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CHAIR KENNEDY: Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to the April 12th and 13th meeting of the California Citizens Redistricting Commission. I am Ray Kennedy, rotating chair for this set of meetings.

And I would like to ask staff to call the roll, please.

MR. SINGH: Of course. Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Kennedy?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Here.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here.
MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sadhwani?
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.
MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sinay?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.
MR. SINGH: Commissioner Taylor?
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Present.
MR. SINGH: Commissioner Toledo?
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Here.
MR. SINGH: Commissioner Turner?
Commissioner Vazquez?
Commissioner Yee?
COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.
MR. SINGH: You have a quorum, Chair.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. And with that, I would like to call for public comment, as we normally do at the beginning of each meeting.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Katy.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. One second. Oh, no. Oh, there we go. To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed. It is 986 8812
5251 for this 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. To indicate you wish to comment, please press star 9. This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it is your turn to speak, you will hear a message that says the host would like you to talk and to press star 6 to speak. If you would like to give your name, please state and spell it for the record. You are not required to provide your name to get public comment.

Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your call. Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when it is your turn to speak, and again, please turn down the livestream volume. And I'd like to remind the people that call in, if you would press star 9 to raise your hand indicating you wish to comment.

And we do have two people in the queue.

And the floor is yours.

MR. JOHNSON: Hello. My name is Dylan Johnson. That's D-Y-L-A-N, Johnson, J-O-H-N-S-O-N. I am with SEIU, California, and I'm calling on behalf of the 700,000 SEIU members who are in large part from communities of color and underserved communities, and I just wanted to call in and make a public comment about a
few items we have some concerns around.

The first thing that I wanted to comment on was the -- in looking at the timeline, the scheduled public input meetings and line drawing sessions that are set to take place from December to January, December '21 to January '22, we're concerned about that taking place over the holidays and how that will impact the ability for communities of color and underserved communities to participate in that process.

And the other issue I wanted to raise at this time was I know there's been discussion of potentially moving the primary election to a later date. We're not necessarily opposed to this idea, but we are concerned about how this might impact communities of color that a lot of our members are part of, and underserved communities, and think that that should really be studied before moving forward on -- particularly in terms of the impacts that would have on participation by those communities.

Obviously, we, you know, we appreciate all the hard work of the commission and look forward to continued engagement, but just wanted to take some time to register those -- those issues. I appreciate you allowing me to speak, and yeah. That's it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you very much, Mr. Johnson.
Just on those two, very quickly, we are certainly cognizant of the holidays. Unfortunately, we have hard deadlines, and actually, a hard starting point and a hard deadline since the California Supreme Court has given us some additional time, but a very specific amount of additional time if the census results are arriving at the State after the 31st of July, so we have a fixed period of time to do our work. We will do everything that we can to make public events as convenient as we can for as many people as we can, but we cannot change the calendar that we are given.

And secondly, on primaries, we certainly appreciate your concern. That should be brought to the attention of your State senator and State assemblymember, as we have no control over whether or not the primary date is moved and if so to when. So we do appreciate your call. We will be keeping all of these issues in mind, but there is very little that we can do to change calendars from our end.

Katy, could you invite the next caller, please?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair.

The floor is yours.

MS. PONCE DE LEON: Hi. Good afternoon, commissioners. This is Alejandra Ponce De Leon, with Advancement Project, California. My name is spelled --
it's spelled A-L-E-J-A-N-D-R-A, last name, P-O-N-C-E, space, D-E, space, L-E-O-N. Just wanted to call in to, one, to continue to appreciate a lot of the work, a lot of the thoughtfulness, in -- in all of the different aspects of the redistricting process.

And one thing that I was calling in regards to is just to uplift a letter that was sent by our network of partners and you know, recommendations for you to consider as, you know, as you move forward in your process to select grantees, we just wanted to uplift several recommendations, you know, for your consideration, and the criteria that, you know, for you to consider in selecting grantees, as well as additional considerations in regards to, you know, the process of the selection to take into account, as well as once you've selected your grantees, just other considerations to -- to consider. So I just wanted to uplift that. It was sent last week, and -- and again, that we are available if you have any questions, or just need more information in terms of what we've submitted collectively in regards to this issue. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Ms. Ponce De Leon, could you give us the date? You said that it was sent last week.

MS. PONCE DE LEON: Yes. It was sent -- I believe I sent it on Thursday. Thursday of last week.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

MS. PONCE DE LEON: It was on the 8th.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I don't believe that I have seen that.

MS. PONCE DE LEON: I don't know -- um-hum.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Director Hernandez, are you able to give us any information on this letter?

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: I do recall the letter, but I'll need to check in to find it and make sure it gets posted, if it hasn't already been done.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much.

MS. PONCE DE LEON: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for calling and bringing that to our attention.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And that was it, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you very much, Katy.

Now, we have general announcements and any updates from commissioners of interest to the full commission.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Hi, everyone. It's great to see you all. It feels like it's been a long time.

I just wanted to let folks know that on Thursday evening, the League of Women Voters in San Diego has invited me and a local commissioner from the San Diego County Commission to do a presentation. So it'll be the
first presentation we do in San Diego, which we'll be having the State and the local representation. So we're excited.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent. And that will certainly advance our objective of ensuring that people understand the importance of participating in both processes, but the differences between the two processes. So thank you for that.

I will go ahead and make a few comments. First of all, I want to congratulate both our staff and fellow commissioners on progress to date on our educational efforts. I think we are demonstrating that we are making good use of the time available to us. We are getting word out around the State to a wide variety of groups, and I just want to thank and congratulate staff and fellow commissioners for all of the hard work that has gone into the educational efforts to date, and to encourage all of us to continue this. I think the calendar, from what I see, looks like it's going to be picking up more and more. I know that I'm still making first contacts with groups, and cities, and counties, so hopefully, we will have quite a result by the end of this educational outreach period.

Second of all, I wanted to point out to people who may not be aware, the last meeting was a split meeting
starting on Monday and continuing on Thursday. That was
an experiment, and we are interested in hearing from
folks, whether through a telephone call or an email, how
that was for them. Was that helpful? Was it useful?
Good? Bad? Just let us know how that split schedule
worked for you.

This week's meeting, the start time is something new
for us, so we will also be looking for input from
commissioners, from staff, from the public as to how a 1
o'clock start time works for everyone.

In that regard, just want to set out what our
expected schedule is with these 1:00 p.m. start times.
So our first ninety-minute block goes from 1:00 to 2:30,
there would be a fifteen-minute break, we would have
another ninety-minute block from 2:45 to 4:15, another
fifteen-minute break, a ninety-minute block from 4:30 to
6:00, a dinner break from 6:00 to 7:00, and our final
ninety-minute block from 7:00 to 8:30. So that is our
expected schedule for today and tomorrow, depending on
when we conclude our business. Just to give everyone a
heads up of when the breaks are likely to fall.

And finally, I just want to take the opportunity to
really ask colleagues as well as organizations that are
collaborating with the commission to really continue to
emphasize accuracy and consistency in messaging. You
know, we've all, at some point in our lives, probably
played whispers games, and you know that what goes in one
end of the chain doesn't always come out the same the
other end of the chain, but this is an effort where we
really all need to emphasize accuracy and consistency,
and make sure that the messages that the commission is
delivering are the messages that are reaching people at
the grassroots level. So just want to highlight the
importance of that, express appreciation for those who
have been making an effort in that regard, and urge us
all to continue to be very aware of the importance of
accuracy and consistency in our messaging.

So that's it for me. Unless there are any other
items of interest from other commissioners, I will turn
it over to the Executive Director for his report.

Director Hernandez?

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. And it was
an adjustment period. I got up very early, was here at
9:00, and ready to go. Then I realized it's not until 1
o'clock, so I have to adjust just like everyone else.
But thank you again.

And good morning, or good afternoon, everyone. See?
Still trying to adjust. Let me go ahead and start with
the staff and personnel. I wanted to let you all know
that formally, I want to welcome our account analyst,
Anessa Kyler (ph.). She has started with us last week and she has hit the ground running, so we're very excited that she's on board.

Next, I wanted to touch on the field staff, the field lead staff positions, they have posted, and as of last week, we had at least three applications for each of the four regions. So you may recall that it was posted, then we had to pull it because it needed to reflect the four different regions. So now we have that out there, and we are receiving interest in those four different regions for those positions, so we're very excited.

The Director of Outreach and Chief Counsel, I'll defer to the respective recruitment subcommittees for an update during their subcommittee report. I sent an email yesterday asking about your availability for the April 29th and 30th.

First, I need to apologize. It should have been for April 28th and 29th. My apologies on that. To see if you would be available to possibly conduct interviews for the two executive level positions, so I'll be revising that request. If you can send me your availability on the 28th, I'd greatly appreciate that as well. So that's all I have for the staff and personnel.

Are there any questions? Okay.

I'm going to move on to the protocols for the
commission and communication. So we have a videography RFP, and I want to defer to the Finance and Administration Subcommittee to provide an update on the videography RFP. So I'll defer to them at this time.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you. Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fornaciari?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes. The current videography contract that we have is almost up in terms of funding, so we had to send out an RFP. We did receive one vendor, who was our current vendor, and we have completed our review, and we recommend that we move forward with, I can't remember the exact -- the exact name of the vendor, but that we move forward with -- what's the name of it, Alvaro?

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: DSS (ph.). So that's the name of it.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: As our videographer --

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yes.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: -- moving forward, and that would encompass videography services until we're finished with our line drawing and beyond. Oh, and there is urgency to try to get that done as soon as possible, also, because as I mentioned, there's limited funding left, and we want to make sure that we have enough for
our upcoming meetings, and that we have videography
services for that as well. Thank you.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: So Commissioner Fornaciari, I
think you were saying something? Sorry.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I want to make a
motion that we accept the contract for video services.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Can you repeat that motion?
I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I want to make a motion
that we accept the contract for video services.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I'll second.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fernandez has seconded.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Actually, that was
Commissioner Ahmad, but I can do it, too. That's fine.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Ahmad has
seconded.

Discussion? Any comments from commissioners?

Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: And I'm assuming there's no
increase in the financial implications than we've already
incurred in the past? It remains roughly around the
same? Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Any other questions or comments from
commissioners?

Commissioner Fernandez?
VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I'm sorry. I nodded my head and then I realized I need to actually say yes, because there's some that may not actually see my head nodding. So yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Katy, we will be voting on this motion to award the videography contract. Could you please call for public comment?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, I will take care of that for you, Chair. Just a moment.

In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed. It is 986 8812 5251 for this meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press pound.

Once you've dialed in, you'll be placed in a queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press star 9. This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it's your turn to speak, you will hear a message that says the host would like you to talk. Press star 6 to speak. If you would like to give your name, please state and spell it for the record. You are not required to provide your name to give public comment.
Please make sure to mute your computer or livestream audio to prevent any feedback or distortion during your call. Once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when it is your turn to speak, and again, please turn down the livestream volume.

The Commission is taking public comment on the motion to accept the videography RFP contract at this time, and there are no callers in the queue, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. We will stand by for two minutes to give the video feed time to catch up to us.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: So while we're waiting, Chair, I'd like to --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: -- offer and inform our commissioners and the audience that we're going to try something a little different with our voting. I'm actually going to share my screen, and we have a voting sheet, and I want to make sure that we can see it, and that way, we can record it live. And also, one of the things that I'll mention later is about tracking for why we're doing this. So I'm going to go ahead and share my screen here.

So you'll see that we have a motion number. We're going to be indexing this information. We'll also have the date, and we have the motion itself, who made the
motion, the time of the motion, and then below, you'll see where we'll do the voting.

So when you're ready, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I just wanted to note that it's 1:21 p.m., now a.m., so. I'm asleep at that time. Thank you. That's great. I'm glad that we have this in place.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. I'm not seeing all of the commissioners. There we go. Now, I am. Okay. You can proceed, Director Hernandez.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Thank you. So our administrative assistant will call it out, and I will check the box.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

MR. SINGH: Commissioner Turner?
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.
MR. SINGH: Commissioner Vazquez?
Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.
MR. SINGH: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.
MR. SINGH: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.
MR. SINGH: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.
MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes.
MR. SINGH: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.
MR. SINGH: And Commissioner Kennedy?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.
MR. SINGH: Thank you.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Okay. The motion passes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you very much. That is indeed a helpful addition to our processes here.

Thank you, Director Hernandez.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Still working out some bugs.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Not to be ticky-tacky, but could those of us who are independents, or decline to
state, or no party preference, whatever the label is, could we be noted as that other than "other"?

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yes. I apologize for that. So just to clarify, what would it -- what should it be? No party preference?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, that's fine, or independent, or I mean, I think there was some previous, kind of, debate about what's the right title, but whatever that is, I would just prefer to be named as that.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: I will make that change.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Okay. So that kind of worked out. I have to work out some of the bugs, but I appreciate that very much, and we'll do that moving forward.

So since we're talking about the tracking of documents, in an effort to track recommendations and other documents that are submitted, we're going to do an indexing. And so that's more of an administrative function that we're doing, but I wanted to make you aware of that. So we'll have a little bit more of a tracking mechanism for when motions, or recommendations, or documents are submitted, so that we can reference them either in our minutes and/or on our website as well. And
so we'll have a spreadsheet created so that people can go
and look for that information. It's in the development.
I call this a soft rollout.
So I think many of you received a draft
recommendations form to use. If you have already a
document, you don't have to redo that document, just send
us that information and we'll complete that form for you.
Just something that we're trying to help us in tracking
all the information. Chair Kennedy and I kind of went
through it and feel that this is a necessary tool that
will help us down the road. All right.
Moving on, I wanted to talk about the transcripts.
I've been working with the Finance Administration
Subcommittee, and this is a topic that they will probably
cover a little bit more detail. But I wanted to let you
know that we'll be posting the transcripts as we get
them.
Last week, we had an all-staff meeting. It's the
first all-staff meeting that we've had since we've hired
some additional staff. So it went really well. At least
I think it went really well. It gave us a chance to get
to know each other, which is something that is hard to do
now that we're in this virtual environment that we're in,
but we did go through and discussed our different roles,
one of which is that we are a team that supports the
commission. And so that was very important that we came together on that. This, again, was our first meeting.

We plan on having additional meetings moving forward to go over our processes and procedures, including our workflow, when something is coming in. One of the things that we've realized is that there are a lot of different touchpoints. So it may come in one way, but all the different program areas probably need to be involved at some point, so where that handoff is is going to be very important. And there's more information that I'll be sharing as we move forward in future meetings.

I also wanted to share that one of the things that came out of that is that we really needed to have more of a training, a Bagley-Keene training for our staff. And so Marian and I will be working on creating a PowerPoint to share with the staff that I think we'll also share with the commission when we have that ready to go. Just to give some examples and make sure that we have that information clear for everyone as we move forward with the public input meetings and anything else that comes through.

Lastly, I wanted to -- on this section, I wanted to share that I had a meeting with the Executive Director of the Washington State's Redistricting Commission. It was a Zoom call with Ms. Lisa McLean. She's the Executive
Director of the Washington Redistricting Commission. We talked about the general differences of our two respective commissions. They have a total of five members. We have fourteen. So very different in that respect. But more specifically, she was asking about our mapping experts, and we had just brought on board our line drawers, so I shared that information with her and let her know that we are going to have a line drawer training on April 17th that she can tune in and watch. So that's what I have for the protocols and communications for the commission.

Lastly, we'll talk about the budget. Our fiscal director, John Fitzpatrick, and I have submitted the May revised request to the Department of Finance after you approved the budget last week. You also may recall that I mentioned in a previous meeting that the legislator wanted us to track -- the Legislature wanted us to track costs related to COVID and census delays. So we received a request, a formal request, from the Legislature to provide that information as it relates to the budget projections we provided last meeting. So Director John and I are working on that, and we'll share additional information as we put it together.

And lastly, on outreach updates, we are still conducting recruitment for the outreach coordinator, but
our own outreach manager, Marcy Kaplan, will provide an outreach update shortly.

So I wanted to open it up if you have any questions at this time. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I was just curious as to how many candidates we got for the two executive roles?

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: I believe for the Chief Counsel -- oh.

Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yeah, I was just going to reply. I believe Chief Counsel was three, and then Outreach director, I believe, is five as of Friday.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: And both of those remain open as of this point?

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Until they are filled. We'll pull down the job announcement.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Very good.

Any other questions or comments from Commissioners? Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just want to share that for all the outreach positions, we have shared that with the California Community Colleges because they've got a lot of adjunct staff and others that have lost positions or
that don't have right now teaching assignments because there's been a twenty percent cut in community college attendees. So they're very excited and they've been sharing it throughout their networks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent. Thank you for that.

Okay. Anything else, Director Hernandez?

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: No, thank you. That concludes my report.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Then the Outreach Director's report, we will go to our outreach manager, Ms. Kaplan.

MS. KAPLAN: Good afternoon, Commissioners. Thank you for having me present on outreach efforts. I want to thank you all for the great work that you've been doing to present to organizations across the state. To date, for our redistricting basics presentations, we've received 107 requests and we've completed 49 of those presentations. Thirty of them are upcoming, that have been scheduled, and we are working to schedule the additional requests. So we are in the middle of processing those requests.

I wanted to thank everyone that has worked so hard to make all of these happen. Patricia and Wanda for coordinating; Fredy and Cecilia for promotion and updates to the website; as well as the commissioners for speaking
and helping to promote the presentations. There are so many steps that are involved into getting these events scheduled, as well as logistical coordination prior to the events, and follow up with organizations and commissioners after events to gather recordings and compile feedback from the presentations. So as you have, please continue to respond as soon as possible with Pahtee (ph.) and Wanda, who are leading on the scheduling.

And as noted in the past, we are also very -- we're working very closely with the communications team to post information about upcoming presentations and include any fliers or registration links as well as the recordings from the completing presentations. We're also ensuring that we are maintaining original copies of the recordings as well.

I did want to flag that the requests have continued to come in and we are getting them further and further in advance. For June alone, we have seven submitted requests, four of which have been confirmed. And we're also receiving requests going into July, August, and September. Pahtee has been compiling questions that commissioners have been getting during the redistricting basics presentations, and we should have an updated document for commissioners soon to help support with any
additional questions that may come up during the presentations.

I also want to remind everyone, and those of you who are watching, that the commission is going to be hosting a redistricting basics presentation on April 20th at 2 p.m. with Q&A by phone. It will be streamed on our website and the presentation will also have ASL and closed captioning and it will be recorded. We are also hosting a Spanish presentation on April 26th at 5 p.m.

