On page 2, it's the second or third paragraph. It's just saying the page length of the proposal.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It's actually the plan, and that's a couple places in there, so we will pick that up. Oh, however, if we do want to discuss that, because we said two to five, the Commissioners want four to six, or do they care?

CHAIR LE MONS: Does any Commissioner have a recommendation?

Commissioner Kennedy, then Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: If you're going to give a maximum, just give a single page -- number of pages rather than range; and certainly maximum of two to five, your maximum is five. So whatever it is. Whether it's five or ten, go with whatever that absolute maximum is.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fernandez, then Commissioner Turner. Oh, Commissioner Fernandez passes.

Commissioner Turner, then Director Claypool.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I think we heard that we may not receive, we're not expecting to receive a lot of
submissions online drawers. So I'm wondering if there is
a need to restrict it and put a number there.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen, then Director
Claypool.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: The reason why, it's to make
sure they realize that's not the proposal length, that's
only the approach plan or the plan length. It's just,
it's a small portion of the proposal. It's an important
part and it's what the -- basically the presentation is
based on, but it is not the proposal length. So that was
the idea why we put page numbers in there. So they'd
instantly go, oh, oh, I see. That is a portion of;
that's not the entire proposal.

CHAIR LE MONS: Director Claypool?

MR. CLAYPOOL: So Ms. Shellenberger's proposal was
to increase that to ten pages. And she makes a good
point. I don't think that we're going to have so many
line drawers that to extend it to ten pages is going to
be onerous in regards to going through that many
proposals. I would just think the Commission should
consider that as an absolute maximum and just make it ten
pages.

CHAIR LE MONS: Any objections, Commissioners?
Okay. Point resolved. Does other Commissioners have
items they want to lift up? Okay.
Director Claypool, from your assessment of the document, you wanted to point to a few things. Would you like to do that at this time?

MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes. So from the comments from Ms. Shellenberger, I'd like to go to table 1 and key action items. I'm not entirely certain where that is in the document. It must be -- there it is.

Key action item, so we're looking at page 10. And there has been the suggestion that we allow at least two to four weeks between the posting of the RFP and the deadline for submission.

So I think we need to consider the length of time that we want to have this out and allow proposals to come back. And I'll yield.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen, did you have a comment?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I did. I tried to move it up because as soon as this goes -- my idea was to try to move this up as quickly as possible.

And as soon as it goes to Office of Legal Services, I thought we could try to notify at that point all the line drawers to say, hey, here's our draft, this is what's out there, this is what we're trying to do.

So we could kind of give them the time frame and once it comes out of legal, then they have, like, a two-
week, a shortened period.

So rather than making it wait and wait and wait, because they already know here's the bulk of it. It'll get cleaned up somewhat. But to give them that time frame, again, just to move the whole thing forward, which is why I tried to move it forward, that deadline, rather than going four weeks afterwards.

CHAIR LE MONS: Is there a definitive recommendation on the length of time change that's being offered?

MR. CLAYPOOL: So and as I discussed with the subcommittee, typically this would go out for thirty days, which is a long time. But as Commissioner Andersen has explained, we're trying to bring this person aboard. I would at least want to split that difference. I would hope that we would go out for at least twenty-one days with this. It is true what Commissioner Andersen said that we can release our draft that's being inspected by the Office of Legal Services, and I don't think -- I don't think that there's going to be a great deal of change between what we see here. So they would be seeing part and parcel the primary document, but it takes a while for people to pull together this document and to consider all the different pieces that go into it. And I think twenty-one days is
where the -- kind of the minimum place that I would expect them to be comfortable.

CHAIR LE MONS: I see a lot of body language affirmation from the Commissioners. Is anyone not comfortable with twenty-one days?

Okay. Next point. Director Claypool?

MR. CLAYPOOL: I'm going through the notes I made. Okay. Let me see. I think that from here, I would just say that as we need to move back with the subcommittee and Raul and myself and just consider the assignments of the points for the proposal plans and so forth on the merit of what was given to us.

I don't see anything else here that I would bring up personally for consideration by the Commission.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Commissioners, any add feedback on this item?

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm sorry. I just missed it before when I talk -- page 6, when you talked about professional and collaboration, I didn't know if you wanted to refer to them adhering to the Commission's code of conduct. What you put in there is fine, but you may also want to refer to that.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Looks like that'll be added.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I just wanted to endorse Ms. Shellenberger's point regarding the scoring table and reducing the number of points assigned to presentation and bumping up the points for substance. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Subcommittee, could you please speak to that?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Sara, did you want to run with that? I'm trying to grab where it is.

CHAIR LE MONS: So while you're doing that, can -- oh, are you ready Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: What page Commissioner Kennedy were you looking in?


COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: 23.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I have it's 29 of the line drawing. I don't know how you got 26.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: And I have 23. Anyway, under evaluation criteria.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I want to say I support it too, so. And it's on 23, the chart's on 23 on my document too.

CHAIR LE MONS: You guys are making me nervous. Are you all looking at the same document?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That's exactly what I'm
concerned about.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. Are different from what's posted on each page from the page of the document.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, it says page 23 on the document, not on the PDF itself.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, thank you. Oh, so I'm sorry, can you walk through the points, because we did go back and forth on -- if everyone's looking at that, you know, there's -- you can see how it is -- in the document right now, it's "redistricting references". So that's all, their references is twenty. Their experience is fifteen. The proposer's, the plan and methodology is fifteen, presentation is twenty.

I think I already told you the cost has to stay at 30; you can't go below that. And Ms. Shellenberger is suggesting move the proposer's plan up to twenty-five and make the presentation ten. So what do people think about that?

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I would propose to bump those two that are fifteen each of them up to twenty and take those ten points that you used and reduce presentation to ten.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commission Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I just want to affirm that
I agree. I think she does bring up a good point in terms of we don't want a lot of flash and not substance. And so I think the renumbering of the priorities or the point assignments, I think will ensure that we get a good quality plan, not necessarily one that looks pretty.

CHAIR LE MONS: Any additional Commissioner feedback on this point?

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. I'm perfectly fine making these adjustments. I'll say, I think Commissioner Andersen, correct me if I'm wrong; when we were talking about presentation, we also thought that that allows us a little flexibility to make sure that we identify someone that we all feel like we can work with, right, through their presentation style.

I don't have any problem with the adjustments that have been recommended either by Ms. Shellenberger or Commissioner Kennedy. Either one would be perfectly fine with me.

But I do just want to acknowledge and kind of point to that at the end of the day, I think we want to make sure that we can identify someone that we all feel we can work with. This is someone who's going to be working very closely with us. So I do want to make sure that we can prioritize that, but I think that still can be the
CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay followed by Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair. I guess my only concern is then the high weight on cost. Because we have talked that cost is part of the equation, but all these other pieces are important.

And I think maybe is there another word we can use for presentation, presentation and engagement, or presentation and -- not charisma, but the whole relationship piece. It may be presentation and engagement, you know, how do they engage us in it? But I'm just worried that cost is a lot of points based on everything else.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. First off, I'm going to say that I think if -- Commissioner Sadhwani, if your intent was more about how we're going to work with the person, and if also presentation was a consideration, I would suggest that we make it split and be explicit about what it is that you want.