The communications team has developed a flier for the April 20th presentation and will be sending out a blast to our email list today. They've also been working on social media posts and creating a Facebook event that should be going out also. And so we'll make sure to flag that for all the commissioners to help with promotion. I encourage you all, as we send those out, to take some time to share the flier on social media with your networks and partners that you've been working with in your zones. Staff are also promoting the events to outreach partners, and the communications team is reaching out to media outlets to help with promotion as well. And the email for the Spanish presentation will be going out on Friday and the comms team is going to be working on a Spanish-English flier for that presentation as well.
And I just wanted to talk a little bit more about the field team as Alvaro noted. The field lead positions have gone out. Pahtee and I have been working on onboarding and a workplan for the field team with Alvaro. The positions that did go out were also featured in the April newsletter and in our social media toolkit. But please continue to forward the positions to your networks and encourage people to apply.

As I noted, Pahtee and I are working with Alvaro for work plan on onboarding. The process includes criteria for candidate selection and interviewing, onboarding and training for the initial week, compiling materials and resources that commissioners have created in their outreach efforts so that field staff are following a streamlined approach. And we are utilizing the outreach strategic plan and Commission goals in order be able to work with staff to ensure that we're reaching out to all Californian's and ensuring that we are tracking the communities that they're reaching and also reaching communities facing barriers to participation that have been outlined in the outreach strategic plan.

Additionally, we're looking at how to efficiently track our outreach efforts that field staff will be supporting on, how we can foster collaboration among our outreach staff, sharing lessons learned and best
practices across the zones, as well as leveraging various strengths of team members as they come on board. So we're really excited to grow the team. And I want to thank all of you for your support and encouragement to get the ball moving on bringing those staff on board.

As the outreach and engagement subcommittee also had noted in the past, we are working with USDR to support with the development of an outreach tracking tool, and we hope to have updates on this in the future. And just a few other updates that I will defer to subcommittees to discuss further. I have been working also closely with the language access subcommittee, and they'll be providing an update on materials translation.

Additionally, I've been supporting the outreach and engagement subcommittee with statewide outreach and I will defer to the subcommittee to provide more specific details on recent meetings and upcoming opportunities.

And that's my report. If anyone has --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent. Excellent.

MS. KAPLAN: -- additional questions.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you very much, Ms. Kaplan.

That's useful information both for the Commission and for the public. So I really wanted to thank you for all that.

Any questions or comments from commissioners?
Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I was just curious, Marcy, where on the website is the announcement about the redistricting presentation that is going to be hosted by the commission? Where will that be available for the public to see and to look for? Because I just looked on the homepage and I also looked under outreach, but I wasn't sure whether or not I was looking in the wrong places.

MS. KAPLAN: So we're just finalizing the flier. So I will defer to Fredy. I believe it will likely go on the calendar, but in another location as well to elevate it.

DIRECTOR CEJA: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Fredy?

DIRECTOR CEJA: Yes. So we were finalizing that today. We'll be updating the website throughout this meeting, but we're also doing a Facebook calendar event and we're going to try for the first time to do social media ads. So we will be placing ads inviting folks to our event. We just have to figure out the universe that we want to send it to. And we'll do all that today.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Also one more follow-up question.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Marcy or Fredy, could you just remind me which of the commissioners are going to be doing the presentations? And I apologize if it was already communicated.

MS. KAPLAN: So I will defer to Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, we have a proposal for that. We haven't finalized that. We have a proposal for that. We'll talk about that in the outreach report.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Anyone else?

Okay. Counsel's Report. Marian, do you have anything to share with us at this point?

MS. JOHNSTON: Only that after the Governor announced that California was going to reopen June 15th, I was asked what effect that would have on the commission and its activities. The Governor did issue a explanatory press release last week that doesn't really answer the question about whether the Governor's executive orders on COVID will still be in effect.

But as to workplace, he said workplace policies must promote -- workplaces must promote policies that reduce risk, including improved indoor ventilation and mask wearing, as well as remote work when possible without impacting business operations. So that's that last point
that we'll have to get more information on. I've tried
to find out from the Governor's office when they may make
a decision on the executive orders and I haven't heard
back yet. If the executive orders are lifted, then you
will go back to the Bagley-Keene requirements as written,
which will change substantially your operations. So I'll
keep you informed of that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. On that,
we've had such great luck in terms of accessing many more
people because of the remote, and more people can
actually attend. Is there possible the idea of doing a
hybrid situation that might -- it might actually still
access more people? Can we explore that or you know, is
that even clear?

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes, you certainly could still have
that done by your Zoom meetings in addition to having the
regular public meetings. One problem with that is that
there's supposed to be a commissioner at every remote
location, so I'm not sure how that would work combining
with Bagley-Keene. I assume that's something that could
be worked out, but I think there are ways to go beyond
what Bagley-Keene requires without violating Bagley-
Keene.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. My thinking on that is that a first step for us may be for the seven northern California commissioners to gather in one spot and the seven southern California commissioners to gather in another spot. And that would reduce travel costs to some extent. Hopefully, we could find a location here in Southern California that would be reasonably convenient to the seven of us that would allow for public attendance as well.

MS. JOHNSTON: And to do that, you would --
CHAIR KENNEDY: And then they --
MS. JOHNSTON: -- then have to have your video accessibility at each of those locations as well.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah, so -- sorry. Sorry.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen?
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Since this is going to be a huge economic impact as well, you know, given going the COVID and the other issues, should we -- could the chair assign this to a group, appropriate group, to further look into this possibility?
CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, we no longer have a troubleshooting subcommittee.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Obviously, finance.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sinay?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes, I think we need to look at that, but it'll also be part of the design working group because a lot of our future meetings and other ways of collecting input will be discussed and designed there. So I think that some of that will be -- will come out of there.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. I would anticipate that the Admin and Finance Committee would be looking particularly at the financial implications of this.

Commissioner Fernandez, followed by Commissioner Fornaciari.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Well, in terms of the financial side of it, we had already considered that in the most recent budget that was presented at the last meeting. But I just want to piggyback off Commissioner Andersen. I do think it's something important for us to look into being able to do a hybrid, because it's my understanding once the executive orders are lifted, we would have to meet in person.

I mean, we couldn't -- I couldn't meet from my home unless I'm going to open up my home to people. So I do feel that it should be explored or at least maybe some sort of memo or letter to the Legislature or whoever to try to get into the Governor's ear in terms of when you remove that executive order, maybe reword it in a way
where we can continue as we're doing now, but also meet in person. And we wouldn't have the requirements of if a commissioner could only meet virtually, they wouldn't have to open up their home. Does that make -- I hope that makes sense. Being on the school board, that was always the issue that we had in terms of being able to meet virtually. We had to open up wherever we were. If it was a hotel, if it was in our home, we had to open it up to attend.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. I have Commissioner Fornaciari, Commissioner Sadhwani, and Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Commissioner Fernandez basically said what I was going to say, that we've accounted for, you know, opening up, having public meetings in the budget. And we're -- and to follow up with what Commissioner Sinay said, we're looking at those, you know, what those would look like in our subcommittee. So we'll have a good idea what the cost will be. You know, that's part of the consideration, we'll have a good idea of what the cost will be of a hybrid-type meeting. So that's all.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good, thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I just wanted to
follow up on Commissioner Fernandez had mentioned, like, a memo to the Governor's office or something of that nature. It sounds like Marian's already in touch with them. I know Alvaro and I had also been in touch with the Governor's office earlier, maybe about a month ago or so, as a part of governmental affairs. So whether it's me or Marian or you know, working in collaboration, I'm happy to coordinate that end of it and try and get a more clear response from the Governor's office of what that would look like moving forward. As well as perhaps if the design committee develops what we want that to look like, if there's any way leeway to share that with the Governor's office.

MS. JOHNSTON: And I just wanted to clarify, mine was just a request to the legal affairs office of the attorney -- of the Governor's office to see if they were making any decision and when it might be expected. So I would encourage your government affairs one to directly say what it is the commission would like.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, thank you. In addition to the financial, I think I just want to speak up and say something about despite what the Governor may be lifting in terms of the executive order, I do want to also state that, as much as we're moving towards opening
up as much as we can, I am concerned about the continued chances of new variants and other infections. And I say this even though I have been fortunate enough to now get vaccinated, my husband is still immune compromised and I would like to be very careful about, you know, how much I will expose him to something, even though I would love to meet you all in person. I just want to say that out loud. And I'm sure there are others that would prefer to be safer still until we know for sure what the next few months are going to bring about. So just trying to be cautious.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very much so. Thank you for that.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Building off of what Commissioner Akutagawa was mentioning, you know, I acquired a disability in between applying for and getting selected for the commission. I'm not in a place where health-wise I can travel, and certainly would not be able to open up my home even if I wanted to for public attendance, even in a nominal way, even if no one showed up. So.

Also, if we can -- I think there's a way to also frame this to folks we're working with on the policy to say that, you know, this is an opportunity for California to reshape accessibility to government. And so we have a
commissioner with a disability who can't, you know, attend in-person meetings but is otherwise able and willing to serve on the commission. And Bagley-Keene as it is, is restrictive for my participation in government for which I was selected to do so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that. So I would like the Government Affairs Subcommittee to work on a draft letter to the Office of the Governor. And I would encourage commissioners -- Commissioner Akutagawa, Commissioner Vazquez, anyone else who has input for that letter to channel it through our Legal Counsel. And so the Government Affairs Subcommittee will be working with Legal Counsel on drafting that letter. And then we can review that as soon as it's ready.

Commissioner Fernandez, had you raised your hand?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I did. I was just going to commend Commissioner Vazquez. I think that what she just mentioned would be great language to put into the letter. So thank you so much.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, exactly.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you very much. It's been a very, very good conversation. Could I also include the public input committee, who in their designs and ideas, if they could, that could be also incorporated
into this letter? Because I know they've done a lot of thought down this process, and I'd like to make sure we capture these wonderful ideas. So thank you very much for the very thoughtful comments, and very appropriate.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Marian, is there anything else? Are there updates on any cases regarding release of census results?

MS. JOHNSTON: Not that I've heard. There have been some articles written about the use of the differential privacy. That's not the right language, or is that the right -- what it's called? But I don't think there's been any litigation on it. There are some rumors about when the reapportionment information will be issued; hopefully, later this month. But no precise date on that and no further information on what the census timeline is.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you so much.

Then Director Ceja, it is time for the Communication Director's Report, please.

DIRECTOR CEJA: Thank you so much. I wanted to start off by letting the commissioners know that we did receive public comment. It is posted on our website. And I did update that letter from the recommendations for selection of CRC grantees that was alluded to earlier in public comment. So it is now up. I think it was stuck
in our email system, but we have it and it's posted. We also have a public comment from Mr. Bill Head, from Rajeev Singh, and Diane Griffiths, and Stacey Reardon, who represent our legislative partners in Sacramento.

Also wanted to let you know that during the past week, Commissioner Kennedy spoke to the Michigan Capitol Reporter; he did an interview with them. Commissioner Taylor spoke to Lake County News. Commissioner Yee spoke to the Valley Mirror. And Commissioner Sinay and Ahmad did a dual interview with Desert Review. And Commissioner Yee and Andersen spoke to Coast News. And finally, Commissioner Kennedy spoke to KVCR NPR affiliate in the Inland Empire. So those are the interviews that we did the week prior.

I wanted to give you an update on what's going on with the CRC training video. We did have to include two additional slides to mirror the presentation that we updated. So we have a slide that tells folks what we want from COI information so that they can properly describe their community when they're giving us feedback. And the other one, the other slide was regarding language access.

So those two are going to be integrated into the video. I should have the final cut today, so I'll send it out to everyone for your review. And if it's good to
go, then we can start using it for those occasions where commissioners are not available to go out and present. And we can just send the link out that will have all your faces on there. You all did a great job of putting that together, so thank you.

I'm still shopping around the op ed. We did send it to one media outlet; they rejected it. So we're going to continue on to shop it around. This op ed is just letting folks know what we're doing with our extra time while we wait for the census data. And as you can see by the number of presentations that you all are doing, you're doing an amazing job. So that number is only going to increase. And hopefully, we'll be able to penetrate a larger portion of the California community so that they can get involved in the redistricting process.

I did send the final edits to our designer for the business cards. I had a poll going around to see what information you wanted on your business cards. I think I've got it all figured out. So I sent the final version to the designer and I'll get you that final proof sometime this week so you can give it a final okay before it goes to the printer.

And then lastly, just wanted to highlight the newsletter that we've put together. It was substantially nicer looking and had a lot more information this month
than we did last month. So I want to continue pushing out an amazing newsletter recapping what we're doing on a monthly basis. So if you have any stories or any issues that you want to highlight, please let me know. Cessie (ph.) and I will be working on the content for the next one, and also creating graphics so that it looks amazing when it goes out to our constituency.

And lastly, just wanted to end with the final number of contacts that we have in our system with Nation Builder. We started off with a contact list of 4,000, we are now at 10,100, so people are interested in what we're doing. So I plan to continue growing that database so that more people know what we're doing on a daily basis. And that's it for my report if anyone has questions, comments.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, congratulations on that milestone. That really is an achievement. And we want to thank you for your hard work on behalf of the commission. That really is something that we can celebrate today.

DIRECTOR CEJA: Awesome. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Unless there are any further questions or comments regarding staff reports, we will move into our subcommittee updates.

First of all, Government Affairs and Census.
Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sorry, I know number 9 is actually the line drawer update. We're hoping that this position -- this will be filled and our next meetings keep on going, by the line drawer with a quick topic of the flavor of the day. At this point, I'm just going to give you a quick update with who the line drawer I've been working with, which is they've connected with the data management group on Friday, and we'll probably continue to meet with them on Fridays. They're having a public meet -- the public input meeting design group this coming Wednesday, which will be very productive. And the other item is -- so they are on board. It's a wonderful moving forward.

And the other item is this -- the public input letter regarding from the Legislature, regarding that their possible redistricting tool. I would ask the chair to bring that letter to the attention of the Data Management Subcommittee, the Public Input Meeting Design Subcommittee, and the technical side of the line drawing subcommittee for its implication in those areas. So if that's a -- and that's sort of a quick summary. That is my summary.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I just want to --
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- make a motion to you or
to the chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I will discuss with Director
Hernandez and we will make sure that that letter gets
referred to the appropriate subcommittees. Thank you.

Government Affairs and Census -- Commissioner
Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So I read the letter. So
they're going to be putting -- they're going to be
putting in these centers to collect input? Do we know
when they will know what the plan is? No, we don't know?

CHAIR KENNEDY: If I can answer from the perspective
of the COI Tool Subcommittee, the information that we've
received from the Statewide Database is that public
access centers -- redistricting access centers opening to
the public would depend on both state and local health
rules. And so at this point, they are not in a position
to give us any specific dates on opening to the public.

Now, that doesn't mean that they wouldn't -- that the
staff wouldn't be working from those locations
necessarily, hey might, in that the public access center
managers would be the ones responding to technical
support calls coming in to the communities of interest
tool, so.
Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I was caught a little off guard by that memo just because we haven't had a conversation at the redistricting. And we have been having conversations with statewide outreach -- with groups as part of the statewide outreach. And we've been having some conversations at the design level.

Is there still room to talk about how -- what is the best way, effectively and efficiently, to do this? Because we did talk to the California Library Association and they're very interested in helping out. They already have the locations. They already have the staff. They already have the computers. And they're already a trusted place for communities to go. They just need training and materials.

And so it seems much more efficient and effective to use the budget in that way. And it'll be more than just six places versus these six. So I guess the big question is, do we have the -- do we -- is this required upon us or is there still time for conversations and thinking through how this is done?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Again, if I can respond based on my understanding with my Communities of Interest Tool Subcommittee hat on, we have spoken with Statewide Database. This is something that they were funded to do
by the Legislature. They have communicated this to us. I don't see any barriers to us channeling our suggestions to them.

I will say that they established -- they made contact with not only the State Library and State Library Association, but also most, if not all of the fifty-eight separate county library systems, and reported to us that the reactions varied. That some were very interested and able; some were interested, but not able; and some were -- maybe because they, you know, weren't able because of space constraints or staffing constraints or budget constraints or whatever, they just didn't get much engagement from some of the county library systems.

I have asked for additional information on that effort from the Statewide Database. We are hoping to receive that information, and we can pass that along to you and to the rest of the commission. But yeah, the establishment of the access centers is something that predates the formation of this commission. And with COVID, my understanding is that a decision was made to just kind of put everything on ice. And it's only recently where the public health situation has begun to improve that Statewide Database started to dust off its planning on this.

So that's kind of where we are and why we are where
we are on that. And there may be some additional
details, excuse me, in the memo that Commissioner
Akutagawa and I have submitted and that was posted today.

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you for that, Chair.
I just want to make sure that in this memo, it's -- this
is not -- the access centers are not strictly for the COI
tool. It's for a redistricting access. So it's a
twofold issue, and hence, it has a lot of -- it affects
all these other commissions and all the other
subcommittees. So possibly, we need to create -- I don't
know if we need another subcommittee other than the COI
tool or this would be an addition to the COI tool slash
redistricting access center. I don't know. But it's
certainly an issue that I think we'd like to get involved
in at the early stage so we don't run into further
complications or duplicate efforts. So.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that.

Commissioner Akutagawa and then Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, Commissioner
Andersen, I think the concerns that you brought up, I
think, are similar to what Commissioner Kennedy and I did
have. My understanding is that these redistricting
access centers are really primarily -- and I would say
almost solely to be for use to access the communities of
interest tool that the Statewide Database -- I know it says -- I know it says other redistricting websites. I am aware of that. But my understanding from the conversation is that that is pretty secondary.

The main role of those redistricting access centers are for the COI tool, making that more accessible. Because we asked similar questions, too. And the money is assigned directly to the Statewide Database. It's not a commission pot of money. It was -- it's directly from the Legislature, directly to the Statewide Database, for the purposes of these redistricting centers.

And the current staff that are hired right now, their current role is basically to be the tech support. So when -- right now, when people do go on to the communities of interest tool and they need support, like they have questions, they call on the phone, they ask questions through the chat on the COI tool, these managers are the ones that are basically now addressing the questions and fielding the inquiries and the requests for help right now. So that's really what their main role has been there to do.

That's as far as I know. We could find out and gain for the clarity about this other part. And make sure that we're correct on what we heard.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And again, just to highlight, the
funding for the redistricting access centers was provided to the Statewide Database before the 2020 CRC came into existence. And then because of COVID, things were put on ice. And you know, so we were developing our strategic outreach plan not knowing that this was, you know, had been shelved, because we weren't in existence yet at the time that it was shelved.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. Thank you, Chair.

And I appreciate hearing about it being predetermined and funding coming directly from a source outside of this commission. I just wanted to name, though, any time there is an effort named as, one, as solution for people being able to engage and participate in the process, it does sort of set in the mind that this was something else done to accommodate. And because of the shift, and because of COVID in that it's not as many areas that they would typically like, I just want to name that having a center in the Central Valley in Fresno does more of a disservice to those that won't have that same access that are two and a half hours away from, you know, end to end of where the Central Valley is. And I would imagine it would may be the same in some of the other areas.

So I just want to name that though it could be a benefit to some, it's a benefit that's not accessible to
a lot. So I wanted to say that in hopes of Commissioner Sinay, when she talked about the access to the libraries, that it would be a little bit more spread out. And I know it's not an either or. I just want to again, Commissioner Sinay, say that I'm very much in support of us making another go round at the libraries that perhaps did not respond initially in hopes that they will respond and utilize the services that they have also lifted up so that people will have access and they will be able to go in-person to these centers. So great for the places that they're going to be, but a little bit inaccessible for many people in the area.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner, yes. I mean, this really is -- it validates what some of us have been thinking and saying for quite some time, which is that the libraries -- local libraries and the community college network could really add to our footprint, if you will. And making these tools and the whole redistricting process so much more accessible to people throughout California. So you know, we understand that library systems and community colleges have their own constraints that they are operating within, but we really are eager to find ways that we can work with these institutions that have such a bigger footprint throughout the state to help us expand our efforts.
Commissioner Sinay and then Commissioner -- okay, Commissioner Turner, you can continue. Then I'll have Commissioner Sinay and Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. And the one other piece is I'm wondering if we have data -- and I assume it probably was looked at from the Census Bureau that established local access areas. And I'm wondering how well they were utilized when there were special centers set up just for census for people to walk in outside of sources such as libraries and what have you. Not so much to shift what they can do right now, but even to inform going forward. Is it worth the investment to put in the lax, and if people are actually utilizing those spaces, or are we just renaming something that has happened before hoping that it's working? I think we should have some data from census now that'll tell us if people are actually utilizing the spaces.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right, thank you.

Ms. Kaplan, do you have any quick response on that?

MS. KAPLAN: So the California complete count census 2020 office had an extensive plan for questionnaire census assistance centers. Unfortunately, as the census launch was when the state went into lockdown and quite extensively the -- all of the -- for the most part, a lot of the questionnaire assistance centers were not able to
open and organizations pivoted. Groups explored other opportunities to do questionnaire assistance in the field, doing kind of a roving model, doing work outside of -- I know some partners, you know, tabled outside of grocery stores and identified ways to integrate questionnaire assistance where folks were coming for other services that were open during COVID.

The libraries did have an extensive plan. They were a key partner that were, you know, many libraries were planning on utilizing computers for questionnaire assistance. But all of that really had to pivot because of that. There was a whole, you know, training and model and process developed for those centers as well. That all kind of pivoted during COVID.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good, thank you.

Commissioner Sinay and then Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So this is kind of part of our outreach report, our subcommittee report. But the -- kind of Marcy and Commissioner Ahmad and I have actually gotten to go pretty deep on the library piece, and they keep opening more and more doors. And so I just want to -- I want to put that out there.

And the other piece is the design working group for the subcommittee, the design input -- public input design subcommittee, the whole -- the second half of our meeting
will be focused on leveraging assets. And I think that's really one of the conversations we keep trying to have is leveraging assets. So even if the budget didn't come to us, I would hope that we would really look at the values that we've created of being as inclusive and engaging and accessible, and think through how to leverage assets. We know not all libraries will take this on, but having spoken to some of the rural libraries, they're very excited for something like this and that's where we really need it.

So just want to -- I know I'm harping on something you all believe in, but I just wanted to say that we have been invited to the California Library Association to do a presentation. We're thinking through how we're going to do the presentation so that it inspires librarians to want to be part of this. We need to discuss, you know, what type of training and stuff like that. But we are going deep in this path and it would be great to have the Statewide Database as our partner in this effort.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent, thank you.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah, I do want to address that part about the libraries. You know, we got it -- it's pretty deep into some of these conversations, and I -- it's sounding like, you know, it might just be
useful to have the Statewide Database, you know, maybe
Jaime come and join us and answer questions directly from
the commissioners.

Because I will say that I think one of the concerns
that we had is are we working at cross-purposes? I think
some of the language that was used, we were like, wait,
wait a minute. We're, you know, we're crossing over and
creating some confusion. But I think in having talked to
Jaime at the Statewide Database, we did have a lot of our
concerns alleviated, at least more clarity.

I hear what you're saying about the libraries. You
know, a couple of the things that I want to just point
out that Jaime had brought up is that she did -- I mean,
basically what she was doing is she reached out to all
the various library systems. And I learned one thing,
there is not, like -- you know, there is multiple library
systems like there are multiple everything, right? I
mean, so it's not like at a California state level, you
know, so we could just go to a -- you know, someone at a
library commission and say, okay, we want to do this.

So some of it -- because we were trying to address
some of the concerns we had in some of the more rural
areas where they were not going to be putting in, you
know, a redistricting access center. We were pretty
concerned about that. But one of the things she did say
is that the responsiveness of different libraries varied. And part of it came down to resources. You know, some of these libraries are pretty small. You know, as much as we think it's a great idea to just say, hey, you know, can you just allow, you know, someone to maybe help answer some of these questions around redistricting? We were -- or I should say she was quickly, I think, educated that it's not quite as easy as just telling somebody, hey, can you do this? Because they are doing other work in the libraries.

And so you know, even the access to a computer. And one of the things that we were told is that, you know, it has to be a dedicated computer or desktop that would be for the Communities of Interest tool. And that's something that some of the smaller libraries are not able to do. They have limited numbers of laptops or actually desktops. And so they can't have it not be accessible to somebody who might need to use it.

So you know. And then we got into questions around, well, you know, do you give them a computer as part of the money that they got? I mean, there's all different kinds of questions like this that we did try to work through, at least as it pertained to the libraries. But I think it might just be helpful for the sake of clarity, perhaps, you know, I propose that if -- you know, anyone
from the Statewide Database is listening and if they have
time, whether it's today while it seems like we've just
kind of preempted our COI subcommittee report. Maybe,
you know, during that time, if Jaime or someone else
could come in, maybe just join us and help answer these
questions, that might just be helpful for the
commissioners.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. This brings up an
interesting quagmire for -- I mean, dilemma for me. They
both will be at the design subcommittee as our line
drawers, and I'm trying to figure out how we manage that
relationship between Statewide Database and line drawers.
And so that -- I mean, I'm going to put it out there. So
I'm just trying to figure that piece out because this --
I think this is a better conversation at the design -- I
mean, others may have questions, but it's already on the
agenda so we can move it over to this meeting. That's
not an issue. But how do we manage those two
relationships besides just sending emails to different
addresses?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I can't speak for Karin or
Jaime, certainly. But in the conversations Jane and I
have had with them, it does seem that they do have a
desire to separate those two bodies of work to the extent
possible. Certainly, I don't think that requires two
different log-ins or anything of that nature. But
perhaps just separating the conversations on your agenda
so that, you know, at one point you're talking about the
COI tool and that outreach and the Statewide Databases
present for that conversation. And later talking about
community input sessions. That's a Q2 haystack
consideration so I might just recommend that at this
point in time. But certainly, it's something that we,
you know, that we should be asking Karin and learning
more about how she would like to interact in this way,
given the dual roles.

I can just note that in that conversation that
Commissioner Andersen and I had with them last week, that
there have been -- they do have questions for us also
about how we want them to present themselves to us. Even
things like, do we want them to use a Wedrawthelines
background or a Q2 or a haystack background. They have
not done so. They are looking for direction from us.
For me personally, I don't have a strong feeling on that.
So I put that out there if others do, to please let us
know.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good, thank you.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes, actually, there is a bit -- Commissioner Sadhwani and I, unfortunately, have had a bit of a tough time trying to get together to work on several of these items. We actually have specifically been asked to try to do our best to keep Statewide Database in one column, and the line drawers in another. Even to the point where if they need to come on different days with different hats on, we should try to work that out for not only our budget purposes, for the public in general, because they're two separate entities. And when we're dealing with the Statewide Database, that is not Q2 and Jaime tends to lead on all those conversations. Karin tends to come in as our line drawer. And that's something that we are going to work out a little bit, and also with the Finance Committee.

So as far as the meeting, be on Wednesday, I don't -- I recommend we do not sort of blindside the Statewide Database side of that group and actually has it as a separate conversation. And even forward this information to them now ahead of time. So but yes, for the whole -- with everyone, please keep that in mind. There are two different groups. It just so happens that some of the people work for both. So thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.
Anything further on this?

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah, I'm just going to name that I don't think it's really uncommon to have to wear multiple hats. And I think if they just name just what we've said, you know, speaking to you from Haystack Q2, that's my role right now, or if they're speaking from the Statewide Database. I think naming that going into the conversation, I don't think they'll cross communication as they're talking. And if we go into a space naming this is who they are representing at this time, I think we can track that as well. So I just wanted to name that. I don't think it's so odd. And so I just think we need to be clear with the role that they're speaking in the time they're providing counsel.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good, thank you.

Any other questions or comments? If not, let's go ahead and break and come back promptly at 2:45 and we'll get into the subcommittee updates -- further into the subcommittee updates.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

CHAIR KENNEDY Thank you, everyone.

Welcome back from the break. We are going to launch into our subcommittee updates at this point.

First up is Government Affairs; Commissioners
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. So I'll just start off and talk a little bit about the census update and then, Commissioner Toledo, please chime in. I know you have a number of other pieces you're working on.

So the last time that we met, on the 29th, I believe it was of March, we had a panel of folks talking about the impact of the delayed census and delayed maps and what that would have for them. I'd love to hear a little bit of feedback from commissioners just as a way of following up on that conversation.

And -- but beforehand, I'll just give a couple of short updates. Last week, I was able to touch base both with Karin Mac Donald in her Statewide Database capacity as well as Lori Shellenberger from Common Cause. Both are hearing that the census anticipates releasing the legacy data during the week of August 16th to the 20-something. And I apologize, I don't have that date in front of me, but during that week.

That then puts us in a predicament because we do need to set a date for when we will deliver the maps, I believe, I should note, because so many different components flow from the finalization of those maps, as we heard last time. Given that it looks like it will be sometime between August 6th and later that week, that
would put us, according to the Supreme Court decision,
somewhere between December 31st and January 4th.

My understanding from Ms. Shellenberger is that
community groups are not liking that timeline, as we
heard from the individual, Mr. Johnson, I believe it was,
who called in from the SEIU this morning. There is a
central concern from community groups about us finalizing the
maps during the holidays. While I understand that
concern, I'm not sure what more we can or cannot do to
extend our deadline further. So I do want to put that
out there, and I would love to hear people's feedback.

The next steps, as I see them, is a secondary
meeting of all of those stakeholders. I am of the
understanding that many of them would like to have
another meeting, and so I'm going to work on planning
that out either for later this week or next week.
Followed by hopefully, some more concrete recommendations
that this subcommittee can bring to the full commission
for discussion and possible action.

As I see it right now, to me, that recommendation
certainly would include at least one option that would
have our deadline falling between December 30th and
January 4th, depending upon when we receive that census
data. Or if the census is not going to put out a
specific date, if they can't hold themselves to a date, I
still am of the belief that we need to select a date in which we would finalize. And given the legal ramifications of this, I would tend towards the more conservative of December 31st.

Alternatively, I think that there are some who want us to further explore questions around whether or not the Supreme Court decision was ambiguous, the ability to use the legacy data. I think those are possible legal options that we could take. Although Marian and I did have a chance to communicate a little bit this weekend, and I think she and I are both in agreement that the Supreme Court ruling was not particularly ambiguous.

I don't know if Marian, if you want to weigh in on this matter, but we would love to have your counsel and guidance on this.

And then I would love to hear from commissioners, also. If you have strong opinions about it, it would be helpful for us to know as we continue to move forward this conversation.

Marian?

MS. JOHNSTON: As you know, the commission in the case initiated by the Legislature asked the California Supreme Court to delay because of COVID. And the reason we had to ask for a delay is because the timelines are in the California Constitution. It's not something that can
be changed by statute. What the Court said was at that
time, they expected the census to be released by July
31st. Then based on the July 31st, they gave the
commission the exact time that it would have had if it
had come out, as it should have, on April 1st. And they
said that the first draft maps were due November 1st, and
the commission maps were due December 15th.

They did anticipate the possibility that the census
would be later than that. And they were pretty clear, I
don’t think there’s any ambiguity in it. It says if the
federal government transmits the census data to the state
later than July 31st, the number of days of additional
delay shall be considered to be additional federal delay.
In the event additional federal delay occurs, the
Commission is directed to release the first preliminary
statewide maps by no later than the date following
November 1st that extends the November 1st deadline by
the additional federal delay.

So it specifically says if you take the amount of
delay after July 31st and you add that to the November
1st deadline. And it said the same thing for the maps,
saying that to approve and certify the final maps by no
later than the date following December 15th that extends
the December 15th deadline by the additional federal
delay.
And the problem is that if you do not do your maps on time, you lose the ability to do maps. It then gets turned over to the California Supreme Court by the Constitution again. So I don't think there's any ambiguity. I don't know how you can -- I think you should go with the earliest possible date. And if it turns out that the Census Bureau does not release them until later in August, you can have a few extra days added on, but I would certainly advise you to take the earliest possible date and work from that as your operating plan until you know there's going to be additional time.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah, thank you for that. The one thing that I don't think the court and the groups and the Legislature had contemplated was that the census might release data that were not immediately usable. So the census is now telling us that they are going to release legacy data. And my understanding from Karin Mac Donald is the data that make up that legacy data set are not immediately usable in the sense that they can't immediately start reallocating.

So instead of needing approximately one month to turn the data over to us, they would need approximately six or six and a half weeks to turn the data over to us. So we're losing time that was not anticipated to be lost.
And so the question then would become, is there a way to interpret or to get the Supreme Court to clarify that the ruling means for us that it is -- when the actual P.L. 94171 data come out rather than the legacy data.

Marian?

MS. JOHNSTON: The problem with trying to do that is that the Court doesn't refer to the Public Law. It simply says the release of census data. And from what Karin told us last time, my understanding from what she said is that this is a census data. It may not be in the preferred form but it is the actual census data. So I don't know how -- I don't think that argument would be successful. Based on the information that Karin gave us last time.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani or others?

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. You know, I think we're going to certainly continue talking with the other stakeholders -- the key stakeholders as we see them. I think Ms. Shellenberger has most certainly raised the concerns from many of the community groups, particularly those who wish to present to us full district maps themselves.

And I think that's really the key piece here is we're going to capture lots of community input prior to
the release of census data. Right? We have the planning for those meetings already being established. And that's regardless of the census data. The key piece that I think will be a challenge, where groups will get a squeeze, are those more statewide groups that plan to engage in and actually drafting full on district maps.

I do want to make sure that we have the time for those folks to get those maps. For them to think about the maps that they would like to present to us. I certainly -- I think we've been talking about that from the very get go. That that's an important part of our process.

But at the same time, just as we are feeling the squeeze and others are feeling the squeeze, given all of the delays in the census, I do think that we need to have that as a common conversation with many of those groups who are planning to do that work. To come up with a realistic timeline for them as well as for us that still keeps us within the boundaries of the law.

And so this is where I really welcome feedback or input from commissioners as we continue to advance this conversation. If folks are feeling strongly one way or another. There's certainly many difference pieces to contemplate in this. I think as the caller from SEIU this morning laid out very appropriately, right? That
there could be impact for a certain communities if we
move the primary. There's impact for communities if we
don't. Right? If we limit the time that community
groups have to engage in the process and engagement
census data themselves. So there's no one easy
situation -- one easy answer. But ultimately, we as a
commission need to develop one answer.

And I do think it's extraordinarily important that
at some point in the very near future we do set that date
and stick to it, presuming the census data comes when
we're anticipating from here on out.

So if there's any additional feedback for the
Subcommittee at this point, we are putting on the agenda
for our next meeting, which I believe is April 28th, to
have a follow up conversation and potential action;
assuming that we don't any new or changing information.
Certainly the information from this census has changed
dramatically over the last few months.

So our hope is to have a more robust conversation --
just a structured conversation on the 28th. As well as a
potential action. And we'll aim to lay out a set of
potential action items for the Commission to consider.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I would just add, this
is a difficult situation that we're in, that the whole
state is in -- the country's in. And I do -- I would
want a meaning -- we all want meaningful engagement from
the community. That's what we're spending so much time
on and developing plans for.

And it's important for us to really do as much as we
can in terms of outreach and education over the summer.
As much of it to educate individuals about the shortened
timeline if we do move forward with a December 31st
deadline, so that we can try to get as much engagement as
possible.

At that same time, I also think that we would
welcome -- the committee would welcome -- both -- we had
this conversation earlier. Alternate legal views on the
matter. So if there are community groups that are
interested in providing that in public comment, we would
welcome it and we would review it as well and take that
into consideration.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I'm going to exercise --
Commissioner Fornaciari?

Mr. FORNACIARI: It's -- I was going to comment on
your timeline so I could save that until you talk about
your timeline.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, I was going to exercise some
prerogative in bring that to the table at this point.
Bring the Gantt Chart Subcommittee report to top of the
list now. After which, I think it would be a good time
to take public comment. So unless there are other
comments I would draw people's attention -- Commissioner
Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. I'd like to hear just a
little bit more about the new adjusted expected census
deadline. It's seems like this now is about a half a
week later than maybe we were anticipating before. I
guess the week of August 16 through 20 maybe? And then
even that is still not clear. That's still a range.
It's not an actual date. So I'm just curious to hear a
little bit more about the nature of that -- of that guess
or that -- where that information is coming from and how
certain can we be at that point -- at this point.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Just to respond, both Karin,
Mac Donald, and Lori Shellenberger, had mentioned that
they were receiving input that this was the case I think
often this information is coming out -- and I don't
recall the specifics of where they heard that from -- but
often some representative of the census will be doing
some sort of public comment somewhere, and then they'll
drop some dates. That has often been how things seem to
have been rolled out or information has been rolled out,
unfortunately.

So both -- having two separate conversations, I did
get that same information. I think we still certainly need to verify that and hopefully the Census Bureau will proved a date. But it's not clear to me if they will settle on the 16th, the 18th, the 19th? It's not -- it's not clear at this point in time.