And if relationship or ability to work well with the Commission is a consideration, I think that should be explicitly said, and also then given a separate set of points versus just, you make a really nice presentation.
Like, it's pretty or something like that. And maybe I'm just overly simplifying what you intended on that.

The other thing is, I think what Commissioner Sinay said on the cost, perhaps for what you were thinking about, Commissioner Sadhwani, perhaps the ability to work well with the Commission could be a set of points that you take from the cost.

I would recommend that we don't go below the 20 points that we put to the redistricting references and the bump that we made to the plan and the qualifications. I think, at least the cost from a fiscal responsibility, we have to put that on par with some of these other things, but perhaps we could take ten points from it and put it towards I think part of what Commissioner Sadhwani was looking for in terms of the person's ability to work well with the team.

CHAIR LE MONS: According to Commissioner Andersen, the cost is fixed. It cannot go below thirty --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right.

CHAIR LE MONS: -- so we cannot subtract any points from cost. Is that correct, Commissioner Andersen and Sadhwani? Thank you. Director Claypool?

MR. CLAYPOOL: So I want to make sure that we're talking about the same thing across the board.

So this presentation we're talking about is the
physical presentation that will be scored when the person
does the interview, correct?

So these are interview -- this is an interview
scoring for the presentation that we receive, not
necessarily the presentation of the documents themselves,
but the presentation when the person's in the interview.
So I just want to make sure we are all talking about
that.

CHAIR LE MONS: Does that clarification help
anyone's position on that?

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I like the twenty percent
for the presentation, because I do want them to put some
effort in there and I do believe that it is important for
us to feel comfortable, and it goes a long way.

And in terms of the references, I know we're
allowing them to pick the references. So I always tend
to kind of not put as much weight on that because for the
most part, if I'm going to put a reference, I'm going to
put a reference that's going to give me a good reference.

So I would suggest maybe reducing that. I know that
goes contrary to Commissioner Akutagawa but I guess I've
just been on the hiring/interviewing side so often that
the references, they don't come into play as strongly as
you would hope they would only because they are being
selective in terms of who they're bringing forward.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sinay, did you have a
question?

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I would actually agree with
Commissioner Fernandez on the reference part and that
that could be a place where we could draw some additional
points for the others.

I will caution however, in terms of, again, going
back to people who make a good presentation, whether it's
their presentation of their plan, I think we still need
to be focused on is the plan good? And then do they make
a good presentation about it? I think that given what
we're trying to do, my concern would be to ensure that
there's a strong plan in place, not a strong communicator
who can make something sound good, but not actually
deliver on what it is that we want.

So I think that that's kind of where I'm coming from
on it, but I would be comfortable if you wanted to keep
it the same, but I think we should try to make sure that
the qualifications and the quality of the plan is bumped
up to at least be equal weight.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy, then

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: So then I would propose that
we modify it to be fifteen, twenty, twenty, fifteen. So references fifteen, qualifications and experience twenty, quality of plan and methodology twenty, presentation fifteen, and leaving cost at thirty.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fernandez, then Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm just a little concerned because Commissioner Kennedy is reading my thoughts. So I'm just going to put that out. It's the second time I'm going to just go ahead and agree with him, that's great.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I just want to clarify, is references, is that like, this team is great references type of references or is it reference projects that they've done in the past?

So in this case, a reference project would be an example of something they've done in the past that is equivalent or significant and how it came out and whether there was a lawsuit and all that stuff, right? Is that correct?

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: If we go back to page -- well, it's 14 on my document, so I guess the document itself would be called 11, qualifications and experience. It is as Commissioner Fornaciari just mentioned. It's,
you know, you have to show -- you have to have done this kind of redistricting. You have to have -- we need a list of all the projects in the last twenty years that you've done this on. And we need to have certain things identified in those projects; expert testimony in the last twenty years, what those involved?

Then the actual reference projects are three different projects with their information. And then that's the -- essentially to show us how complex the jobs are as well as the complexity, in which case we sort of defined it as dealing with not just size. Size is a very small component, actually. It's racial diversity; you know, how much really hard VRA items have you had to deal with, that sort of thing. And that's all in here.

So that is kind of a larger thing. The project personnel, I'm not quite sure if that's under -- yeah, so the redistricting references is a portion of the qualifications and experience. Right, the references itself, those we're talking about, are the three specific big projects and how complex they are. So the complexity issue is very important.

And then the other though -- yeah, so it is, that is very important. And then the qualifications though is very important because it says all the rest of everything, it includes all the resumes. And the resumes
have to say for each person involved, what have you done
with the VRA, what have you done with the geography,
essentially, what redistricting work have you actually
done?

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that Commissioner
Andersen. Commissioner Fornaciari, does that change the
proposal on the table from your point of view? Are you
recommending an alternative point distribution?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'm not. I just want to
make sure we were all clear on what that meant.

CHAIR LE MONS: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So those folks who are
proposing point distributions might consider that, but I
don't have a specific proposal.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Anyone who has made a point
distribution proposal, does this clarification alter what
we have on the table? Okay, anyone against the proposed
point proposal? Should we have some --

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Could you just clarify
exactly what it is?

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: So the proposal is
redistricting references fifteen points, and particularly
if we're considering three references, it's harder to
divide twenty by three than it is fifteen by three.

Qualifications and experience of management and lead
staff, twenty points. Quality of proposer's plan and
methodology, twenty points. Presentation, fifteen
points. Cost, thirty points. Total, one hundred points.

CHAIR LE MONS: Again, I see a lot of body language
affirmation. I don't know if that's intentional or
involuntary, but thank you. Any opposition?

Okay. I think that was the final point, but we'll
ask again, are there additional points that any
Commissioners or staff want to raise with regard to
feedback or anything that you've observed in your own
reading and review of the document? If not, we will move
to public comment at this --

Ah, Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'm sorry. I'm not really
fully understanding her point about regarding
confidentiality. And I don't know if counsel can clarify
that, if there's something about that that I'm just not
understanding.

CHAIR LE MONS: Could you say it out loud, please?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sure. It's the bullet
point that says -- regarding confidentiality. I guess
it's III(D) and it says to -- it urges us to err on the
side of transparency and it seems like documents that are
incorrectly labeled as confidential, and that the proposer will have the option to withdraw such documents and have them removed from consideration if proposer disagrees.

I'm not quite sure what they mean by that. And that may be some kind of legal thing. I don't know.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So if you read through the statement of work, there's a section in there that talks about confidentiality, and the proposer can claim documents are confidential, and those won't be released. The rest of the proposal will be released. I think what she's saying here is if the Commission believes that those documents should not be confidential, they can disagree with the proposer and then the proposer would have the option to either withdraw those documents or allow them to be released publicly.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: So has this -- so are we going to incorporate that and make that change? Is that what's being recommended? Are you recommending that, Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I would support the change.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was just asking for clarification. I'm not necessarily making a
recommendation.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I was going to say I do like that as a recommendation and thanks to Commissioner Fornaciari, I never would've had that understanding without the explanation. So I think it's a good one with his explanation that he added in.