Which is why I didn't want to come with any formal recommendations at this point in time because information just continues to kind of slowly roll in. But that being said, the time is of the essence. Because if we were to move in such a direction in which the primary needs to be moved, there are many things that need to happen to achieve that. Right? The Legislature would have to act to do that. So we do need to come to some agreements in the near future with the best information that we have available. And so hopefully we can -- we can shore up some additional information about the -- when the census will release that legacy data.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Ahmad and then Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. I really appreciate this discussion. Is this something that we can just ask the Census Bureau or are we under the assumption that once they know they will release a date?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: We haven't been in -- oh. Sorry. Go ahead. Can I?
CHAIR KENNEDY: No, go ahead. I was -- to recognize you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. We haven't -- Commissioner Toledo and I haven't been in touch with the Census Bureau directly. The Statewide Database, however, is in communication with them on a very regular basis. Which is why we often refer, or defer to Karim because she has those pre-existing relationships with the Census Bureau. So I think she's really the one getting the best information. Most certainly I can follow up with her and ask her to push them for that date. But I think, also, because there are lawsuits pending in other states against the Census Bureau, I think they have many considerations, of course. This is a nationwide issue. And not unique only to California. Although, of course we are disproportionately impacted given our large size.

But I will certainly continue to coordinate with the Statewide Database to try and get additional information.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. I have Commissioner Andersen followed by Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Yes. This is obviously very important to everybody involved. But I don't see this as such a huge -- I mean -- okay. Basically, we are going to get this data that we can't actually use. But for another -- no one can use it for
another couple of weeks. But regardless, our clock
starts ticking. And the date is going to be -- obviously
it doesn't look like we're going to -- actually December
30th won't be the date. But the -- sort of the latest
it's going to ever be, because they're not saying, well,
now it's -- we're not going to touch legacy until
September -- is going say be by August 31st, which is a
January 15 date.

So maybe I'm misunderstanding, but all the scenarios
from the last presentation where, as long as it's before
that January 15th, everything will still work. We don't
have to do this massive reconstructing of all the
electrical processes. If it was February 15th, that was
the big problem.

So unfortunately, we all do not like the idea of it
going through the holidays, but the calendar is the
calendar. And if it's December 31st, or January 14th, or
January 12th or something -- a week here or there, that's
going to eventually happen. And I don't think cutting
ourselves off by -- if we have those extra days. That
just means there'll be a last -- no -- one go around,
won't be able to happen.

And that's what I'm concerned about. Not just with
the large input groups, but for individuals who have
issues that they notice about one of our maps. And
then -- oh, but we've arbitrarily made this December 31st
date -- well, we could have to the 10th of January or
something that would still work with the election issues.
That -- we'd hurt more people than if we actually pick a
date. I don't know how -- a little bit more information
I guess is if January 10th is just too late we need to
know that as opposed to -- I mean, December 31st,
everyone can make that. But how far into January will it
just blow up? I think is the issue. Because otherwise,
I don't think we need to spend so much time worrying
about the specificity of it. But that's what I saw, so.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.
Commissioner Fornaciari?
Mr. FORNACIARI: Yeah. A few things.
In response to the -- to the date, if you look at
Commissioner Kennedy's schedule he put here, if we get it
on August -- the date on August 15th; which is not going
to happen. But let's just say the 15th. That's fifteen
days. So December 15 plus fifteen is December 30th.
I mean that's -- that's our deadline. Unless we get
some relief from that, we don't -- I agree with Marian's
assessment. That's beyond our control. But I will -- I
mean -- I put a lot of time maybe thinking what the
schedule should look like for the input design meeting.
And Ray -- sorry, Commissioner Kennedy was doing the same
thing at the same time. So we came to the same place. But I think the way that Commissioner Kennedy has laid out the schedule, it gives six weeks after we get the data before we put out our first draft maps. In the preliminary discussions that Commissioner Sinay and I have had with some of the groups that seems reasonable within the schedule that they want to have.

But I just want to alert the rest of the Commission that this -- this is going to be the conversation we have for the first half of the public input design meeting on Wednesday. We've invited community groups to come in and talk to us about what their process is, what their entire process is, right? The pre-census process but also the post-census process. What they're going to do, how much time they envision needing, and to get done what they want to get done, and how they envision interacting with us.

And so we're having a conversation to inform the design group, but it's also there to inform this conversation too. So I'll just -- would encourage everyone who's not on the committee, if they get a chance to tune in, and hear that conversation.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari. Okay. Are we ready to -- Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: One last little thing. If
the public is all listening to this very detailed
cornerstone we're having and the angst we're going
through, I have a shameful -- shameless push. Just
please use the communities of interest tool now. Don't
wait until after the census data has gotten there. Do it
now. And we have your information. And you don't even
have to worry about this part, so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that. Okay. So let's
move to discussion of the timeline scenarios document
that was posted this morning. And my apologies for the
late posting of this. I did develop this in consultation
with Ms. Mac Donald. And so this is -- the intent was to
help us think through these scenarios and work backwards
from these to a full blown Gantt Chart. But it didn't
make sense to me to try to put everything in the Gantt
Chart when there's still this level of uncertainty on the
various scenarios.

So there are three columns; legacy data in two of
them and the full P.L. 94171 data in the final column.

So if census data were to be released --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Chair, could you please
share --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Could you please share your
screen for the public?
CHAIR KENNEDY: I would have to pull it up on my screen first and then share it. Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Would you like me to share it?

CHAIR KENNEDY: That would be wonderful.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Oh. Okay. I can do it. I have it up.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Thank you. So if the census data were released on the 15th of August -- and the reason I set it up this way is if we're moving a couple of days one way or another from any of these dates, it's easy enough to come up with the new results.

But this was -- this was to give us a sense moving forward. And originally there was another column for receiving legacy data on the 15th of September, but Ms. Mac Donald was correct in pointing out that if they got -- if they were to get the legacy data on the 15th of September and the P.L. 94171 data were only coming out two weeks later, there would be no need to do anything with the legacy data. Because the P.L. 94171 data would come out in a usable format, just at the same time as they would be able to get the legacy data into that same usable format. So that's why there's no column for census data being received on the 15th of September.

So then the next row is calculation of the additional Federal delay, which as we've been reminded is
the length of time after the 15th of December that the
final maps would be due; also the length of time after
the first of November that the first set of preliminary
draft maps would be due.

So this includes the two weeks to reformat the
legacy data in the first two columns. There would be no
need to reformat legacy data in the final column. The
one month approximately for Statewide Database to do its
reallocations.

And so we have three scenarios for when the
Commission would receive data. We have the 28th of
September, the 14th of October, and the 30th of October.
And between the 28th of September in the first column and
the 16th of November, my count is that's seven weeks to
prepare the first full set of preliminary maps. So seven
weeks, forty-nine days. If we were to take one day a
week off, if, that would mean we would need to be going
through something on the order of four to five districts
a day. Assuming we have in excess of a 175 districts to
be drawn.

So that's already a heavy lift to get through that
many districts per day, consistently, throughout that
seven week period.

So the first preliminary maps would be presented by
the Commission no later than the 16th of November and
then be on hold for public review until the 30th of November. So that period would include Thanksgiving.

But if some of the groups are looking at developing their own maps to feed into our process, then presumably they would want to be sharing those complete maps with us before the 16th of November. So before Thanksgiving.

The maps would be on hold -- our maps would be on hold for public review through the end of November, and then we would have until the 26th of December, the day after Christmas, to prepare the final maps.

And again, any other groups that wanted to be providing input into that phase would have that same -- well, would actually want to get their maps and comments to us before the 26th of December because that's the deadline that our maps have to be ready.

We then have the three-day period for those final maps to be on hold for public review before presenting them to the Secretary of State on the 30th of September. So that's what that timeline would look like.

Marion?

MS. JOHNSTON: Just one correction I would offer is that the hold on the Commission doing any other maps only applies after the first draft maps. There is supposed to be a three-day review period after you put out your final maps. But you could still modify them during that three-
day period if there's a need to.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that. The second scenario would have the Statewide Database receiving data on the 31st of August, forwarding data to us by the 14th of October. We would be preparing the first full set of preliminary maps by the 2nd of December. Those maps would be on hold through the 16th of December. Preparation of the final maps between the 16th of December and the 11th of January finalized and submitted by the 15th of January.

My own personal observation is, if anything, this middle scenario looks more difficult than the first scenario.

And then finally, based on the P.L. 94171 data arriving to Statewide Database on September 30th, we would have those data by the 30th of October, preparing the first set of preliminary maps by the 1st of January; which actually gives us more time than in these other scenarios, because there's no need for the two weeks for reformatting.

The maps would be on hold for public review for the first half of January, essentially. We would then have through the 10th of February to prepare the final maps and until the 14th of February to submit to the Secretary of State. We know that that causes problems as far as
the collection administration calendar, but certainly
would give us more time between the receipt of data on
the 30th of October and the first preliminary maps being
put out for public review by the 1st of January.

Because we would -- the Statewide Database would not
need the two weeks for reformatting data.

So I hope that this is helpful to commissioners and
to the public in understanding this part of the timeline.

I saw Commissioner Fernandez, Commissioner Turner,
and Commissioner Toledo.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you for that,
Chair. That's very helpful information to put it out in
a spreadsheet. My only concern in the P.L. 94, I believe
that's -- well -- first of all, I do agree with Marion in
terms of what the date that we receive the legacy data,
that's when the clock starts ticking. So I feel that the
third column is not appropriate to us because we won't
have until February 14th. Because it's going to depend
on when the legacy data comes in, not when the P.L. 94.

So I just feel that it's -- there's a month -- or a
couple weeks that may not be appropriate. And my only
other suggestion would -- I would love to do the
conservative -- whatever the deadline is minus one day,
just to make sure we make the deadline. That's kind of
how I've always operated, so. Anyway. That's it. But
Thank you so much for putting that timeline together for us to discuss it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: The reason that that third column is there, we're still dealing with enormous amounts of uncertainty. The census has said that they hope to be able to release the legacy data between or in the period from mid to the end of August. Well, what happens if they only release the legacy data -- if they're two weeks late releasing the legacy data? The legacy data would be released in mid-September and the point that Ms. Mac Donald made was that it would make no sense at that point for them to reformat the data, since they would receive the P.L. 94171 data by the 30th of September. Again, that's speculative to some extent, because the Census Bureau has indicated that that's their plan, is to release the P.L. 94171 by the end of September. But they could be early, they could be late with that. We don't know.

But the last column is really two columns in one. It's what happens if the legacy data are not available until the 15th of September. In which case Ms. Mac Donald's point was it makes no sense to devote two weeks to reformatting data when two weeks later you would receive data from the Census Bureau already in the format that you would be working those two weeks to put the data
into.

Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: No -- I get that point, but still the time would start clicking -- or ticking in mid-September, not September 30th. Regardless of which data we want -- we choose to use. I understand that you wouldn't want to use a legacy if you're going to receive the P.L. 94 two weeks later. But the clock would start ticking when you receive the legacies. Assuming that was released prior to the P.L. 94 data.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Okay. Yes. That --

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- is a good point. Thank you for that. I've got Commissioner Turner, Commissioner Toledo, Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair. I have three points. First of all, can you clarify for me, I thought when we initially learned of the legacy data that it wasn't -- it was presented as an option or a choice as to whether or not we would utilize the legacy data. And if that was the case, I'm wondering about our clock starting, when it becomes available if we don't -- or didn't choose it. That's the first one.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. That's a very good question. Because one of the things that we've heard from the
Statewide Database is that there are states, including California --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- that are capable of doing the reformatting and therefore using the legacy data. But they -- the sense is that there may be some states that don't have the technical --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Right.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- capacity to reformat the data and therefore would be forced to wait until the release of the P.L. 94171 data. As for the legal implications of that, I can't speculate.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum. Oh. Okay. Maybe -- Marion, maybe that's something we can follow up on. I'm just curious because it seems to be important.

And then the last two questions I'll ask at the same time, in your presentation -- and thank you this is very helpful, the timeline -- you mentioned after the first column of legacy, the second one you said was -- you thought was more problematic. And I just wanted to hear a little bit more of you talking about why that was more problematic and what you're seeing. I'm curious about that.

And then I'm wondering, when we look at the timeline scenarios -- I've brought up a couple of times -- and
maybe it's a nonissue. But the way my mind works, and I'm looking at these tight timelines, I still believe it would be helpful for us to see, for the public to see, where we actually will be drawing maps. I still think we have to build in days that we have to stop -- not maybe stop receiving data. But again, at some point we can't draw maps while we're still getting draft -- needs to be some kind of notice to the public that says we're drawing maps now based on information received by whatever that previous date is. Because I think if we communicate that there are groups that would want to make sure their information is input before we stop looking at them. And I know there will be another opportunity to see what came in new and make adjustments. But if it were me, and what I'm suggesting for sure, is that to the degree possible, to get all of the testimony, the comments, the COI information in before the first time we stop. And I can't see another way around drawing maps and continuing to get information in while we're trying to draw maps. Looks like we're going to have to put a pause on it and then revisit new comments that came in. And I think we should let, at some point, the public know what that's going to look like.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes. Agreed. I think that a very good point. I -- did you have another question?
COMMISSIONER TURNER: No. It's just I wanted to know about your comment about --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- the middle column.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. My sense on the middle column is that having the preparation -- the final maps running from the 16th of December through the 11th of January, that looks to be a -- just a more challenging time to do that, as far as people being distracted by other things going on.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Um-hum.

CHAIR KENNEDY: My sense is that there's less distraction in the first column or the third column. But the second --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- just would run everybody into more distractions.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Sure. Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think Commissioner Turner asked my question. But to the point -- to the first about the option of the legacy data; I do remember that when Commissioner Sadhwani and I met with stakeholders, they made it very clear that the -- that the state had the option to accept the data. But if they did so they
had -- the census would require that they take responsibility for the accuracy of that data. Which my understanding is that -- and Commissioner Sadhwani can correct me if I'm wrong -- is based on the letter that we've received from the Legislature that they are taking responsibility for the accuracy of the data at this point.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And that's also why one of the variables in this, the two weeks for reformatting the data also includes the whole process of parallel formatting the data, or analysis of the data by the Department of Finance unit that also deals with demography here in California. And that Statewide Database would be working very closely with the Department of Finance, and with the Department of Finance providing a check on their work; so that you have two very experienced and qualified teams working in parallel and comparing their work products to make sure that the end product is the best possible data set that we could have at that point.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you for that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Actually, I'm going to go ahead and pass. I think my question's been answered.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Are there other questions or
comments at this point?

Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Oh. Just -- I did check
out for just a minute. I had a phone call and I hope
this question didn't already get asked. If it did, let
me know. Looking back at the schedule that we got last
time, they talked to us about the election timeline. And
in -- I'm not that familiar with elect -- or running for
office, but there's a -- there's a time in there that's
this signature in lieu period. And so I guess that's
when you sign up to run for office. But there's
different dates -- each column has a different set of
dates for that signature in lieu period. And I don't
really -- I don't really know how to draw a conclusion
here on -- how are dates -- are crashing into that
signature in lieu period. Can someone help us understand
that a little bit better?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Let me -- let me pull that and I'll
try to help you out on that. The signature in lieu
period is candidates can file nominating petitions --
well, it's a certain number of signatures to get them on
the ballot. So the reason for the different dates is,
this is based on three different scenarios for the
primary. And these -- the nomination period and these
other things are calculated in terms of election day
minus so many.

So the -- let's see -- signature in lieu period, based on the current primary date of June 7th, would run from December 16th to February the 9th. The signature in lieu period for an alternative primary date of June 28th would run from January 6th to March the 2nd. And signature in lieu period for an alternative primary date of July 12th would run from January 20th to March 16th.

The actual nomination periods, respectively, from February 14th to March 16th. For the current primary date, March 7th to April 6th. For the alternative date of June 28th, and March 21st to April 20th in the case of the other alternative primary date of July 12th. Does that help?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. That helps a lot. So even in our best case -- with the current election date as it's scheduled, in our best case that we deliver the maps of the 30th, we're still crashing into that signature in lieu period by a couple weeks. And -- but there's -- but there's work that has to -- but then they also -- don't -- they have to make the precincts or something?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. The time of election officials need to precinct final maps; that's on the first page of that timeline scenario that we were given
last time. So that basically, for all three of these --
which I don't fully understand -- is shown as running
from February 1st to March 2nd.

I had printed out somewhere something off the
Riverside County Election timeline that gave me a number
of days in advance that those precincts would need.

Basically, the requirement, as I understand it, in the
elections code is that precincts cannot cross district
boundaries. So therefore the counties can't finalize the
precincting until we give them the district boundaries.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. So I guess then --
sorry. For my question for --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- for the committee would
be, what -- we're crashing into the signature in lieu
period regardless. And so I guess -- if you're going to
see impact there. I guess there's nothing we can do
about it, but.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, if we were -- if we submitted
by the 30th of December, the signature in lieu period for
the June 28th alternative date would start, essentially,
a week later on the 6th of January. So that would
require a further adjustment of the primary date, but we
would not be infringing on the signature in lieu period
Part of the -- part of the calculations in all of this is how much time do potential candidates need to plan their collection of signatures, to plan their campaigns? Now, we might be infringing on that. But that's not something that is established in law, whereas the signature in lieu period is.

Okay. My apologies. I have Commissioner Sinay, then Commissioner Vazquez, then Commissioner Sadhwani, then Commissioner Fernandez, then Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Pass.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Sinay passes.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I was just going to share that the precincting is really important for practical purposes. So they can't cross district boundaries and you have to decide -- you have to be able to send folks their correct ballots based on where they're voting, particularly in the precincts. So like -- and I feel like that the timeline for that is probably ambitious as it is, given that district boundaries are changing all across the state.

And then my second point -- no. I'll raise my hand again if it comes back.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you. Commissioner
Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I was just going to add, I believe in the conversation that we've had, shortening the -- and I could be wrong, so I'll most certainly follow up with all the stakeholders that we've been speaking with. But my understanding is that the signature in lieu period could potentially be shortened so as to keep a primary at the same time, but it would require legislative action. Right?

So this is where all the different stakeholders have to kind of work together on whatever it is that we finalize for our dates of how it's going to carry on throughout all of these other periods. The signature in lieu period, my understanding is very important because it is a time period when candidates go out and collect signatures in order to appear on the ballot. But they have to know what district that they're running in. So we of course we have to have the maps finalized for them to do that. But is it possible for the Legislature to potentially shorten the time period for signature in lieu while maintaining the June primary? I think that's a separate question that we can certainly raise with those -- with appropriate folks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: My understanding is that what might be changed legislatively is the number of signatures
required, not necessarily the length of the signature in lieu period. It would -- it would -- the change would be in the number of signatures required because candidates effectively would have a shorter signature in lieu period. I don't believe we're talking about legislatively changing the signature in lieu period itself.

Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I just wanted to go back to what Commissioner Toledo had mentioned. He had said that the states have the option of whether or not to use the legacy data. But I do not believe, based on the presentation last time, that we don't have an option to not receive the legacy data. I believe what they said is you're -- regardless, you're going to get the legacy data. Whether or not you choose to use it or wait for the P.L. 94 is up to the states. So maybe that's something that we need to clarify? Because again, if we choose not to use it but we receive the legacy data, again, the timelines starts from when we receive it. Hopefully I've confused everyone right now. So.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Next I have Commissioner Yee, and then Commissioner Akutagawa, Commissioner Turner.

Was there another hand? Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Could Commissioner Toledo
answer that question?

CHAIR KENNEDY: If he would like to.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: My understanding from our conversations with the Legislature was that the state had the option to receive the data. That it wasn't automatic that they would get it. Unless they took responsibility for the data. Because unless the state had the capacity to take responsibility, they weren't going to send it over in a format that could be usable. So -- but my understanding is that the state has decided to exercise the option to receive the data.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that. Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. Just to explain the term signature in lieu. So that's actually a mechanism where a candidate can defer filing fees, tended filing fees, based on the number of signatures collected. So -- but the Legislature would have to act to alter the period when that can done. That's what it's in lieu of, in lieu of filing fees.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. But as I -- and one of the reasons I've been a proponent of signature in lieu mechanisms overseas is that it enables candidates of lesser means who do not have access to the funding that would enable them to pay the filing fees to run for
office. But again, my understanding is that the Legislature would not necessarily shorten the -- or change the period. They would more likely reduce the number of signatures required proportionate to the effective time available to candidates to collect the signatures.

Recognizing that it takes a certain amount of time to collect a certain amount of signatures.

Okay. Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I was going to just -- I guess he -- Commissioner Toledo really answered the questions. So thank you for that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Pass.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Turner passes.

Commissioner Toledo, did you have anything further?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good. Any further questions, comments, discussions on the timeline scenarios?

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, it's not so much on the actual particular dates, but this coming Saturday when we have our line drawing training, I think it will bring home the point that the Chair said about how many
maps we're trying to draw in how much time? And how much
time it's actually going to take the Commission to draw
the maps. So just something to think about this coming
Saturday.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yep.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I was trying to
think of how to formulate this, and I'll just name it as
a curiosity or a thought that I'm having. I think it's
interesting that the state named -- or had opportunity to
determine if they would receive the information earlier,
and it actually shortens the amount of time that we have
to draw lines or get input. It's just something in that
that makes -- that I just think we'll need to sit with
for a second. I'm thinking, well, that's interesting.
So that wasn't an option, ultimately, that we had. That
the state did make the determination to receive the
information. And great. California had the ability to
translate it. But we now are I guess locked in to the
consequence of that. And I guess I just wanted to name
that. because that's how I'm thinking of it right now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that. Commissioner
Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I just want to echo what
Commissioner Turner just said. Because I was thinking
the same thing is someone else made the decision for us without consulting with us to see if that's the route we wanted to take. So I don't know if there's some way to maybe go back and discuss it and maybe change our decision? But I just find it interesting that we weren't consulted at least prior to making that decision.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Could I ask the Government Affairs Subcommittee to come back to us with just a one-pager, hopefully, laying out who made what decision based on what options, when, and how? Just so that we have that in front us? Thank you.

Okay. As I indicated earlier, I think that after the report from the government affairs and census Subcommittee and now the Gantt Chart Subcommittee with the timeline scenarios, now would be a good time to invite public comment.

So Katy, if you would please invite public comment?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And this is general public comment at this point.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Okay. In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process the Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To call in dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When
prompted to enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed, it is 98688125251 for this meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press the pound key.

Once you have dialed in you will be placed in a queue. To indicate you wish to comment please press star 9. This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it is your turn to speak you will hear a message that says the host would like you to talk and to press star 6 to speak. If you would like to give your name please state and spell it for the record. You are not required to provide your name to give public comment.

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

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

And the Commission is taking general public comment at this time. And we do not have anyone in the queue at this time, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. This whole 1 p.m. start time schedule is new for all of us. We'll wait a couple minutes to see if anyone joins the queue.

(Pause)
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And our instructions are complete at this time.

CHAIR KENNEDY: We'll give it one more minute.

(Pause)

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And I'd like to remind anybody calling in to press star 9 to raise your hand, indicating you wish to comment. And we do have a caller. I'll be opening the line.

And the floor is yours.

MS. WESTA-LUSK: Hello. This is Rene Westa-Lusk. And I just have a few questions going back, I guess to the other discussions prior to the one you just had on the timeline.

One question I have is, I heard some announcements, I believe by the Communications Director, Mr. Ceja, that there was going to be -- I might have not gotten this correct, that's why I'm asking it. April 20th. Is there going to be a presentation by the CRC on how to use the COI tool? Will that be livestreamed? That's my first question.

And then I have another question regarding -- I believe Mr. Ceja said that they had updated either the redistricting basics PowerPoint presentation, the slides or whatever? And they also updated the redistricting basics scripts. And he said there was more detail that
was going to be given to the public so they would be
guided as to what kind of description or information the
Commissioners are looking for about their communities of
interests. That's my second question.

And then I -- well, had a question regarding the use
of public libraries and community colleges. Were you
only looking at those two venues for establishing local
access centers in rural areas that are maybe two or more
hours drive away from one of the six regional access
centers for information on COI tool, et cetera? Were
you -- were you possibly looking at community colleges
and libraries to be used as remote sites where people
could give public input when you start having the public
input meetings? Where they wouldn't have to drive two or
more hours to go in person to do a public input session?

Those are my questions. And thank you for all your
work.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And thank you Ms. Westa-Lusk for
your comments and questions. They help us understand
better where we need to focus more of our attention.

Let me turn it over to Director Ceja to respond.

DIRECTOR CEJA: Thank you so much. So yes, on April
20th the Commission will be hosting a redistricting
basics presentation. And it will be livestreamed via our
website. So you can catch it there. We're still
finalizing the details on broadcasting, but it will be
broadcasted through our website.

The other announcements I made did include an update
to both the redistricting basics presentation and the
script. That includes two new slides. One is for
letting the community know what COI information is
valuable and helpful for the Commission.

And the second is in addition to language access and
what the Commission is doing to ensure that every
Californian has access to our meetings and to our
information.

And I believe there is one more question and I
forgot.

CHAIR KENNEDY: The other question was on use of
libraries and community college as locations for input.
I will say that we've -- or at least some of us have
always dreamed of having those as part of our network,
and enabling people to provide input from those
locations, since we know there are so many more of those
locations throughout the state. And with that I'll turn
it over to Commissioner Sinay to expand on.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes. Just to add, we're not
only looking at community college and libraries. We've
also had conversations with Boys and Girls clubs of
California as well as YMCA of California, and are looking
at other sites that we know have other statewide partners
that have local sites. And almost everybody is excited
to talk about how it can be used in different ways.

So we are looking. This is still part of the
design -- I hate to keep saying. I'm one these people
that don't like pushing things off to another meeting,
but I'd rather have the conversation now. But it is
agendized, and this will be part of the conversation of
how do we design it so it's more -- it's easier and
accessible and inviting for the communities to
participate in all different phases of our process.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And that public input meeting
design, Subcommittee or committee meeting is scheduled
for?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Wednesday, 4 to 8.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Wednesday, 4 to 8, this week. Thank
you.

MS. WESTA-LUSK: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And thank you, Ms. Westa-Lusk.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And that was it for this
time.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent. Thank you, Katy. Let's
then proceed to the report from the Finance and
Administrations Subcommittee.

Commissioners Fernandez and Fornaciari.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. Let's see. Just a couple things. Director Hernandez touched on this, but I just want to amplify something that they're working on and share our appreciation. You know they're working on process flows here for information coming in, and working out ways to manage that and record it for us much more effectively than is being done now.

And so I just -- I wanted to acknowledge and thank -- or we wanted to acknowledge and thank Director Hernandez and his team for working on that and working on -- behind the scenes. A lot of work going on behind the scenes to make the back of the house run much more effectively. And so thank you for that.

And then the other we just want to talk about was transcripts. We -- got a sample transcript and Ravi reviewed the transcript. And just to -- kind of -- as a quality check if you will. There were a few errors, but it took him hours, and hours, and hours to go through it. And so we don't -- we want to make a recommendation that it wouldn't be an effective use of his time to review all the transcripts to ensure they are a hundred percent accurate.

We would suggest that, you know, maybe we put some wording on the website that says, the official record is the video. The transcript is kind of a best effort, but
we've asked Director Hernandez to work with Marian to come up with some wording to that effect that we could put on the website. And so we'll bring that back next time we meet for everyone to kind of agree to, I guess, at that point. But that's where we're headed -- or we recommend heading with the transcripts. I think Marian has a question.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Marian?

MS. JOHNSTON: I asked Ravi what some of the corrections were. And a lot of them seemed to be misspelled names of Commissioners and staff, and that's something we can correct. Ravi is going to make a correct spelling list and send it to the court reporter so that he has all those correct spellings. A lot of the others were punctuation. So I don't think we need to worry too much about those. But I agree, we'll put a disclaimer on there that I'll draft up for your consideration, saying that the official record is the actual recording. But the errors were not of any great significance.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And otherwise, I think we've covered everything already with the videography contract.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Just on that one point, I mean, to me it seems like we're doing what politicians
and others ask people to do. Here's a copy of my -- the script of my speech, but there's always a footnote that says, check against delivery. So yes, if we say the video record is the official record; the transcript is provided for convenience, check against delivery. I think we will have covered what we need to cover.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. Do you think that we need to bring the statement back for a vote, or should we -- I mean, where do you think we should go with this, Chair?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Personally, I would say, yes.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I like to view Subcommittee recommendations as recommendations rather than decisions. And so you know, I would like to see it come back for some sort of official action by the full Commission.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I mean, can't we just make the recommendation now? And Marian's going to come up with the disclaimer language, and that way we can move forward with that decision.

What do you think, Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Well, I didn't know if folks wanted to approve the exact language or not.
That's kind of what my question. Do you think, Marian --
do you think you could come up with some language before
the meeting's over, so we can --

MS. JOHNSTON: I could do it tonight or tomorrow
morning, and get it to you tomorrow.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. Can we just take a
look at it then, Chair?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. Great. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. 10-C, Gantt chart we've
already covered.

10-D, VRA compliance. Commissioners Sadhwani and
Yee.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, a couple things, I
suppose -- and Russell will help me out here, but we are
continuing to work through the Legal Affairs Committee on
finalizing the contracts for the selected VRA Counsel so
we can give an update for that under Legal Affairs. We
also have confirmed that Eric McGhee from the Public
Policy Institute will give his presentation at our next
meeting during October 28th and 29th meeting. And I
don't recall what exact time that was, but it is
confirmed for that meeting. Russell, do you have
anything else to add that I've missed?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I think that's all. Just to note
that we're also following up on the disclosure items --
the Gibson Dunn -- that had been mentioned. So we'll
report back on that in a memo and a presentation,
probably at the next full meeting.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you.

Next is 10-E, Outreach and Engagement. Commissioner
Sinay and Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Am I going? Okay. So
first off, we want to thank everyone for all the efforts
in raising awareness in outreach and all the work going
on. You heard from Ms. Kaplan earlier about, you know,
the number of education presentations requested and
completed and scheduled. So that's awesome effort, so
thank everyone. So as you also heard, we have scheduled
an English-language version of our education -- or our
Redistricting Basics presentation for the 20th at 2. And
for the Spanish version on the 26th at 5, I think. At 5?
I think it's 5.

And so as far as presenters go, for the Spanish
version, we have four speakers who speak fluent Spanish.
We thought we would try to get one Commissioner from each
group, if you will, and I think we've got that. Yeah.
Okay. So we've got Commissioner Kennedy, Commissioner
Fernandez, and then Commissioner Toledo.
VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Toledo.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Commissioner Toledo for that one. And so we also wanted the same thing for the English-language version. And at first we were wanting three folks, you know, that are on the Subcommittee. Since we're doing it prior to the Subcommittee meeting, we thought, well, you know, since we're all going to be engaged that day, we might as well just have three from the Subcommittee, but we can't do that. For Bagley-Keene reasons. So I had volunteered.

Oh, go ahead, Marian.

MS. JOHNSTON: You can do it complying with Bagley-Keene if you simply extend the time of your meeting to cover that.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. Okay. So I mean, is that something we can do now? I thought that we were too late for that.

MS. JOHNSTON: I think Alvaro's checking.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Since it's the 20th.

MS. JOHNSTON: The 26th, isn't it?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: No, it's the 20th that we're talking about.

MS. JOHNSTON: But the 20th you already changed, I believe, to make it part -- it's already agendized as part of the Subcommittee.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Oh, it is. Okay. Okay.

So I'm sorry. I misunderstood what was happening here. So we can do that? Okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: It's on the agenda as part of the Subcommittee meeting, so you can have whoever you like on it.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. Well, we had thought of myself, Commissioner Turner, and then one of the nonparty-affiliated members. And so since we thought that we couldn't have the third person on the Subcommittee, I had asked Commissioner Le Mons if he might be able to do it. But I know Commissioner Ahmad can't. I don't know if Commissioner Akutagawa would be interested in doing it. So we haven't kind of resolved who the third person is at this point. And if there are other Commissioners who are really wanting to do it, you know, we could consider that, too.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So this would be at 2 o'clock on the 20th?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: 2 o'clock on the 20th.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I could do it. I might be just a couple minutes late, though, but I'm coming from another presentation, but I could do it.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. Is that okay, Commissioner Le Mons, or did you have your heart set on
it? Okay. Okay.

Well, then if it's okay with the Commission, then we'll have myself, Commissioner Turner, and Commissioner Akutagawa conduct a presentation on the 20th? I don't see any objections, so we'll move forward with that plan.

Then, for the next bullet, I'll turn it over to Commissioner Sinay to talk about the -- do you want to talk about your interactions? Well, we've --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sure.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- already talked about it a bit.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I feel like we've already talked about that. So I sent an email out about the California community colleges. They're very similar to the libraries where there's a lot of different levels, a lot of different people. You just kind of keep digging and keep getting more and more meetings. So I did send out a community college email just to give you advice on how to reach out to your local community colleges. You can start with the district representatives, but the two places that make a lot of sense to speak to is the faculty senate and the student senate. That's their leadership branches of the community colleges.

And at all our statewide level -- I guess, I should take a step back. The statewide outreach that we've been
doing -- it's Commissioner Fornaciari and I and Marcy --
Ms. Kaplan. We kind of have two purposes. We initially
go in there just to kind of say, how do we raise
awareness of your constituents, and also how do we engage
your constituents in our efforts? And we purposely have
gone to those groups that we know have local chapters or
local clubs or local whatever. So it has a local
presence, and we let them know about the zones and the
zone leads. And the idea's -- and most of them have
requested a letter from us that kind of talks about the
process and the zone leads. And we've talked about this
in the past. And so when the zone leads that's supposed
to be kind of a warm handoff -- I mean, a warm welcome.
When you all contact them, they've already, hopefully,
heard about the redistricting process. And so in one
effort, we're trying to connect with them so that we can
do presentations or what at the statewide level, but also
opening up those doors at the local to those local
lead -- those trusted leaders.

And I did have that -- I met with the local farm
bureaus, and they actually pulled out the letter. So
they had gotten it, and it felt really good to, you know,
to kind of see the whole loop work. The list of all the
folks that we have contacted is in that one -- I emailed
it again to you all so you can use it. And it shows you
where the local contacts are. So just click on the
different links in there, and it'll send you to where
those local contacts.

And really, we've been getting some great ideas. A
lot of the stuff that comes to us or that we present from
our Subcommittee has been ideas that have come from the
community. So that's been really exciting. After each
meeting, we're, like, okay, what can we do? What can we
not do? So we're really excited to share all that with
the Design Subcommittee, and constantly thinking about
how do we keep our minds open so that we can think of
things creatively and leveraging what's out there. I
think that's about it on that one.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. And then local and
statewide groups are asking for curriculum and training,
and so we're going to discuss that further in the Design
Subcommittee. And you want me just to go ahead with the
Design Subcommittee report since I'm kind of going at
this point?

CHAIR KENNEDY: We've got five minutes before break,
and it seems like it might take more than the five
minutes.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: No, I don't think so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: No? Okay, then. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay. Just to comment.
We prefer public input design rather than public input meeting design, because that presumes the format that we're going to have meetings. You know, what are called meetings or hearings or whatever. We want to keep it open. So just a note.

Let's see. At the last meeting, we talked about legal, budget, contractual and other constraints, and we're putting together a document -- just one document -- as a reference, for everyone to understand those constraints. We don't have that quite done yet, but we're working on it. Our next meeting is Wednesday, 4 to 8. And again, we encourage everyone to listen in to the first half, as I mentioned earlier. We have a handout that's the working agenda, so you can see what we're going to be working on.

But the first part is conversations with community groups and line drawers to understand -- well, with the community groups to understand their efforts that they're going to be going through to provide input to the Commission. But with pre-census and post-census. And then, you know, the line drawers to understand what's going on with local redistricting efforts and discuss how our effort can help support those local efforts and you know, where there might be synergies between those efforts.
And then the second part of the meeting is to brainstorm how best to create opportunities that are accessible, inviting, transparent to the public to submit their input to us. And the entire meeting will include the community groups and the line drawers in that conversation. So that's what's coming up.

And one thing I just wanted to note, you know, in that meeting, at the very beginning of the meeting, we open it up for public comment. We had a commenter, Rajeev Singh, who began to give input on redistricting, specifically talking about specific districts and how those districts needed to be redesigned for the next time. And you know, after a bit, I interrupted him. I let him know that, you know, in that meeting we were, you know -- that wasn't a meeting of the full Commission where we could accept public input, that we wanted his public input, that we would record his public input, and we would present that to the entire Commission. He submitted his input in the form of a public comment this time around. And I also asked Director Hernandez to have Ravi yet watch the tape, and write down his public input, and put that into the system for us. And they've done that.

And I also worked with Director Hernandez to revise the comment announcement that Katy reads for us to be
clear that during our Subcommittee meeting, we're accepting comments on the work of the Subcommittee, not public input. And for the second public input -- or for the final public input session in our Subcommittee meeting, I made an announcement to make that clear. But I just wanted to let you all know that that went on. And let the public know that we've captured the public input, that Rajeev Singh submitted his public input, and so we have that captured.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Anything else from the Outreach and Engagement or the Public Input Design Subcommittees?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to say for the line drawers, it's not just our line drawers. We also have a local line drawer from Redistricting Partners. So we're kind of expanding it in that way.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. It is now 4:15. We'll take a fifteen-minute and reconvene at 4:30. Thank you, everyone.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Welcome back from the break. We will continue with our Subcommittee reports. Next up, Item 10-F on the agenda is the Language Access Subcommittee. Commissioners Akutagawa and Fernandez.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you, Chair. On
language access we have great news to report. Three of our documents -- our frequently asked questions, our flyer, and our fact sheet, should be up on our website by the end of the week in the twelve different languages, which we're very excited about. And the PowerPoint, our Redistricting Basics, will follow shortly after. We had to hold off on that one because we did have the two additional slides that we had to get in there.

And the last piece is we're working with Ms. Kaplan on the language access coordinator. We feel that it's time to try to get that position up and get the recruitment started, because we're going to need that support in terms of either interpretation requests, translation requests, public input that comes in in different languages, so hopefully, within the next couple weeks we should be seeing that recruitment posted. And I think that is it.

Commissioner Akutagawa, was there anything else?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think you got everything. We're making some progress.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: We are.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And I just want to make certain that you have and are taking into account the comments from the March 25th letter received from partner organizations regarding language access?
VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you. Yeah, we have a standing -- now, we have a standing biweekly meeting, and so if there's any public comment that comes in, or correspondence, we go through that. As well as Ms. Kaplan does forward anything that is of urgent nature to the Subcommittee for attention. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Other than the interpretation that we had of public comment during the one meeting, have we received anything in any other language through any channel at this point?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: At this point, I don't believe we have. But we do foresee that -- once we get into the public input meetings, we do foresee the requests coming in for that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I might suggest to communications staff that we do a release announcing, you know -- we want a splash that we will have these documents -- or we have these documents in these different languages once we get them, and we want to make sure that people are aware of their options -- language options during our meetings, whether they be public input meetings or business meetings.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Two things. At one point we had said we would have, like, a header or something that
had "redistricting" in different languages or "welcome" in different languages, just, you know, something in different languages, as well as different scripts so it'd be easy for folks to find where the diverse languages are. And again, we're promoting that this is -- that this is open to everyone, because that question still remains is if this process is open to all or not.

And then the other question that came up during the Design Subcommittee that Commissioner Turner brought up, and I did as well later, was if a community asks us to cover the costs of an interpreter, will we? Because we've been saying since the beginning that we don't want there to be extra burden or costs on community groups. And even if they offered to have an interpreter, like they did with Commissioner Sadhwani, ideally, in my thought is that we would cover the cost so that it's not another, you know, a cost on their side.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I'm hoping I'm understanding you correct, Commissioner Sinay, but our position has been that if it's not a Commission-sponsored event, and if it's an external event, that they are required to -- I shouldn't say they're required -- if they provide interpreters, that's on them versus if it is a Commission-sponsored event, such as our meetings and also our Redistricting Basics presentations, and if a request
is made for interpreter services, we would -- as long as they follow the protocol that we have of five business days, we would pay for that. Unless it's beyond the twelve languages, then we would do our best to try to contract for those languages.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Any other questions or comments on Language Access Subcommittee report or anything further from the Subcommittee? Okay. Next is Materials Development.

Commissioners Fernandez and Kennedy. Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. So I'll just repeat what I just said for Language Access. No, I'm kidding. We did update the Redistricting Basics presentation to add the two slides, one related to more detail in the COI input in terms of what we're looking for. And then also another slide on language access. And we also updated the script to correspond to the additional slides, and the new versions should be up on our website now, as well as the other documents that I had noted earlier.

Was there anything else, Commissioner Kennedy?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, I wanted to highlight one comment that you had made, and hope that Director Hernandez and staff will do their best on this one. We need to, you know, in line with my comment at the
beginning of the day about the importance of accuracy, we need to make sure that we're all working from the same script. And the only way that we can work from the same script is if the script has a date on it, and we can all make sure that our version number -- something that enables us to ensure that we're all working from the same document. Because I've been aware that there are times when some things get lost in the multitude of versions that we've had. So you know, I thank the staff for the work that they've done so far on this and just ask that we all be very attentive in ensuring that we're all working from the same documents and the same script.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. Thank you, Chair. I just wanted to say in addition, and maybe during this time period of talking about materials, I wanted to give a shout-out to the staff that I think is absolutely amazing. So of course, we appreciate the script, but I've done several presentations now and wanted to just shout-out. Wanda is an amazing staff member. And Marcy and you know, Patricia -- all of the different ones -- of course, Fredy, that is providing support, ensuring that we are locked and ready to go when it's time to do presentations. And so I just wanted to express how much I appreciate their support. I appreciate the process
behind the scenes. It makes it very enjoyable and easy
to do the presentations, and so I just wanted to say
thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I will echo that. I see applause
and nods.

So Director Hernandez, please convey our thanks and
congratulations to the staff.

Commissioner Fernandez.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: And I do want to echo that.
And I think the one piece that I really appreciate is
either the day before the day of the presentation, Wanda
sends an email -- because I got to tell you, it's hard
for me to look for the prior email, so I really
appreciate her sending the reminder email as well as the
presentation and the script and the invite. So thank
you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Next up, Item 10-H,
Website Subcommittee. Commissioners Kennedy and Taylor.

Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Good evening, everyone. Just
want to continue to elicit any of your ideas and thoughts
about the website. The Website Committee met over the
break. We continue to make changes and to develop the
website accordingly so that it is the most efficient.
And we drive people to the pages and to the items that
they request and they discuss over our public input. As we finalize the process for transcripts, that will be added to the website. And we continue to find a solution for the 2010 website. And we'll continue to work on the website accordingly.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.

One of the other questions that we had that we've asked staff to look into is what has happened to the Shape California's Future website from the California State Auditor's Office. That has all of the history, if you will, of the selection process for this Commission. And our concern is that that information could at some point in the future be relevant. We want to make sure that it's not lost. We have asked staff to look into the possibility of obtaining all of that information from the Auditor's Office and hosting it on our website, understanding that it may not make sense to continue the Shape California's Future website during this time when the Commission is actually active and the selection process is not active. But we did want to see if it would be possible for the We Draw the Lines website to have all of the content of the Shape California's Future website that had the history of the selection process.

We're also working on looking at where -- and it may be in multiple locations -- but where visitors to the
website will eventually be able to link from to see the
draft maps. The website has been set up at this point
where there are no draft maps, but we need to be
thinking, okay, when there are draft maps, how are we
going to give the best and the easiest access to the maps
from our website? So that's a bit of what the website
Subcommittee has been up to, and we will continue to
review the website on a regular basis and share thoughts
and recommendations. And if there's anything that we
need the Commission to approve, we will bring it to you
in another report. Marian?

MS. JOHNSTON: I'm not sure if this is for the
Website Committee or the Public Input Committee, but
since the Commission is already getting public input,
there was some talk about how it was necessary to get a
separate section of the website just devoted to public
input.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So that would be on the Website
Subcommittee and the communications staff, so we will
be -- we will be looking into that. Okay.

Next up, Data Management. Commissioners Ahmad and
Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair.

Yes, on behalf of Commissioner Ahmad and myself, I'm
just wanting to report on the Subcommittee. We had an
opportunity to meet with the Subcommittee from line
drawing team, also Commissioner Sadhwani and Andersen, to
convene our first meet and be able to bring together our
line drawers, which Karin, Jaime, and Bradley were there
to meet with USDR, Phil and Yon, and we cannot express
how excited we are to be able to move forward in this
process. And so now, they are in relation with each
other. They're going to be able to solidify their
interactions and finalize processes for flow now that
they're able to talk directly and determine what that's
going to look like. So we'll continue to meet to be able
to see what they're coming up with and how we're able to
structure -- kind of solidify and the little details of
how they're going to work together.

I also wanted to say for our data manager job
description, just to give you an update on that -- Raul
let us know that that has been referred to DGS,
Department of General Services, and they forwarded it on
to the State Controller's Office. We don't have word yet
back on that, but that is also moving forward. And so
I'd like to see -- Commissioner Ahmad, you want to add
anything additional to our brief report? Okay. So we
will follow up -- there's a meeting weekly -- and at a
different time have more information to share about the
data management portion.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. So if there is anything more before this meeting closes, just let me know, and I'll be happy to reopen this agenda item.

Commissioner Sinay, did I see your hand?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: It's okay. Alicia can go. I mean, Commissioner.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I just wanted to ask, on the data manager position. Can you still move forward with the recruitment or do you -- like, at least the posting and getting applications? Or do you have to wait for the position to be officially, I guess, established?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: We have to -- I believe the counsel we received was to wait until it was officially established.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And on being able to know how -- now that we have the line drawers, are we able to start getting counts on how many COIs we have? You know, getting updates on COIs, how many we're getting, from where we're getting community of interest information? And at what point will we be able to create kind of that map that we've talked about on the website just so that people can see that we've heard them and that it's been
submitted?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. Thank you for those questions.

May I, Chair?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay. Thank you for those questions. Commissioner Ahmad and I had high-level conversation on still-to-be-designed. What we desire is once the data manager is on that we'll also be giving reports such as the ones that Fredy is doing, as far as here's what's going on with our COI -- our comments that we received, community of interest, et cetera. So we will be saying how many we're receiving, where they're coming from, so we'll be able to give kind of reports such as that.

And then the other piece that we are looking at is the COI tool is also a public tool. And so we are also looking to see how do we make the parts of that available for public to be able to see directly what's being submitted as well.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Anything else on or from Data Management?

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you for that. It was
a really lively meeting. I didn't catch all of it. But one quick thing, though. The COI map -- the COI is Statewide Database; it's not line drawers. So all this information is actually forwarding through the Statewide Database. The line drawers have an issue -- which is what the Data Management Committee is working on -- how is the interaction going, for specifically the data and who gets what? But just to remember, slightly different hat, you know. The COI is the Statewide Database.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.

Next, the Grants Subcommittee. Commissioners Akutagawa and Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think I will be making this report. So I know this is one that a lot of people have interest in, and I did hear what our public commentor, Ms. Ponce De Leon, did comment on a letter that they had sent that I have not yet seen. But I do know that this is a topic that it's of great interest to a lot of organizations. I will tell you that for the Grant Subcommittee it is something that we are very aware of and we were wishing that we could be saying something a little bit more promising.

Right now, all I can say is that, you know, we are working with taxpayer dollars, state dollars, and there are lots of different rules and regulations and let's
just say that we are still kind of trying to figure out what is the best way in which we can actually disburse this money. We're just running across some different, perhaps, challenges with the way that disbursement would go and what's the best way. And so right now at this point we are planning to regroup. We just got some additional information, so we need to regroup and we'll figure out a plan of action. I don't want to say too much, because nothing is very clear to us right now. There's still a lot of "if this", "then that's", and I don't want to create, you know, a lot of angst by saying too much when there is no clarity on our part.

So I just wanted to at least just say that that, you know, we've been working on this and we've been waiting to hear on some different points about the process by which we would actually go about this. We thought we had something and we had a little bit of a setback, so we started again. And it looks like we might have to revisit, yet again, our process. And so we're hoping that we'll have a little bit more clarity the next we'll meet, and you know, just get this moving along. So hopefully, fingers crossed, we'll have better news the next time.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa. Any questions, comments from Commissioners? Okay.
Next up is the Community of Interest Tool.

Commissioners Akutagawa and Kennedy. Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Well, I feel like we did make our report this morning. I was hoping that we would be able to have Jaime, but what I'll do is I'll specifically reach out about scheduling a time with her for her to come and join us and be able to help explain and answer the various questions around the redistricting access centers.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. We can hold this agenda item for tomorrow or a later date.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Sounds good.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Are there any further questions or comments from Commissioners? Okay.

Item 10-L, Cybersecurity. Commissioners Fornaciari and Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: So nothing extremely tantamount on the security front. I would like to add -- and Neal and I had discussed before maybe coming up with tips of the week -- security tips of the week; however as we have our phones and our computers over a longer period, it's more likely that we're going to get malicious email. Please don't open them. Delete those items. I've already started to receive a few on my
phone. So just delete those items upon contact. The biggest deterrent to security is the end-user. So let's just be mindful of the things that we receive that are unexpected, and just delete them quickly. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I'll take the opportunity to share my experience. My phone number seems to have belonged previously to a realtor who was working in Arizona. So I get all of these requests from other realtors and from potential property buyers wanting to see this property and that property and so forth, as well as any number of you know, spam calls and spam messages. I finally went online and registered my Commission phone number on the National Do Not Call Registry. So other colleagues may wish to go online and take advantage of that opportunity to get your number on the National Do Not Call Registry, and hopefully that will help cut down on some of the extraneous communications that we receive.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: And Chair, not to prolong this conversation, but social engineering is amazing. It's designed to pick at our curiosity and our imagination. So even though that's not your case, it is meant to elicit a response for us to facilitate that malware. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you very much.

Item 10-M, the Incarcerated Population Subcommittee.
Commissioners Fernandez and Sinay.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you, Chair. I apologize for the short notice. I did forward a document, and it was posted this morning on our recommendation. If you recall -- oh, I don't know if it was the last meeting or the meeting before -- we did receive a letter asking how we were going to handle the incarcerated people in federal facilities. And so we also -- back in January we -- as a Commission -- we adopted the recommendation -- in terms of those in state facilities -- incarcerated individuals in state facilities -- we were going to take those numbers out of where they're incarcerated and put them into the last known residence. And so back then we had Karin Mac Donald and then also Aleks -- and I can't remember Aleks' last name. But anyway, at that point in time, they had both said that in terms of getting the information from the Federal Bureau of Prisons -- they weren't being forthcoming. And I know having worked for the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation for many years, them being a law enforcement agency, it was always difficult to get information from them. So with that, what we're recommending is that the Commission remove the number of people incarcerated in federal custody in California as of April 1st, 2020, from the institution of
incarceration. Because their last known place of
residence was not released by the Federal Bureau of
Prisons, incarcerated people that were enumerated in
federal prisons will not be redistributed to another area
in California.

And I did provide -- we did provide more information
in terms of how we came up with that recommendation and
in terms of the various facilities that would be impacted
as well as the counties. We identified the counties.

And in total there are 14,494 incarcerated people in
federal facilities. And then we also are recommending
future action is to add this to the Lessons Learned in
terms of -- as we recommended last time -- is that the
issue of federal incarcerated people in California be
added to Lessons Learned to address further with the
Federal Bureau of Prisons to discuss the need to obtain
the prior known residence of federal inmates that are
incarcerated in California federal prisons and detention
agencies. So we're hoping that by the 2030 Commission
they will be more forthcoming and provide more
information in terms of the last known residence of
incarcerated individuals in federal facilities.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Turner?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Commissioner Sinay, did you
have anything to add?
CHAIR KENNEDY: No? Okay. Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yeah. There was also the suggestion -- and I seem to recall that we at least make a run at the new AG to see if there was a willingness to apply pressure to get those numbers so that they can be counted in their previous residences. Did we go that route at all?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: No, we have not.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And my suggestion had been contacting Senator Padilla as a former Legislator or former Secretary of State --

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- who is certainly going to be very familiar with this issue and its implications.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: This may be -- because I'm not that familiar with what are considered prisons or other areas of detention -- but does this include, you know, people who have just been sort of gathered for other types of immigration issues or not --

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: No, this would be those you would consider an inmate. Those other individuals are not considered imprisoned.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: And we do have the names of
the different facilities on our recommendation sheet.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: If I could just add to what Commissioner Fernandez said and just kind of respond to moving forward with sending a letter either to the AG and/or Senator Padilla. We do think both of those ideas are good ideas and as we recommended in the past -- because of all the work that we need to do right now -- that we could send the letters, but the follow-up -- and if things -- we won't be able to collect the data that we need for this for 2020. We would be able to -- this is as far as we can for the federal -- for the federal inmates. And if we want to continue -- we do think it's a good conversation and want to continue it for 2030. But this is the data that was collected on April 1st that the Statewide Database was able to get. And going back to get the actual places of where their last address was is going to be quite difficult. And also there's -- yeah.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. Thank you. So I'm recalling that when Karin had initially described the last known address process to us she made a comment about those who do not have a usable last known address. I'm recalling, maybe imperfectly, her saying that they would
be randomly assigned a location across the state. So I'm just wondering whether that was accurate. And that's different than federal inmates, then, who will simply not be assigned anywhere. I think, in effect, it actually is a wash, because either way, the maps would effected equally. But I'd want to know for sure were the case simply so we could say accurately what was happening.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Right. Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

On that, when Karin was here last time when we talked about the state facilities, right? She did say -- they were able to at least pinpoint it down to, like, a county where they were from. So they were going to randomly place that count -- whatever the count was -- in that county. But for federal the only information they were able to obtain is the numbers that are currently being housed in each facility. So they have no idea where their last known residence is at any part of the state. And so that's why at this point, we are recommending to remove the counts from those areas. But we don't have enough information to be able to then place it into at least a county. I hope that answers your question.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And that follows a request by the Legislature. That's a recommendation of the
VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Right.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Very good. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I'm wondering what it would look like to write the letter, send it -- since we have a little bit of time -- and see if there is a response and a willingness to say what areas in California these federal inmates are located so we'll know what we're dealing with?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: We can do -- do we do that or does the Government Affairs Subcommittee do that?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Well, like, if it's an advocacy request, Government Affairs can certainly take that on. If it's a request for information, just data points or information, then the Subcommittee should probably -- we can work with the Subcommittee on that as well.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Agree to see the same. We're happy to work with the Subcommittee if there's a desire to send a letter. And I'm happy to work on the letter. I think this is such an important issue. And I do feel really great about the fact that I think
California's leading in this issue as it pertains to the incarcerated folks in state facilities. I think the federal facilities just presents such a difficult dilemma because there are individuals in there who may not even be from California. They may be actually from other states.

So without that information we just don't know. But I do -- I very much appreciate the Subcommittee's attention to -- this is a -- we can really help set up the future for 2030. Not just for California, but even federally, right? To be thinking about how incarcerated folks are being dealt with when it comes to reapportionment and redistricting purposes.