CHAIR LE MONS: Any dissenters on that? Okay. Any additional points?

Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: On the issue of multiple simultaneous hearings, I'm one wondering if that's really what we mean where people will be talking at two or three or four locations at the same time, or are we talking about a meeting where we will be listening to all of the input coming from two, or three, or four locations?

And so I mean, I don't know that the actual physical requirements of the contractor would be different, but I'm just trying to understand if we are going to have to choose between which of these simultaneous meetings we participate in, or whether we will be able to hear the input coming from all of them. And it's sequenced so that we can do that. So if the subcommittee could help me on that, I'd appreciate it. Thank you.

CHAIR LE MONS: Subcommittee or staff, do you have a
clarification on this point?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: This is the point ii on page 12. Is that correct, Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: It's mentioned several places in the document.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. Yeah. You know, this was an -- and Dan, correct me if I'm wrong here, this was some ideas that we had had about how we might do some outreach. This is not locking us into anything. But simply laying out some alternatives for how we might make this approach during COVID, right? If we're not physically present, could we be holding multiple meetings at the same time? If so, how would a line drawer approach that? So this is meant to be a part of their plan to show us the kind of flexibility that they may or may not have.

I know Dan has talked previously about, you know, could we set up in multiple locations and in one evening and do two hours here and two hours there, something like that. So my sense of this is, show us what you got. These are times that are very difficult, they're challenging for all of us to figure out. And this provides an opportunity for the line drawer to give us some suggestions about how we might be able to handle that.
But Commissioner Andersen or Dan, if either of you want to jump into give further clarification. My understanding Commissioner Kennedy is that's not holding us to it, but simply laying out how would a professional line drawer respond if we were to move in such a direction?

CHAIR LE MONS: Director Claypool.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah, Director Claypool?

CHAIR LE MONS: Do you have anything to add?

MR. CLAYPOOL: That is -- Commissioner Sadhwani, is completely correct. That was our thanking behind it completely.

CHAIR LE MONS: Is that sufficient, Commissioner Kennedy? Thank you.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. Looking at the public comment, and I did not get an opportunity to look at them real clear until this morning as well.

But Ms. Shellenberger, when she makes that announcement, I'm wondering if it's one of just agreement. She says regarding the simultaneous meetings discussed, and she gives the 1B, 1H clarifying that it would be two to three. And then she says, since you include that detail in III.

So I wonder if there was something there, and I'm
trying to flip through and compare the two areas quick 

enough to see if the point was is that there just was not 
an agreement from one place in the proposal to somewhere 
else.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that, Commissioner 

Turner. Any other --

Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So when I first read this, 

I misread it, and I'm not sure if Ms. Shellenberger 

misread it.

I think what it means is, we're going to hold 

meetings at two to three locations simultaneously, right? 

It doesn't mean two to three simultaneous meetings 
because I thought we're going to hold these simultaneous 
meetings and we're only going to have two or three of 
them.

I think what it really means is we're going to have 
some number, unknown number of simultaneous meetings, and 
they'll be at two or three locations at a time. Am I 
making any sense? No, sorry.

CHAIR LE MONS: Well, Ms. Shellenberger did say that 
she was going to be listening into this conversation. So 
if you are listening, Ms. Shellenberger, clarity, when we 
go to public comment is welcome on that. Any other 
comments?
Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That was the intent, as Commissioner Fornaciari just said. The idea that, particularly remotely, that possibly we might have to have -- like, say we can just do a very small selection.

We could have a line drawer and a videographer in a particular place. We might have a little bit, but not all of us. But have us -- you know, that might be set up in three different locations on a particular day.

We would all -- they wouldn't be happening all at the same time, but the locations would be occurring. And so a line drawer would have to staff three different locations. Is that -- that's, I believe, what Commissioner Fornaciari was saying. That was sort of the intent there.

Again, as Commissioner Sadhwani said, it's to show the flexibility and could they staff that many if need it be.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I'll go back to a point that I think I made once before in a meeting. Particularly with an RFP, we want it to be impossible to be misunderstood. And I don't think we're there yet.

It may be possible to understand, but it would be
much better if we could make it impossible to be
misunderstood.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy, are you
referencing that point or the overall RFP?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes. No, no, no. That
point.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Okay. I understand that Mrs.
Shellenberger is in the queue, so at least as someone
reading it, we'll hear what her perspective is
momentarily.

Is there anyone else that would like to share
comment or uplift a point before we go to public comment?

Okay. Katy, could you read the instructions?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Oh.

CHAIR LE MONS: There's that fervor I was looking
for, Commissioner Fernandez. Let me go to Commissioner
Fernandez before we go to Katy. Thank you, Commissioner
Fornaciari.

Commissioner Fernandez you have the floor.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you. Yeah, so
I'm going back to the simultaneous. The way it reads, it
can be interpreted two ways.

So I do agree with Commissioner Kennedy that instead
of saying, may decide to hold two to three simultaneous,
why don't we just say, may decide to hold simultaneous
meetings so that -- because the two to three could be is
it going to be on two to three different days, or is it
going to be two or three meetings on the same day?

But if you just put simultaneous, take out the
number, we don't hold ourselves to how many times or days
we'll have simultaneous meetings, if that makes sense.

But anyway, yeah. So it probably needs to be maybe
rewritten just a little bit. Thanks.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Katy.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. In order to
maximize transparency and public participation in our
process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment
by phone.

To call in, dial the tell telephone number provided
on the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When
prompted to enter the meeting ID number, it is provided
on the livestream feed, 91092377762 for this week's
meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply
press the pound key.

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

Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your call.

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

The Commission is taking public comment on -- how do we describe this?

CHAIR LE MONS: Item number 4.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Item number 4. Perfect. And we do have a very full queue at this time. We will open it up.

If you'll please state and spell your name for the court reporter please.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Yes, this is Lori, L-O-R-I, last name Shellenberger, S-H-E-L-L-E-N-B-E-R-G-E-R. I'm the redistricting consultant with Common Cause. And thank you for the robust discussion, and I should have said this earlier, for all the work that went into this RFP, which is in such a different form than it was previously
and looks really great.

And I just want to respond on the two to three meetings question. And my understanding was the same as Commissioner Fornaciari's and was that this meant you would be having a few meetings at the same time. And Commissioner Turner was correct, I was just trying to ensure there would be consistency. I understand now from your discussion that it could be read in a few different ways. I do think it's important to put a number in there in terms of how many meetings you would be having at the same time, as opposed to how many times you might have simultaneous meetings.

Because I think that a line drawer would want to feel confident that they have the staff necessary to staff that many meetings at the same time. So I think the prior draft just said simultaneous meetings, and you know, does that mean you might have meetings in ten regions at the same time? And that would be a big lift for a line drawer.

So knowing how many, what the expectation is of how many you would conduct at the same time, I think would be important to make sure they have the technicians they need to staff that.