So I do appreciate, you know, the work of the Subcommittee thus far. Happy to support in writing a letter. But I can certainly see where the challenges lie in terms of that data sharing from the federal to the state level, and ultimately that we just don't have the jurisdiction to mandate that data being sent down. But a lot could change over the course of the next ten years for sure.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. And I just want to say I'm not on either of the Subcommittees but certainly would volunteer to help in any manner. I just think it's
one worth pushing as far as we can. And yes, probably some of the findings may not come out until 2030, but I don't feel good about just dropping it here. I think we need to at least write the letter, see how far we can go, see which of those federal inmates are from California, and try to have them reallocated into areas that they came out of where possible -- if possible. It just starts the larger conversation, I think.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And I'm looking at Senator Padilla's committee assignments. You know, he's on the Committee on the Judiciary. He's on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs Committee. Just, you know, I have to think that he's going to be able to help us make some progress, even if it's not all the progress that we would like to see.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: If I can recommend maybe Commissioner Kennedy and Commissioner Turner to draft the letter just because Commissioner Fernandez and I are busy on the outreach side and how we're actually going to raise awareness and engage those who are incarcerated, because that's a whole other big challenge. And I think that that's a better use of our time. And because you -- you know, we're here to support you all, but if I could recommend the two of you draft it?
CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, we could. Or as Commissioner Toledo said, if it's an advocacy thing, which I believe it is, then Government Affairs could. But Commissioner Turner and I will chat and possibly touch base with our colleagues on Government Affairs.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Perfect.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

Anything else from the Incarcerated Population Subcommittee?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: No. We're still waiting to meet with the other -- this kind of derailed us from meeting with the other three, so once hopefully this recommendation goes through and then we can concentrate on coming forward with some recommendations on outreach efforts for incarcerated individuals in California state facilities.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can you make a motion?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I haven't made the motion yet. No, I just made a recommendation. But I can make the motion that we adopt the recommendation. And of course, if something comes up and for some means we're able to get the information in time, I'm not sure how that would impact the Statewide Database. Of course, we could address it then, but for now, in terms of all the
information we have, and in terms also of feedback from the Statewide Database in terms of their inability to collect the information, I make a motion to move forward with our recommendation to remove the number of people incarcerated in federal custody in California as of April 1st, 2020, from the institution of their incarceration. And that's pretty much it, because we won't -- we won't move those numbers to another area in California. We'll just remove them from the count.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. And I just wanted to be real clear because I didn't get an opportunity to read it before the call.

On the motion to remove them, if we did not remove them they would be counted in these areas where they're currently housed --

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- and by removing them -- okay. Great. I'll second the motion.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: And this is, of course --

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- pending some miracle that we --

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Right.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: -- get what we need.
VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: You believe in miracles sometimes.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes, I do.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani?
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I'm sorry. Can you walk me through the logic one more time of we're removing them and -- just removing them?
VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: So we're removing them because if we don't remove them then the numbers in those specific areas are -- oh, what do they call it?
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Are inflated, right?
VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Are inflated, yes. So they're inflated, so it makes it seems like they have more constituents than they actually do in that area. And then that obviously effects how you draw your districts.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: It's over representation in those areas, but this won't affect anything doing with budgets, because everybody asks --
VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Right.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- that question as well, especially those who are from those areas. So it won't affect funding allocations. This is just for redistricting purposes.
VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Right.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And so then those individuals, though, are not represented anywhere in the state? From a redistricting standpoint.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: The numbers are not.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And we also don't know if they're all Californians or not. Because they're in federal.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Right.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I have Commissioner Ahmad, followed by Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I think my question was just answered. I will pass.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Okay. Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah. It's just that along with that assumption, we don't know where they're from. We don't know if they're Californians. We don't know if they're local, so there's a chance that some of that population could belong in that region. So it's accounting for all of the unknowns.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. And I think that that's what I'm hearing is that, you know, for the 2030 redistricting cycle that hopefully the work that we'll be doing here will eventually result in some national
changes. Because I mean, you know, for us to be able to count -- I mean, you know, we don't have the level of detail as what I saw on the, you know, on the document that was prepared -- which, thank you for that.

But also then, what are the implications for those who are here but are from other states? You know, there's just a lot of different kind of what-ifs and then that kind of thing, so I definitely support what I think is being proposed. I mean, I know that, sadly, they're not going to be represented, but I think it's an imperfect kind of solution to the kind of skewing that could happen if we were to continue to include them and their numbers are inflated for the purposes of redistricting.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair. I just want to make sure I'm understanding this correctly, that we are removing those folks regardless of whether they are from California or not. Because the Federal Government has not released that information to the states, right?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Well, we're removing them because it's overinflating that specific area where these facilities are. And unfortunately, because we don't -- the Federal Government is not providing us with residential information, we can't reallocate them
somewhere else.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Right. So if we had -- if we
did have that information from the Federal Government --
that we knew their last known address or that they were
from California -- a similar process would be employed as
with folks who are imprisoned in state facilities as
those who are imprisoned in federal facilities within
California. But at this point, the Federal Government is
not releasing that information to us. Got it. Thank
you.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Correct. Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Any further discussion.

Okay. We have a -- Director Hernandez.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Yes. I just wanted to clarify
the motion. What I have here is to adopt the
recommendation to remove the federal incarcerated people
in California from the State's population count. And
then I referenced the handout that was provided. Is that
correct?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Katy, thank you for joining us. Can
you invite public comment, please?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, Chair. In order to
maximize transparency and public participation in our
process, the commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. It is 877-853-5247. When prompted to enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed, it is 98688125251 for this meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID simply press the pound key.

Once you what you dialed in, you'll be placed in a queue. To indicate you wish to comment, please press star 9. This will raise your hand for the moderator. When it is your turn to speak, you will hear a message that says the host would like you to talk and to press star 6 to speak. If you would like to give your name, please state and spell it for the record. You are not required to provide your name to give public comment.

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

And the Commission is taking public comment for the motion on the floor made by Hernandez to adopt the verbiage relating to the incarcerated inmate population. I hope that sums it up. And we do not --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- have anybody in the queue.

CHAIR KENNEDY: We will wait a couple of minutes for the live feed to catch up and then a little bit longer for anyone to call.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Oh. And we do have someone in the queue.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Hold on. Before we invite them in --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Oh.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- Direct --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I already clicked it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Director? Okay. Go ahead then.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Well, they haven't unmuted themselves, but hold on. The floor is yours.

MS. WESTA-LUSK: Hello. This is Renee Westa-Lusk. I just want to say that I concur with Commissioner Turner and the other commissioners, I believe Toledo and Kennedy, that you should send the letters and make every last ditch effort to try to find the last residence of the federal incarcerated individuals.

I just think it's needed just to make that last effort. So I applaud if you go ahead with the letters as soon as possible. I think you might be surprised. You might get a response quicker than you think. Thank you.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Ms. Westa-Lusk. Yeah.

I've delved further into Senator Padilla's committee assignments and his position on the commission -- committee on the judiciary, they do have jurisdictions -- jurisdiction over national penitentiaries. So I'm hopeful that Senator Padilla can at least take us farther than we've ever gone before as far as getting this information. So thank you again for your call.

Okay. And did we have another caller?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We do. Did you want to -- before I --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Go ahead.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: -- go ahead -- okay. The floor is yours.

MS. HOWARD: Hi there. This is Deborah Howard again with the California Senior Advocates League. I have a big concern that these people who are incarcerated in federal prisons would not be recognized at all if you remove them from the April 1, 2020 count in California. My concern -- I understand about the State and all that, and I understand it's a relatively small number, less than 15,000, but they're not all in one facility. And I think that they have a right to be representative -- represented. And this is not a perfect system, but they, on April 1, 2020, were in these facilities and they
should be recognized.

And I know that it doesn't make any sense. There's a lot of -- there's a lot more, oh, better ways to do this, but I don't think the right answer is to exclude them from representation overall. So my -- your meeting and my comments are way out of sync, so I have no idea where we are in this, but I urge you to be very, very, very careful about this. I think that is something that is problematic on -- at the deepest core of democratic representation and just procedure of what the job of redistricting is. So I'm going to stop talking now.

Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And that's --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Ms. Howard. My connection, at least, is unstable. I hope that other colleagues were able to hear.

Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah. I think, you know, as far as my thinking right now unless I can be convinced otherwise, the thought of having no representation over to a percentage of overrepresentation to me is problematic. I would think that we want to represent -- what we're fighting for -- we fought for representation for our state inmates, our state incarcerated folks, and it seems that we're taking it away from these other
individuals. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani, did you have your hand up?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, I would tend to agree with Commissioner Taylor. I'm not opposed to this motion necessarily, but I do feel like I would like additional information. If someone who's incarcerated in a federal prison has some concern and wants to write to a member of Congress about their concern, yet we've removed them from that district for redistricting purposes, do members of Congress feel a desire to be responsive to the needs of those folks?

It's -- it does kind of present almost a normative -- a quandary about representation. And if we're removing them and not putting them somewhere else, then where or how is it that we anticipate them actually receiving that representation?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. I mean, I guess this is my political science background crashing in as well. I don't see them as lacking representation so much as I see it as a question of dilution or not dilution of the representation of others. And yes, it remains very much an open question.

Commissioner Akutagawa and then Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you for this, and
Commissioner Kenn -- Chair Kennedy, I do appreciate what you just said. Yeah, I would -- I would -- well, I guess from my perspective, I would think that they would still be able to write to an elected official and still be able to have their voice heard.

However, I think to what Chair Kennedy just said about dilution or not dilution, I think -- what I'm trying to understand is, if we remove those who are incarcerated in federal prisons, we'll remove them from the counties in which they are sitting right now, and therefore, rebalance the numbers so that it's reflective of truly the people who are from that particular area.

And if that is the case, then from a redistricting point of view, if their numbers go down by whatever numbers, then to have the equal populations, they may need to be combined with other areas. I am curious. I saw that we at least have county level data for those who are incarcerated into the federal prisons. Is that perhaps not something that we could at least assign to those counties if we have at least county level data so that maybe it's a middle ground to some of the concerns that were raised?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you for that. Commissioner Fernandez or Commissioner Sinay, did you want to respond?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I mean, I was trying to
understand. I mean, we know where these facilities are located. We have received the information in terms of, as of April 1st, the counts and we know what county it's from, so I'm -- it's county and city and you know, location.

I was trying to understand the second part,

Commissioner Akutagawa, in terms of what --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think -- so sorry. I was doing a little public musing that I shouldn't have done. I think the first part of -- I think the first part of what I was asking is that if their numbers are truly reflective of the people who are voluntarily living in those regions, then their representation could change because the numbers of those who are incarcerated would not be included. Because then, you know, to build the districts, obviously, you know, they have to be equal population. And if it excludes those who are incarcerated, then that could change their representation, which, you know, they may choose to prefer.

I'm not -- I'm just speculating here. But if we include the -- those who are incarcerated in the federal prisons or penitentiaries, that would then increase or inflate their numbers -- I think that was the word that was used -- inflate their numbers by X number of people,
which would enable them to perhaps retain a certain kind
of district size that's more concentrated than if it were
truly reflective of, you know, an equal population
district. Does that make sense?

I don't know if it'll skew it that much, but then
separate from that, we did get -- I did see on the
handout that you gave that there was some data as to the
county, I guess, of the last known place of residence for
each of those federal -- no, that was not --

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: No.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- true. Okay. I read
that wrong. Sorry.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: No, the county -- the county
that I noted is where that facility is located.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh, I'm sorry. Okay.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yeah, yeah.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I read that wrong, then.

My apologies --

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: No.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- again.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: If we knew the county -- if
we at least knew the county they were from, we could,
like, randomly put them in that county. But because we
don't -- we have no information as to, I mean, if they're
even from California --
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: -- or where in California they are. That was the issue.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh. Okay. Then scratch the second question then.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I have Commissioner Sinay, Commissioner Taylor, and Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, Chair. I love -- this is a good conversation, and I keep going -- I keep pingding back and forth, so we are having a good dialog. I just wanted to remind a couple of things is that when we talked about the state-level facilities, that one of the things that came -- that came up was that the incarcerated people when they want to plead their case or anything, they go to their congressional member from where they last lived. So that's the congressional member that represents them, and so everybody will still have that representation. Unfortunately, we don't have it here.

This recommendation from the Legislature has already passed the Legislature, and it will take into effect at the city and county redistricting efforts just like the other half that we had discussed before. And at those levels, these numbers may not look like a lot at our
level, but they are a lot at those levels. So that's
going to make some big shifts, but that's already been
done and that's why the Statewide Database had these
figures for us. So I just wanted to bring up that -- and
the final thing is someone had asked, you know, we did
start all of this because of a letter that we got from
the Legislature and we need to reply back to the
Legislature. And we went back and forth on how to -- how
to do this, and then we went to Karin and said, Karin, do
you -- do we even have any data that we could use for
this? And they had already -- as you can see, the
Statewide Database had requested this information.

And the reason I keep going back and forth is I,
too, I'm a political scientist and it's about the
representation of -- as I think Commissioner Taylor said,
you know, it's a representation of the -- of the people
who are incarcerated, and it feels like we're putting it
versus the representation of those who live in the -- who
live in counties outside of the counties that have those
facilities. And so it's not -- as I keep saying,
democracy can be very messy.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Absolutely agree, Commissioner
Sinay. Democracy can be messy. Again, some of the
people in these facilities belong to these communities, so there are some people that we would miss. Democracy is messy, as you just stated. We don't know what the rate of inflation would be for event -- for any given facility, but again, I just find that troubling. I wish we had the information.

And just looking at the -- at the list as presented, San Bernardino has three facilities, which means that a greater proportion will be removed from San Bernardino. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Taylor.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. I wanted to also, as Commissioner Taylor just said, look at the actual areas because typically where you have prisons they're in areas that are usually more disenfranchised. So I was trying to determine, again, the overinflation, what does it do to the actual places where these prisons are, number one.

And then I'm wondering -- looking at L.A. Times, et cetera, so 3,500 inmates were just released or are going to be released, right, from that federal number, which would bring it down from the 14,494 down to just a little bit -- almost under 11,000. And so again, that's a lot of -- that's a big variance, a difference.
And so maybe we're not -- and I'm hearing the conversations and I am concerned about no representation, but I also want to know -- I know that they took that number from I think the report said, April 1st, 2020. But if indeed it's verified that there are 3,500 less federal prisoners in custody now, I'm wondering, do we make that adjustment somewhere? Does that even come into play?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Fernandez.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I didn't check all of the numbers when I was going back to see where they -- what counties they were from. But the few that I actually did look to see what the numbers were on April 1st versus now, I think there was three or four that I actually saw, and their numbers are actually higher now than they were back in April 1st. I'm not sure why, but -- so we'd probably have to look.

And another thing in terms of adjusting the figures, and the reason obviously we take April 1st is because that's when the census was counted was April 1st, so we try to at least be consistent with the date, but I mean, we could go back to see what their current populations are because that is public information. But I do know when I did review a few, that it was actually
significantly higher.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So we used April 1st, 2020 because it is the census date. The data, Ms. Kaplan and I were talking about this, I think, just last week is that there are different data populations that the data is not -- is not going to be that great. And we've talked about this a little bit before, and we haven't quite discussed what we might do, and that includes college campuses, prisons, as well as those areas that were affected by fires.

All of those are really -- because of the pandemic and the fires, the numbers are really in flux and we could ask a lot of questions. And so if we want to -- I feel that that point is really well-taken, Commissioner Turner, and it's actually a bigger issue that I've been kind of collecting some data around that we need to talk at some point with the Statewide Database about some of this, I think.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. Thank you to the Subcommittee for crafting this consideration and leading us through this important discussion. You know, I'm thinking about it as, okay, well, in the best case, people would -- everyone would be counted at their last
known address, right? I mean, if we had all that data, that would be the best case.

And if I knew for a fact that removing federal -- people in federal prisons now would be a step towards that I would feel, you know, easily supportive of that. But of course, we can't know that. We can't know that that best-case scenario will come about. You know, we can work for that. We can write those letters. We can advocate for it, but there's no guarantee.

So meanwhile, we're in a situation where, you know, even with the census, the number one message is always get yourself counted. Get yourself counted, be represented, right? And here we would be effectively taking a step to uncount some people, you know, for various reasons.

I'm trying to work through a thought experiment. What if it were the case that people in federal prisons had never been counted in apportionment counts, you know, and that had always been the practice? And then we were presented with a proposal, well, we could count them in the places where they're incarcerated. Would we do that? Would we vote to do that? Would we feel supportive of at least counting them where they're incarcerated versus not counting them at all, you know, if it were the reverse case.
You know, I could easily see myself, yeah, that would be better than not being counted at all, you know. Of course, it'd be better if we could count them where their last known address is, but as Deborah -- as our caller, Deborah Howard, you know, mentioned, not being counted at all is a big deal and I'm weighing that right now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you, Commissioner Yee. I agree with you on this, and I struggle with this because if someone came and said we should remove undocumented immigrants and not have them be counted, I think we would all say absolutely not, right? They absolutely must be counted as a part of redistricting. I definitely understand the concerns of inflating populations. I'm not -- I'm not entirely convinced that simply removing those people and not having them counted anywhere is the solution.

I'm wondering if there is an opportunity to explore other distribution of the federally incarcerated folks, right? So I understand it's less than 15,000 people. It's not an enormous number, but is it possible to redistribute them across the county -- the counties of California to the proportion of the population of California in some sort of schema, right, so that -- so
that those individuals don't just get uncounted, right?
So that they're not left out of redistricting purposes,
but they are actually put back into different places of
California with the recognition that they're still
Californians.

I'm concerned about what the precedent is of
removing people from redistricting purposes in the long
run, right? Like, what does that establish for us?
Certainly the inflation piece, I get that and that makes
total sense to me, but I'm not entirely comfortable or
convinced around the explicit removal of people that they
have no place in redistricting, that they -- that they
then, therefore, have no representation. And so I'm
wondering if there are alternative solutions to simply
removing them but instead redistributing them in some
other way.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani.
Commissioner Ahmad and then Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Chair, and thank
you, everyone, for this really robust conversation. I,
too, feel a little uneasy about just removing folks,
particularly because we, as an independent commission,
haven't taken the steps to get that information for
ourselves.

I appreciate that the Legislature has looked into
this and Statewide Database has looked into this as well, but I report to forty million Californians and I need to be able to turn around and say, yes, I did do everything in my power to find out if these people who are incarcerated in federal prisons are from California or not, and if they are from California, they were given that opportunity for fair representation.

So because of that, I don't feel comfortable voting to remove these people yet. In the case that we are unable to receive the data that we need to accurately redistribute that population, this conversation would be very appropriate at that time. But as of yet, I don't feel like I will be voting to remove these people from the count.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I'm thinking about what Commissioner Sadhwani said and what Commissioner Yee said. And you know, perhaps -- and correct me if I'm wrong -- but perhaps instead of thinking about removing, perhaps what we really need to do is instead spend our energy on the opposite, which is to push and as best as we can, I would say, flex our muscle as a commission to get the data that we need, and at least minimal data so that we can at least understand where those who are
incarcerated, at least in California's federal prisons, what their last known addresses are.