And then I wanted to make one other point. I know I'm running to the end of my time. It is a clarifying
point that has to do with the date. And I appreciate
that you'll make the change to reflect that the date
could be extended, the deadline, for the final adoption
of maps could be extended to December 15th.

And I do want to make a clarifying point regarding
that comment and it doesn't have to do with the substance
of the proposal at this point, but to your decision to
have August 15th as your working deadline and have the
deadline be tied to the receipt of data.

And I just want to flag for you that I do believe
there are organizations that I've been facilitating who
have concerns about tying the date to release the data
because -- and certainly that date is in flux and my
colleague Rosalind Gold who leads work on that nationally
can speak more specifically to that.

But the second concern is just the conditions of
this pandemic and everything else that has been thrown at
organizations who are scrambling to respond over this
past year in the midst of a pandemic, and uplift
underrepresented communities, I think have concerns about
being able to facilitate and engage and educate the
community on redistricting in a time line as tight as
August 15th. And I would just urge you next year when
you reconvene to potentially revisit that discussion and
even invite some of those groups who would be doing unity
mapping and engaging communities in to gain a better understanding of why that deadline may be really difficult.

And then there was one other question that I had in my email to you last night, which was a clarifying question about the description of the data and the reference to adjusted census data and was hoping that the subcommittee could clarify what that was referencing.

And those are my comments. I can stay on if there are any follow-up questions.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. Just in terms of the adjusted data, I need to go back to your email and see exactly which portion you are referring to. But I believe we had used that terminology regarding whether or -- what we will do with the incarcerated population data that we receive.

We have not had at discussion yet as a Commission. I believe we will be having it soon. I have a sense of where I think we'll go as a Commission, but we ultimately haven't made that decision yet.

So that was what I believe we were referring to in adjusted data. And I need to go back and look at the specific subsection that you identified. But that was where some of the use of the language of certified data
versus adjusted data had come from.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Andersen.

MS. SHELLNBERGER: Okay. Appreciate that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And also on that very same point as I believe Ms. Johnston already said, that also gives the flexibility should any immigrants be taken out of the numbers we are given, that gives the flexibility of putting them back in, because as you know, we have to consider all people for our redistricting.

So it was on both points. And that's why the "adjusted" is written in there.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you Commissioner Andersen.

Katy, could we go to our next caller?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Ms. Shellenberger.

Katy, are you there?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes. If you'll please state and spell your name for the court reporter. Sorry, I was trying to get him to connect.

You're live; if you'll please state and spell your name for the court reporter. Caller --

MR. JOHNSON: This is -- this is --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: There you go.

MR. JOHNSON: -- Doug Johnson. Are you talking to me?
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, I am.

MR. JOHNSON: Oh, okay.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: If you could state and spell your name for the court reporter.

MR. JOHNSON: Thank you. This is Douglas Johnson, D-O-U-G-L-A-S, J-O-H-N-S-O-N. And good morning Commissioners. I'm from National Demographics; we've spoken before and good to talk to you again.

I just wanted to share a couple thoughts on this proposal. One thing, as I mentioned before, I do encourage the Commission to not make the proposal too onerous because that will limit who bids.

Two thoughts on that; first of all, is kind of the theoretical side to trying to spell out how many meetings you're going to do simultaneously and things like that. Playing what if games in the proposal is very hard and takes a lot of work on our side.

And then secondly, a lot of provisions that may sound straightforward are very onerous. For example, you have the provision asking for a list and descriptions of every project we've done for the last twenty years.

Well, our firm has done somewhere between 250 and 300 redistricting projects in the last twenty years. And if we spend only two minutes per project putting that summary together, that's between, I don't know, seven and
ten hours of work.

So I do want to encourage you to think about that and make sure that you don't write an RFP that is so onerous that the highly qualified firms that you might be interested in just find it's not worth the effort to apply.

So just a couple thoughts. Last, I would note there's no information on how to share a thought in your meetings on the agenda or in the website. There's actually a circular reference. The website says, check the minutes -- the agenda and the agenda says, check the website, but neither one actually shares. I thought I'd highlight that for you. The only way to find out is actually video -- watch the meeting. So wanted to share that with you, but thank you and I hope you take these considerations into account.

Lastly, there's no provisions for an online mapping tool. And as I talked about before, we'd note that when the smallest school districts and small towns are offering their residents online mapping tools to participate in their process, it might be embarrassing if the Commission for the State that hosts Silicon Valley does not offer that to its residents.

So just wanted to remind you of that. Thank you very much. Bye-bye.
CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you Mr. Johnston. Next caller, Katy?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. If you'll please state and spell your name for the court reporter.


PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And the floor is yours.

MS. COLES: Oh, thank you. Thank you, Commissioners, and good morning. I'd like to say a couple of things quickly in my time. One is appreciate Ms. Shellenberger for her email, none of which the public has access to because it's not posted yet.

And so given the very extensive comments that Common Cause is wonderfully making and I agree with, I would love to be able to follow along. And so I believe this has come up unfortunately numerous times and to encourage that finally to be figured out.

I'd also like to talk about the time line and that's Ms. Shellenberger's comment again. The impact of the shortened time line and the working deadline of August does seem to make sense in terms of the sort of democracy of getting this done. But the impact on communities and maybe of not getting the public comments and the communities and all of that outreach done, is six months.

And so not to dismiss that with the desire to stick
with the original deadline, that the December has come around for a reason. And the likely impact is not just on the line drawer and getting those maps out, but on the inability to get the data you need from California and the people.

And then finally, and I know this is just a general comment, for the last three or four meetings, you have all discussed getting the 2021 calendar out. But it just keeps up appearing on the agenda, is not happening.

And so for all of our planning and I think again, several colleagues had mentioned this, it'd be really nice to get at least the January, February schedule so that we can all plan our time and you can plan as well.

Thank you very much.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you Ms. Coles. Katy, could you invite in the next caller please?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. I'm trying. They have to let themselves in. There we go. If you'll state and spell your name for the court reporter.

MR. CHAFFEE: Hi, my name's Chris Chaffee, C-H-R-I-S, C-H-A-F-F-E-E. I'm the CEO -- COO, excuse me, of Redistricting Partners. I just want to say at the start that we are not bidding on the line drawing RFP. So this is not a comment from a potential proposal.

However, it is based on our experience doing this
work professionally and working on many proposals right now, both in California and out of state. We have three general comments on the RFP, both -- all on section II, B(1) and (2) on page 8, related to the work of your next demographer.

First, you want people to disclose the redistricting work of both their companies and their employees working on their various projects. This is about the people involved in the work, not a brand name. To fix this in sections 1 and 2 in the first sentence, after "proposer", you'd need to insert phrase, or project personnel.

The second point is you really want to capture redistricting work done for both decision makers and outside organizations. In 2010 as you know, we did work for Equality California, promoting the use of data to identify LGBTQ communities as a community of interest.

If we were bidding on this, that's work you would want disclosed. To fix this, in section 2 (sic) in the first bullet at the end of the sentence insert the phrase, and if different, who authorized the project, i.e. nongovernmental organizations.

And the third point is you want to know if incumbency was a criterion for one of the plans that the proposer is submitting. Simply put, because it changes the process. If it didn't exist, the Commission really
wouldn't exist. So to fix this and in section 1, in the third bullet at the end, you'd want to insert, and whether the maps considered incumbency.

So to summarize; one, experience is about the people involved. Two, nongovernmental work should be disclosed. And three, incumbency really impacts the relevancy of a map if it's used as a criterion.

So thank you for your time and attention on this. I can stay on if you have any other questions. Thanks.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Mr. Chaffee. Katy, would you invite the next caller in, please?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: So we do have one other person in the queue. However, they do not have their hand raised. So if you would like to make a comment, if you could press star 9 to raise your hand. If not, we will move on.

Chair, they have not chose to raise their hand.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Thank you very much for the comments. We will now move out of public comment and to -- let me check the time.

So we have ten minutes before our break.

Commissioner Yee, would that be an adequate budget amount of time for you to address the chair rotation?

COMMISSIONER YEE: It could be. It just depends on the amount of discussion that gets generated.
CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Well, why don't we begin it and if we aren't able to complete it, we'll finish it after lunch -- excuse me, after the break. So Commissioner Yee, take it away. We're moving to number 7 on the agenda, which is the chair rotation schedule. And then we will come back to number 6 if we complete 7 after the break.

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Very good. So as you'll recall, Commissioner Toledo and I initially drafted the current chair rotation policy, which has a strict rotation of our political categories and then our alphabetical order.

Some of the coming and going from the pool of Commissioners who are choosing to stay in the rotation create a situation where we may be down to, it looks like we're down to three Democrat Commissioners in the rotation. So this creates a situation where we just have some of the Commissioners rotating in a lot more than others, and it just seems to be something worth revisiting because it gets to a point where it is just not very equitable.

So I came up with some various options we can consider and you can see in the handout that I prepared, playing around with this. Option A is what's currently policy and you'll see, for instance, that Commissioner
Turner who would be next after currently, Commissioner LeMons, and then Commissioner Taylor, and then Commissioner Turner would be next. And then Commissioner Turner comes back again because there are only three Democrat Commissioners in the rotation. And so it goes. The other issue is that it just happens that the policy we came up with maybe we should have played it out because as it happens, it's seems to generate just by happenstance, a lot of unmixed gender pairs of chair and vice chair. In fact, eight of nine so far which is just -- we seem to specialize in low probability outcomes in this Commission. And some Commissioners have voiced a desire to have more mixed pairs. So that's the current rotation.

Option B that I propose, emphasizes mixing genders as a priority. In none of these, do we have Commissioners serving with the same political affiliation Commissioner. So that's always mixed to some degree. And then option B also tries to have Commissioners serve sort of in the order so far, so that -- except that Commissioner Kennedy comes up quickly again because he's the only Democrat guy, actually.

So you'll notice that with option B, however, political affiliations are not equitable. So since in the rotation, you have three Democrats, four
nonaffiliated, five Republicans in that rotation, that's the ratio you get. So you have a Republican Commissioner chairing five-thirds as many as you have a Democrat one. So those are no longer even in that proposal.

Okay. Working along, option C, this is if we try to equal out workload. So this option looks at who served so far and tries to continue on putting up the three of us who have not served so far early and spreading everyone out as equally as possible, not considering gender.

So that proposal, again, the political ratio is not even, and you end up with a lot of unmixed gender pairs. But it does even out the workload, if that's the most important thing to you.

Okay, then option D, we go back to a strict political rotation. So all three categories are strictly even, and then I tried to -- and then I strictly alternate gender. So political affiliation are even, you have mixed pairs at all times. The cost is that some Commissioners end up serving a lot more than others.

So for instance, you'll notice that Commissioner Fornaciari doesn't actually show up until a long time from now, because there's five Republicans and you have to spread them out. And Commissioner Kennedy will have served three times before Commissioner Fornaciari comes
back. So that's the cost of that rotation.

Note that in none of these rotations, do I consider geography or race. So we're not prioritizing that in any of these rotations.

I do have a preference. I don't know if I should float it or recommend it or just wait to let this comment.

CHAIR LE MONS: Totally up to you to you, Commissioner Yee. Would you like to share, or?

COMMISSIONER YEE: If I had my druthers, I would go with option B. So in thinking about it, as I think about how the 2010 Commission was routinely lauded for having a rotating chair, nobody went on to say, and the rotation was perfectly equal; isn't that great?

Of course, more equality is better than less equality, but it's just the fact that it was rotated. That seems to be the chief credit. And in option B, we still do have always a mixed pair politically. You never have two Commissioners of the same affiliation status.

So I think that's relatively less important. We do still rotate. We still do have all three affiliation statuses rotating. They're not perfectly even, but they're sort of even, as even as can be. And then we do address fully the gender mixing concern, which I think actually would be a nice change.
In option B, you do have two same gender pairs coming up; Fernandez and Ahmad, and then if it rotates around again, you'll see the last one there is Taylor and then it rotates back to Toledo. So Toledo would be two guys. But otherwise, we're all mixed pairs.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes, absolutely. I wanted to support Commissioner Yee's option B. Thank him for all of the work in detail that he put into this. And I am heavily in favor of option B.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Any other Commissioners have --

Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I certainly appreciate the work and I hope Commissioner Yee has enjoyed the work. I'm still to this day, not fully convinced that rotating is something that was -- certainly not contemplated by the original drafters. And I'm not fully convinced that it is compliant with the regulations as they're currently drafted.

Would I object strenuously to any of these? No. But you know, I do have my doubts as to whether rotating was really the intention of the regulation as drafted.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy.

Any other comments?
Okay. We're going to break for -- break. We're going to go to break for fifteen minutes. Feel free to ponder the list before us. We will return back to this agenda item when we come back from break at 11:15 and go from there. Enjoy your break.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

CHAIR LE MONS: Welcome back from break. We're at agenda item number 6 -- hang on; I'm sorry -- 7 that's being led by Commissioner Yee. So where we left off just before the break is there was a recommendation of option B and we were having a little bit of discussion there.

So I'd like to pick up the discussion and continue. Our goal here is to choose one of the options so we can move forward.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just wanted to ask Commissioner Yee if this was -- I hope my assumption's right; that we would start this rotation after Chair Le Mons. And if so, my recommendation -- I mean, I don't mind it, but I would recommend that maybe we move Taylor and move him up since he's the Vice Chair and then that way he can be the chair and it can be Taylor and Toledo, and then go that way.

And I was looking at that also because both of them have not chaired so far. And I know that Commissioner
Yee and Sadhwani also hasn't chaired so far, so I didn't want to take that away from them either. So I'm just trying to even it out.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, good point. Actually, I assumed that Commissioner Taylor would chair next since he's current Vice Chair. And then the rotation goes on from there.

If I may, a couple other quick points, one is that -- so a substitution rule, which we need, because if somebody has to step off temporarily, then how do you know who's next?

The rule I'm suggesting is that basically, we keep the gender and political affiliation order. And if somebody has to step off temporarily, then that spot is filled with somebody of the same flavor.

So if I had to step off, then another Republican guy would take my spot in the rotation. That works except for Democrat guys because there's only one. So we have to keep Commissioner Kennedy healthy and strong so that there will not be a situation where he needs to be a substitute cause there's no other Democrat guy in the rotation.

Another thing -- oh, just apologies to Commissioner Andersen. I misspelled her name once here. Hopefully, I
didn't misspell anyone else's. If I did, my apologies.

Also we need to think about, okay. So I've been
applying myself to this because Commissioner Toledo and I
picked it up the first time around, but I think it needs
to land in one of the subcommittees actually, rather than
just as my kind of private project.

I mean, it's okay if that makes -- actually, it's
okay. But maybe I should go to finance administration, I
don't know. And I think we're keeping our already
agreed-upon understanding that chairs will conduct two
full meetings, and then some of these single-day meetings
are just getting added on to whatever meeting followed or
proceeded.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: This looks like good work. I
had a question about option three. It says at the bottom
that there's three Democrats, but I count four in that
rotation.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I can see --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I count four Democrats listed
there, but in the bottom, it says there's only three
Democrats.

COMMISSIONER YEE: In option C, that is?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No, in option B.

COMMISSIONER YEE: B.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And actually, all of them, I think option B and C assumes only three Democrats, but there's four Democrats, I think, listed whose names are on that list.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Let's see. We have Sadhwani, Turner, and Kennedy, right? So I should have mentioned, I did touch base with several Commissioners who would be most affected by some of these options. And so for instance, maybe we should hear from Commissioner Vazquez about her decisions.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Thanks, Commissioner Yee. I've elected to pull myself out of the rotation just given my health and trying to navigate everything. I'd much rather commit my energy towards subcommittee work, especially outreach with Commissioner Turner and my zone rather than also trying to add additional pieces to my plate. So that's just best for me. And I think it's also a way for me to better serve the Commission.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.


COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No, I think I was miscounting.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. All good.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I'll send you these later. You can play with them too.

CHAIR LE MONS: Are there any more comments to option B as the recommendation or does any Commissioners want to offer an alternative option?

If not, we'll move to a vote. Well, we'll go to public comment, of course, and then we'll come back and vote on option B if someone puts the motion forward.

So Commissioner Fernandez, then Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I would move to accept option B starting with Commissioner Taylor as the Chair, and then moving in the rotation.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I would second.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. If there's no additional comments, I'd like to go to public comment and come back for a vote.

Katy, could you read the instructions please?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone.

To call in, dial the telephone number provided on
the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted to enter the meeting ID number, it is provided on the livestream feed, 91092377762. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press the pound key.

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

Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your call.

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

The Commission is taking public comment at this time on item --

CHAIR LE MONS: Number 7.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: 7. I had it. Thank you though. I was proud of myself. We do have one person in the queue.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you so much, Katy. You can
invite the caller in, please.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Please state and spell your name for the Commission -- or court reporter.

MS. GOLD: Yes. Rosalind Gold, R-O-S-A-L-I-N-D, and the last name is Gold, G-O-L-D. And I just wanted to ask permission to make a very short comment that is not germane to the issue being discussed right this moment, but is germane to the previous discussion on the scope of work for the line drawer, if I may beg that indulgence?

CHAIR LE MONS: What I'd like to do, caller -- Ms. Gold, is to invite you, right after lunch, we'll have open general comment and you can comment on anything on the agenda at that time.

MS. GOLD: I will be happy to call back then. Thank you so much.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And Ms. Gold was our only person in queue at this time.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. So could we do our roll call for vote please?

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Taylor?
VICE CHAIR TAYLOR: Yes.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Is that a yes?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Abstain.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Le Mons?

CHAIR LE MONS: Yes.
MS. SHEFFIELD: Okay. Motion passes.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you.

MS. SHEFFIELD: You're welcome.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, everyone.

Chair, you're muted.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. I'd like to move to item number 6; data management, Commissioners Ahmad and Turner.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. Commissioner Turner and I would like to provide an update in regards to data management and where we are at.

So last week, we met with USDR and Karin Mac Donald to go over the different responsibilities of the line drawer and then specific needs from a data management standpoint that the line drawer had. USDR was able to engage in a discovery sprint in which they asked a whole bunch of different questions related to what our process is, what our vision is, what lessons learned. Karin had to share with them.

We are in the middle of that process so we will have more to report on that at our next meeting. We also will be getting assistance from USDR in drafting the job descriptions for a data analyst or management type role from a technical standpoint. They have substantive experience in doing this and providing this service for
other agencies. So we will be taking advantage of that opportunity as well.

In terms of next steps for our data analyst or manager, we are really exploring the idea of an interagency agreement. This avenue would expedite the time in which we can bring someone on board for that role. This interagency agreement will also take advantage of the talent that we have in California at academic institutions, and potentially provide us with an additional avenue to connect with students from across California given that academic tie as well.

So we are in the process of getting that information together with staff, and we will have more to report in January. Commissioner Turner, is there anything else that I missed?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: No, you did a beautiful job. I think it was very clear and we'll see now if there are any questions.

CHAIR LE MONS: Any questions Commissioners?

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Are we not revealing who the interagency agreement may be with?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: We don't know who the interagency agreement will be with at this point. We are still in the early phases of drafting that from what I
understand from staff. And Dan, you can correct me if I'm wrong; that process will work relatively faster than a traditional RFP process. Dan?

MR. CLAYPOOL: The only thing I would say to all the Commissioners, including you, Commissioner Sinay, is if you know of someone with these types of talents and skills, please reach out to them once we put this together.

CHAIR LE MONS: Any addition?

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So just for clarity; this will be released like an RFP? My understanding of an interagency agreement is that it's specifically with an entity or an individual at an entity.

Are we still -- it sounds like we're still seeking such an entity here in California or at a state-based entity. My understanding, for example, in 2010, Matt Barreto had an interagency agreement, but he was not in California at that point in time, he was at the University of Washington.

So this could be at a state-based higher education institution outside of California as well. So this is going to be released and people are going to respond? Or I guess just a little bit more clarity about how this is going to be managed in terms of identifying this
individual.

CHAIR LE MONS: Direct Claypool.

MR. CLAYPOOL: So this is where we can go back to an RFI and basically put out a request for information from individuals who might be interested in entering into this type of agreement with us.

So we can use an RFI as a vehicle to search or we can identify it. And Mr. Barreto is a good case in point; he was with the University of Washington last time, but we also can use individuals who have a cooperative agreement with California and California institutions.

So we're not necessarily restricted to California talent, although we would always like to place this with Californians as much as possible. But that's the process that we're looking at.

We're going to produce an RFI document. We're going to float through all of our vendors and all of the people that are on our list. And we're going to look for somebody who has the talent to pull this forward for the subcommittee.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that, Director Claypool. Any other questions for the subcommittee?

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thanks. I'm not sure this is the
time to ask, but about scope of work, it wasn't entirely clear to me that we ever landed on the question of whether the data management contractor was responsible for the COI tool input in any way. You know, we discussed that. In my mind, I'm not positive we landed, but I might be mistaken.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. Thank you. And thank you, Chair. In the discussions that we're having currently with USDR, when we receive their prototype back of the process, that will be included as well.

And we also noted that in the line drawer RFI that we just went over, that there is also an opportunity there for the Commission to direct that individual to own a piece of that as well.

And we're going to -- so once we get the prototype back, we'll have a clearer kind of picture and path for you that will just say who's going to own COI and how all of that will work.

We do know that USDR and our conversation has talked with both Karin and Jamie to kind of shore up some of those details. So probably for part of January is when we'll have a clearer picture. We have all of the right players on the table now and in discussion with each other. And so now we're really looking forward to
getting definitive answer for us as a Commission.

    COMMISSIONER YEE:  Very good. Thanks.

    CHAIR LE MONS:  Any additional questions? Okay. So we'll expect to hear more from the subcommittee at a subsequent meeting and we look forward. Thank you so much for all the hard work that you all are doing.

    I love that word "discovery sprint". That sounded kind of sexy, actually. So as we move forward, I did want to -- speaking of COI tool, I wanted to clarify a comment made by one of our callers earlier, Mr. Johnson, who suggested that there wasn't a tool or mechanism for the public to be able to submit maps.

    So we want to just do a shoutout to the Statewide Database and the wonderful work that them and their partners are doing develop the very thing that Mr. Johnson suggested wasn't happening. We do have that, and will have that for the citizens of California.

    Commissioner Andersen.

    COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN:  I'm sorry; to clarify on that. He was actually talking not about the COI tool. He was talking about a redistricting tool when he was talking about the maps. And that is something that the Statewide Database and the -- you know, that is still being worked on, but the COI tool was the first portion that they were working on.
The COI tool is only for communities of interest. The redistricting tool which is what Doug Johnson was talking about; he wasn't talking about just communities of interest mapping. He was talking about which is our -- we talk about mapping, mapping, mapping, we get them all mixed up.

He was talking about redistricting mapping. So basically, the average person can go out there and say, I think you should draw them all like this. That's what he was talking about. And that is -- Michael Wagaman was talking to us about that. But again, that is gone -- the sequencing of the work on that is after the COI tool is out, then they were going to start working on that particular item.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen for that clarification; I stand corrected. With that, we will move on to item number 10, which is discussion of future meeting dates and agenda items.

So I'm not sure which Commissioner has been keeping track. I know that there has been at least one or two Commissioners who've been keeping track of the dates that we have scheduled so far. And I think we are scheduled into early February at this point. So if we could pick up from there and potentially go out to the end of February or the beginning of March in terms of picking
dates, and then we'll continue to use our Google docs tool and the developments of our progress to indicate our agenda items and grow those agendas accordingly.

Commissioner Sinay, did you have your hand up? I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes. Sorry, I was trying to unmute. My notes say that we had gone all the way through February on our selection. I can put them --

CHAIR LE MONS: Oh, okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: If you'd like, I can share them verbally so everybody knows what I have and we can see if I was correct or not.

CHAIR LE MONS: Sure.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: January 6th is a tentative meeting if needed. January 11th through the 13th. January 21st is a tentative meeting if we need it. January 26th through the 28th, February 8th through the 9th, February 16 through the 17th, and February 24th through the 25th.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay, fantastic. So I think one of the callers -- I don't think we have this posted anywhere yet; is that correct?

Yeah. Okay. So I think with our rotation and our dates now that we solidified our new rotation, we can tie those to the meeting dates that we have out to the 25th.
Do Commissioners want to go out further than the 25th or wait until we convene after the first of the year and see where we are in terms of extending the chosen dates?

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I guess one of the reasons I think we stopped, but also one of the reasons I'm not sure how to extend it past February, is I'm not sure what our world looks like, what our work looks like after February. And we were waiting for the outreach plan to kind of have a better feel of that.

CHAIR LE MONS: Awesome.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Same. I kind of wonder to what extent we need to continue to have these kinds of business meetings, if we're also going out into the community and beginning to collect either COI information or doing the public outreach and education meetings. I think we need further clarity on that before we commit to these meetings.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. So with that, I think we can satisfy helping the people slate -- helping the public start to slate their schedule through the end of February by simply posting our current projected meeting dates.

And Commissioner Yee, do you want to add the new rotation schedule? Do you want to tie it to those dates
or would you like to keep that separate?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I'd be happy to put it all in one
document. That would be useful. Also I should mention
that February 18th -- we're projecting that we will have
our new legal affairs committee formed in January and on
the 18th, there'll will be an additional public meeting
day for the Legal Affairs Committee to do any final
interviews and discussion to select our VRA and
litigation counsel.

So that's February 18th. But I'll go ahead and
merge the two; the calendar and the rotation.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I was actually writing that
down now, and if we wanted to go over that. Because
there is a question about the two-day meetings, are we
talking about full meetings and were our two-day meetings
full meetings or not?

So that does affect February obviously. So if we
wanted to kind of talk about the two, three-day item,
than -- and anyone can put it together. But I think --
did we decide two days was the full meeting or was it
three? I think Commissioner Akutagawa was involved in
two-day meetings and might have some input on that.

CHAIR LE MONS: Does anyone have any comments on
that?
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, if I can just comment on what Commissioner Andersen said. I'll just -- for clarification, I chaired two meetings because they were two two-day meetings and I think the rule was one three-day.

CHAIR LE MONS: If I recall, I'll just jump in here. I thought it was just a series of meetings. They might be a two-day meeting or a three-day meeting. I don't think one was considered a full meeting if it was three days versus two days. Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I believe the original rule was one meeting or three days. Then we amended it to be two meetings. I recommend that a two-meeting day count as a meeting because it involves a whole separate agenda and that's kind of the biggest work is assembling the agenda, right, so.

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And I just want to add further on top of that; I did find that having the two consecutive meetings did make agenda planning a little bit easier, and then working with Commissioner Fornaciari on the agenda and then having him also do two, I think enabled us to think further out and get kind of ahead of the agenda because of posting requirements.

And so I think it was at that time that we made the
recommendation that each chair, chair at least two meetings. And so that's where we ended up and I think that's why you were chairing quite a few meetings now.

CHAIR LEMONS: Okay. Any other comments or feedback on that?

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So with that understanding, I could say who has each of those meetings, if that would help people right now, just for --

CHAIR LEMONS: I think Commissioner Yee is going to post it. We know that the next Chair is Commissioner Taylor, and then it'll be posted and people can check the list and see when they come in, if that's okay with everybody.

Okay. Any objections to Commissioner Yee combining the schedule with the rotation and putting that forward to our staff to post?

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Just to mention that Commissioner Le Mons, Chair Le Mons generously picked up this meeting, a one-day meeting adding it to his total. And so I'll just continue for optional meetings to assign those to either the proceeding or the following set, just depending on how the order is going.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Okay. If there's no
additional comments on that --

Commissioner Taylor.

VICE CHAIR TAYLOR: Yes, and I guess maybe for clarification, as we had discussed and presented before, Commissioner Le Mons will have the January 6th optional meeting, and I will have the January 21st optional meeting as division of labor.

CHAIR LE MONS: Yes. Okay. Any other comments, questions, concerns, thoughts on this item? Okay. Thank you, everyone.

So what we need to do now is go into our closed session. Yes, 11:43. And we have until 12:45. Is that correct, or 12:30, Kristian? Time check for me.

MR. MANOFF: That's correct, Chair.

CHAIR LE MONS: Which one? I'm sorry. 12:30 or 12:45?

MR. MANOFF: 12:45.

CHAIR LE MONS: 12:45. Okay. So why don't we move into our closed session? So the public, we'll be going into closed session to address the personnel matters.

I'm not sure exactly how long that'll take. We've budgeted 45 minutes to an hour. Then we will be returning. That'll put us right at lunch.

So we would come back after lunch and take final public comment in the event that we don't have time to do
it before we break for lunch. And at that time, you'll be able to comment on anything that we've addressed in the agenda today, as well as we'll report out where appropriate, any decisions or actions taken in closed session.

So with that, we will leave this meeting and go into our closed session link, and then come back. We will come back just before lunch either way, to let the public know where we are. That way we can stay on top of time and the public can be aware. Okay. Alright, everyone.

Thank you.

(Whereupon, a Closed Session was held)

CHAIR LE MONS: Welcome back, Commissioners.

Welcome back, California. Thank you, California, for your patience. We are going to go right into public comment to close the day and I'll turn to Katy to read the announcements and this will be general public comment, and you are welcome to comment on any of our agenda items for today, or anything else for that matter.

So Katy, could you read the instructions please?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone.

To call in, dial the telephone number provided on
the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted
to enter the meeting ID number, it is provided on the
livestream feed, 91092377762. When prompted to enter a
participant ID, simply press the pound key.

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

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

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

The Commission is taking general public comment at
this time. We do not have anybody in the queue.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. So we'll give it a minute or
two -- two minutes -- to give people a chance to sign in
with the delay. Can we, while we're waiting, can Marcy,
supervisor, introduce her to the Commission and say a few
beautiful words about her, please?
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Just so you know Commissioner -- real quick, Marcy, I don't mean to interrupt. We do have someone in the queue, so the please talk and then we'll go there.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Real quick.

MR. HERNANDEZ: All right. So let me go ahead and introduce Marcy. She comes to us with a wealth of knowledge from having participated in the census a few months ago. So let me introduce to you, Marcy Kaplan. Marcy?

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you. Welcome, Marcy. And we'll hear more from you in our next meeting, but we were remiss not to introduce you earlier. Katy, could you invite our first caller in please?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. If you'll please state and spell your name for the court reporter.

MS. WESTA-LUSK: Yes. Renee Westa-Lusk. First name is spelled R-E-N-E-E. Last name is W-E-S-T-A, hyphen, L-U-S-K.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Please share your comment.

MS. WESTA-LUSK: I just have some questions regarding mainly today's agenda items that came up under the item 4, the RFP line drawing services on page 12 about that there would be more than one hearing being
held at the same time in different parts of the state.

I wanted to know why do you have to hold more than
one hearing at a time in different parts of the state.
Is it because you might have to have more than one
hearing in each region at the same time?

And I wanted to know how many Commissioners will be
listening or attending the virtual hearings, if you have
more than one hearing going on at the same time. Because
in the past, in the 2011 hearings, all the Commissioners
from all the hearings either attended or saw online, all
the nurse were there, all fourteen at each of the
hearings.

And then my second question has to do, if you could
please explain the outreach zones and what the teams are
supposed to do for outreach?

CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Sadhwani, would you
like to address the first question?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. Thanks so much Ms.
Westa-Lusk for calling in and for your comment. We did
actually discuss the simultaneous hearings a little bit
earlier in the meeting, so I'm not going to go into too
great of detail.

But the idea here is not that we are most that we
are definitely holding such meetings, but that it is a
possibility based on many of our discussions. And so the
idea here is that we would want to know how a potential line drawer would staff meetings if we chose to do them that way.

So it is not saying that that's how meetings will be held, but simply that we want to make sure that we have -- that we can identify a line drawer who could be flexible and nimble and be able to accommodate different kinds of meetings should we choose to go in that direction.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

Commissioner Sinay, would you address the zones real quickly please, understanding that we're going to get into that more fully in a subsequent meeting?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes. The zones, we discussed them briefly at the last meeting, and in a future meeting, we will actually vote on them and we'll have a better understanding of our roles.

The idea was to really look at the whole State of California and how could we break it down so that each of us could get -- go in a little deeper in the different zones and start making some of the relationships we need for the outreach piece.

When we hear from -- when we receive the outreach proposal and we discuss the outreach -- not proposal, sorry -- the outreach plan from staff, that will give us
more guidance on what our next steps are.

But currently, the outreach teams are just --

they're just a place to do -- it's just outreach zones.

They are not anything to do with the mapping or where

we'll be having hearings or any of the above. It's just

a way to organize ourselves.

CHAIR LE MONS: Thank you for that, Commissioner

Sinay and thank you, Ms. Lusk for your questions and your

call. Katy are the additional callers in the queue?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: No, Chair. That was it.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. Well, that brings us to the

end of our meeting. And if there are no closing

comments, concerns, I want to wish everyone happy

holidays, Merry Christmas, and all of that good stuff.

It's been an absolute pleasure being the Chair. And if

you have anything that you want to put forward for the

January 6th meeting, please be sure to go and post that

in the Google doc today.

And then I will let you know. It looks like we

probably will have that meeting, but you'll get a

confirmation letting you know because we'll need to post

by tomorrow. Is that correct, Director Claypool, or is

it by midnight tonight?

MR. CLAYPOOL: Let me work backwards on that, Chair.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay. So either be midnight tonight
or by tomorrow.

So Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Because it was a maybe meeting, anything that we thought of like the zones, we put it in the 11th. Should we just also put it in the 6th just so or will we just look at the 11th and move it up?

CHAIR LE MONS: Yeah, I'm going to look at the 11th. So if it's pressing, like if we have some -- like today where there was some things we really needed to handle and likewise, if there's some things we have to handle on the 6th, then we'll flesh out the agenda for one-day meeting and then pick and choose.

So if you have something on there that you have posted for the 11th through 13th that you want to handle earlier, like say, please, please consider this, make a note there. But we do have the zones on there as a consideration.

Like for example, with the chair rotation today, that was one of those things that if we could get to it, we would, if not we push it. So we are going to handle the zones the same way. Director Claypool?

MR. CLAYPOOL: So it would be, by my calculation, midnight tomorrow.

CHAIR LE MONS: Okay, perfect.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Midnight Wednesday.
CHAIR LE MONS: So if everyone could just go by there tonight at some point, and if you have something pressing, remember this would be a meeting added; if not, it'll happen on our January 11th meeting.

So in any event, we won't see each other till next year. So happy New Year. And I look forward to seeing you all in 2021.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Happy New Year, everyone.

CHAIR LE MONS: And with that, I guess I have to officially say the meeting is adjourned. The meeting is adjourned.

(Whereupon, the Business Meeting adjourned at 4:42 p.m.)
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