And frankly, I would even say, if we're going this far, we should try to find out where other Californians are residing in other states so that they can also, too, be counted in our -- in our districts as well, too, because if to the point that was brought up that anybody who is incarcerated, you know, their last known address is who they're represent -- who -- you know, basically represents who their representative is, then in addition to California's federal prisons, we should also know where the rest of Californians are also incarcerated as well, too, and that they should also be included as part of our redistricting numbers as well, too.

I mean, I'm just thinking like, look, if instead of saying, okay, we don't want to disenfranchise these folks, then we need to go the complete opposite and I think push and push as hard as we can then to get them -- to get all of their numbers counted, both here in California but across the U.S. in any federal facility.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Really appreciate the conversation and in agreement with Commissioner Akutagawa. We know that our prison population is
disproportionately African-Americans and Latinos, statistically speaking. And so I think the overrepresentation or it just provides additional political power to these regions that's hosting prisoners if we do not find out and determine where the appropriate count should be.

I am still in favor of writing the letter. I think it needs to be -- we need to push that and expect that we get it. I am having trouble actually saying I don't want people to be counted, but what I don't want is those areas to continue to have the extra representation that I don't believe they deserve. So I want to name that.

And I definitely am in support of figuring out where all the Californians are so that they can be counted here as well. So that's my struggle, that's where I'm standing. I'm not for the extra power, the extra political power. Thanks.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner.

Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: So I'm kind of get the gist and the vibes here of the commission. And so what we could do is withdraw the motion and then, you know, move forward with the letters, and then we see if we get any traction and then we can revisit it. I don't know if it'll be any better in a month or two, but that's
something that we can do. And when I say we, I believe it was Commissioners Kennedy and Turner for the letter. I just want to make sure it's clear.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I was just going to say I'm very happy to help in any way possible to write this letter and to push for this issue. I agree with you, Commissioner Turner, a hundred percent, and I think if there is an alternative way to redistribute the population of incarcerated folks in a manner that makes sense, right? And so I'm just trying to, like, brainstorm, like, is it based on, like, the proportion of -- like, you know, L.A. County has what proportion of all Californians?

Can we take that same proportion of the prison population, put them in L.A. County? Or given the racial dynamics, could we take a look at the racial -- the racial breakdown of the -- of this this 14,494 people and put them back into racialized communities, right? Like, can we put Black people -- folks that are Black prisoners back into Black communities and Latinx folks into Latinx communities?

I don't know, like, what any of the legal ramifications are or anything. I just want to try to think outside of the box of how we can approach this. I
see it as like almost a data issue and like, to me then there has to be some sort of data solution behind it so that people continue to be counted. Because I do have this fear and concern that if we -- if we say it's okay to carve-out some and just simply leave them out of redistricting, then what's to say we can't apply that to other groups in the future?

And in particular, I think this continues to be a question nationally for the undocumented in other states, right? People want to remove the undocumented for redistricting purposes, and so I'm concerned about just the precedent of what this means on a larger level. But I -- I'm -- I would be very happy to work with you and Commissioner Kennedy to push for an alternative solution on this matter.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani. I have Commissioner Vazquez and then Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. Thank you. And I'm appreciating this discussion, as always. I feel like there -- I am also in agreement that there must be a way sort of through a data -- through a mindful, like, data approach to sort of do some reassignments as compared to just completely leaving folks out.

I mean, that is exactly what the census does for unanswered census forms, right? That they have a process
of figuring out sort of where people are based on a bunch of different things, right, so that there is -- we already -- we, the government, has a way of sort of, like, guesstimating. It's not great. It's not perfect necessarily, but it is a process.

So is there some way that we can -- that we can guesstimate or make the best sense of what little data we might be able to have to be able to properly -- or at least maybe not properly, but at least reassign folks in a way that makes sense and gives communities the power that they actually have in numbers, even if it's not reflected in people's current physical residence.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And I'm in support in both the advocacy the letter-writing and also -- I would suggest that, perhaps as once we bring on VRA counsel, that VRA counsel might be able to help advise us on the compliance and legal -- how we might be able to -- some -- give us some options on how we might be able to approach this issue, if there are any. And so -- and perhaps that's something we can talk about once we get to the legal affairs committee.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Toledo. So Commissioner Fernandez, if I recall correctly, you had
indicated that you might be amenable to withdrawing the
motion in and allowing the letter-writing to proceed
and --

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Right.
CHAIR KENNEDY: We might --
VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: And then we still --
CHAIR KENNEDY: We might --
VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Right.
CHAIR KENNEDY: We take this --
VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: And we still have to -- yeah.
We still have to respond to the email, right? So I'll
have to look at that language and then come up with some
draft language on our response. And I believe
Commissioner Turner was seconded, so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So if somebody just --
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Toledo?
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Withdraw.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I was just going to suggest,
in terms of response back to the Legislature, we -- I
believe, we're meeting -- Sara and I are meeting -- our
Commissioner Sadhwani and I are meeting with the
Legislature soon, so we could convey the message at our
future meeting unless we want to deliver it over a
letter.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: They sent it via email. I believe everyone received the email. So I think it would be appropriate to respond in email likewise, but feel free, of course, to bring it up whenever you meet with them.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner -- sorry.

Director Hernandez?

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: So did I hear correctly that the motion was withdrawn?

CHAIR KENNEDY: The motion has been withdrawn.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Anything further on this topic?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: No.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Proceeding with our Subcommittee reports, public input meeting design has already reported. Lessons Learned, Commissioners Ahmad and Kennedy. Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you. Please continue to send over any Lessons Learned. I heard a number of Lessons Learned today during Subcommittee report outs and have noted them.

CHAIR KENNEDY: So thank you to colleagues for your ongoing contributions. Keep them coming. Item 10-P,
Outreach Director recruitment, Commissioners Ahmad and Fernandez.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: So the recruitment did go out. It was posted on April 1st, and Director Hernandez had mentioned earlier today, I do -- we do have a sense that we might be ready for interviews at our next commission meeting, which was currently scheduled for the 26th and 27th. So we're thinking that we would have to extend that another day or two.

Also the Chief Counsel might also be ready for interviews, so that's something that we -- I would hope that we can discuss today in terms of people's availability, in terms of being able to extend it another day or two. And as noted earlier, so far we have five applications for the Outreach Director recruitment.

So if everyone could please look at their calendars and again, if we're not ready at that point, we'll have to readdress -- reassess it and maybe wait for the following meeting. But I think we're all very anxious to get these positions interviewed and on board as soon as possible.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Will these positions be interviewed in public session or in closed session?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: They're executive-level
positions, so they would be in closed session.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I just want to learn, like, from our Lessons Learned thus far, I don't know what all of the State rules are for hiring, and I know that we do have to protect the privacy of candidates and such things in general. Like, I think that that's a rule.

But I do think that having -- from what we've learned thus far, what I see is, is a lot of value in having at least some portion of the process being public, even if it's simply the release of the names of the candidates we're interviewing or any portion of those interviews, and yet our deliberations are maybe in closed session. I'm not sure what we can or can't do in terms of that, and so I might look to Marian or Commissioner Fernandez or whomever else has more input on that.

But I do think that had we had a more public process in some of our earlier hires, that it would have helped us. And I have no idea who the candidates are at this point in time, but just in general, I -- that's my own lesson learned as we've come thus far.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Sadhwani. I'm just noticing that the following meeting, we have an action meeting for Tuesday, May the 4th. And you know, we're certainly far enough out that we could extend the
hours of that meeting, if necessary, to fit interviews in. It seems to me we're a little on top of things, on top of deadlines if we try to squeeze this into this next set of meetings.

Director Hernandez or Marian, do you have any thoughts on that?

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: In regards to extending the -- or doing the interviews on May 4th versus --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: -- earlier?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: Either way. I think we do have it agendized for the 28th and 29th at this point. If that does not work, then we should agendize for the May 4th. I forget exactly when the deadline for putting that agenda out is. I'll double-check that right now.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes, Chair. Just so that you know, I did -- because the agenda was due yesterday, I did ask Director Hernandez to go ahead and add a couple days just in case we were able to do that, so it has been agendized if we need it.

Again, if we can even be flexible with that, like the 26th and 27th, maybe those two days are interviews if everyone can make it, and then the 28th and 29th could be
our regular everything else that we have on our business.
I was just trying to be a little bit more forward thinking of -- and trying to get interviews done. And especially because we do have some.

We have received applications, and Commissioner Ahmad and I were going to review -- I think as of this Friday, whatever we have, we're going to review that, and then come together next Monday to decide how we're going to move forward, if we're going to move forward with any of the candidates. And maybe we won't. Maybe it'll be we don't have anyone or we have someone and you know, we'll just have to play it by ear. But I just wanted to put time in there.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect. Yeah, yeah. Perfect. That's very helpful to have that information.

Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: This is maybe a question for Director Hernandez, but just wanted to confirm that the recruitments were also cross-posted in some of the more nonprofit circles. I had sent a list of potential places to cross-post the recruitment, so I just wanted to confirm that that happened.

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: I believe it did happen. We also shared this information. I believe Fredy, or Director Ceja, shared it through other media or contacts
that we have. So you know, we tried to make it as robust
as possible to get folks to apply.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Great. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Okay. We are three
minutes before our scheduled dinner break. We have made
very good progress through our agenda. I wanted to get a
sense from Director Hernandez and from the colleagues.
My thought would be to solicit public comment now, close
for the day, come back tomorrow at 1 o'clock, and it
would presumably be a fairly short meeting.

If we come back after dinner and continue until
8:30, we would have virtually nothing to do tomorrow. So
I just wanted to get thoughts from Director Hernandez and
colleagues on that. Director Hernandez?

DIRECTOR HERNANDEZ: I am all for that, given that I
had thought the meeting was at 9:30. So I've been here
since 9:30 in the office. I would love to get dinner, so
I don't see that being a problem. I think we have to
consider that we have this meeting agendized for tomorrow
and we need to have content for that meeting as well.

If we have the same level of dialog as we had today
in regards to the incarcerated folks on any of the
remaining items, I think it'll make for a very productive
day tomorrow. That starts again at 1 o'clock. Just a
reminder. I'm not going to get out of bed too early.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Commissioner Fornaciari, was your hand up?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I guess my question is, it looks like we just have two more items. I mean, is -- legal affairs committee, is there further report? And is there a government panel?

CHAIR KENNEDY: At this point, the government sector panel is not happening.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And the data management reported. So I mean, I could knock out the IT recruitment in one minute. Right? I mean --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: That, and before we adjourn, if we're going to try to do it tonight, I do need information on whether we're going to have an extra couple of days at the next meeting. So I just want to make sure we solidify that before we adjourn. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: I think what Commissioner Fornaciari was heading to was a quick lunch, let's do the rest of the agenda, and then we're done, right?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Actually, I was heading for can we just keep going for 15 more minutes and finish this up?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Andersen.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I -- these are all great ideas, but didn't we actually request a couple of things to people to come back and that they were going to give stuff to us tomorrow? Like, I believe we actually requested Ms. Johnston to bring back -- you know, I can't remember exactly what it was but I know --

MS. JOHNSTON: That was disclaimer language on posting the transcript. I think that could wait.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. And I thought there was something else. It was that one and then -- oh, some other committee was left open because they were going to get some other information.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I think -- Commissioner Andersen, I think it was the communities of interest tool one, but I think if you're all willing, we could postpone it to the next report. And that will also give us time to schedule Jaime as well, too, from Statewide Database.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Data management, do you have anything further for the full commission?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So then videography and other support personnel, would we be able to continue for another fifteen minutes or so including public comments?
MR. MANOFF: That should be okay, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Regarding Wednesday, is there a legal affairs -- or is there a legal affairs meeting in the -- okay. I just wanted to make sure that we're using a full day because I know it's best to cancel with two days in advance and all that, but.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think Commissioner Toledo will be chair. I don't know how big of an agenda we have, though.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Not a very long agenda. As long as the -- it's not a very long agenda, but we do have an agenda.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Then -- okay. Have -- we will continue now. We will finish out before we break, and then we will not reconvene tomorrow.

Anything further on the Outreach Director recruitment? Commissioner Fernandez.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: We just need to -- we just need to see if commissioners are going to be available for an extra couple of days at our April 26th, 27th.

Commissioner Ahmad, do you have anything else? I was hoping that we --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Nope. Just wanted to bring to your attention that our next -- after the 26th, 27th, and
28th, our next multiple days of meeting is not slated until May 12th. So that does put us a little ways away for interviews unless we schedule something in the interim just specifically for interviews. But your availability would be very much so appreciated for the 26th and 27th.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. We'll bring that up under future meeting dates and agenda items. Chief counsel recruitment, Commissioners Andersen and Toledo.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Commissioner Toledo, do you want to --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Sure. We have three applicants that have applied and meet -- met the minimum requirements. We are in the process of reviewing the applications. We're still accepting applications at this point. Thank you to everyone who has helped in publicizing the position and getting it out to your networks.

We -- I know we are -- we've had a couple of the state agency -- state agencies and law firms that we've been working with tell us that they are distributing the application to their networks, and hopefully, we'll be able to yield more individuals and more candidates.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yep.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you. Anything
further, Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Just in terms of the dates, I do think it's a good idea to put them on the calendar, allowing time -- sufficient time to cancel those without costing anything on the video ahead of time should the ideal candidates come along.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good. And then Commissioner Fornaciari and Commissioner Andersen, the IT recruitment.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I've had a few conversations with Director Hernandez about this recruitment. We're still trying to get some clarity on the roles and responsibilities and how the roles and responsibilities of the data manager and this role and Karina.

And so Commissioner Hernandez and Raul are working together to get some clarity on that. And then Commissioner Andersen and I still need to connect and talk in detail about our thoughts and get with Commissioner -- or Director Hernandez on it. Do you have anything, Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That's just a very good summary. Very good summary.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So then government panel is not happening this time. Data management, we have no
further information or action on that. No need for a
closed session at this point. So we come back -- we come
down to discussion of future meeting dates and agenda
items.
So Commissioner Fernandez, you want to know who is
and is not available at the end of the month for
interviewing?
VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yeah. How about more of
who's not available? Yeah. But again --
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.
VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: -- so it's the 26th, 27th.
The 28th would only be a half day because we have a
public input design, so it would only be, like, a 12 to
4. And then the Thursday would be a 9:30 to 4:30 is what
I was proposing.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. I potentially have a speaking
engagement with the Riverside County Voting Accessibility
Advisory Committee 10 a.m. on the 28th, but that would be
over by 12. So I could be --
VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Um-hum.
CHAIR KENNEDY: -- in a commission meeting that
started at 12. I saw a hand. Commissioner Taylor and
then Sinay and then Turner.
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I never want to stop the
train, but I think up until 2 o'clock on the 27th, I may
have a work commitment, but I -- you know me, I always try to multitask.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I get my second vaccine the morning of the 28th. First one didn't do anything, so hopefully the second one won't do anything. But I should be okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. And --

MS. JOHNSTON: The second ones are worse.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Turner and then Commission Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you. Those first Monday, Tuesday is great. Wednesday, I am not available in the morning. I just -- probably up until 4 -- well, yeah. We have our hearing at 4. So yeah. Wednesday morning does not work for me, or Thursday. I am here, though, Monday and Tuesday.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez followed by Commissioner Akutagawa.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes. I just wanted to make sure everybody was aware that on Monday the 26th, it's from 9:30 to 4:30, and on the 27th, it's 1 to 8. The 28th is 12 to 4, and the 29th is 9:30 to 4:30.

And just, Commissioner Sinay, my first and second shots were fine. So I think it depends on the person.
Good luck.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Akutagawa and then Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I'm with -- I'm with Commissioner Turner. Unfortunately, the 28th and 29th are pretty bad. I mean, I could -- I'm happy to add some extra time to the 26th and 27th. I could stay later. I could come on slightly earlier on the 27th, but the 28th, the earliest I could get on -- I mean, it would only be, like, from 3 o'clock and then we have the public input design meeting after that unless, you know -- I don't think you want to forego that meeting.

And unfortunately, the 29th, I -- I'm back to back to back that day. So unfortunately, I -- and these are things that I can't just cancel. If I had just regular meetings, I can, but they're all presentations that I have, so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Vazquez and then Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: The 26th, 27th are good for me. I'm not available before 4 on the 28th. I could do the 29th, if necessary.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. Commissioner Turner?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. I was just going to offer Thursday after 3 o'clock. I could do something
Thursday after 3 o'clock, and also earlier on the
Tuesday, 27th, before our other meeting.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fernandez?

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Okay. I'm just trying to
see. So what I'm thinking what might work best is if we
are going to have interviews to conduct those on Monday
and Tuesday because I will assume that Commissioners
Akutagawa, Turner, and Vazquez would like to be involved
in those interviews. And then maybe juggle the -- our
regular business meeting to the other days. But then
again, that would mean that possibly three of you are
gone. So if there's any action items, we'll have to --
we'll have to work around that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I know that we didn't want
to make multiple-day meetings, you know, multiple weeks
in a row, but what about adding on to the following week,
you know, May 3rd? I know we have a meeting scheduled on
the 4th and also on the 5th.

At this point, I mean, I could probably even add the
6th a lot more easily if I needed to. And I don't know
if that would be the same for Commissioner Turner to just
having that little extra time. I could just move things
around a little bit more easily.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: We have May 4th right now, but I don't think we have May 6th -- 5th. May 4th is a -- is just an action meeting if we have items.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Oh.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So the --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Maybe the -- maybe the 5th is the public input design meeting. Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Not on my calendar, but I have been known to be wrong.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: It's okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: It's probably -- it's probably me.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yeah. Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Commissioner Fernandez, I like your proposal since the 26th of April was already a day where a majority of commissioners said they would be available. So if we hold interviews on that day and then juggle the rest of the business items through the remaining scheduled days, I'm sure we can work out something within our Subcommittees to ensure that there's coverage for report outs.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fernandez?
VICE CHAIR FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you, Commissioner 
Ahmad. I agree. And especially seeing how quickly we 
got through our business meeting today. However, we do 
have a couple of panels scheduled for that week, so I'll 
have to work with Commissioner Sadhwani and Commissioner 
Sinay, I believe, because they're the two that have 
panels. So yeah, I think we could probably, maybe if 
we're efficient, conduct all the interviews on the 26th 
and then maybe go from there. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Katy, if you could please 
call for general comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Sure thing, Chair. All 
right. 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 
television number provided on the livestream feed. It is 
877-853-5247. When prompted, enter the meeting ID number 
provided on the livestream feed. It is 98688125251 for 
this 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. To indicate you wish to comment, please press 
star 9. This will raise your hand for the moderator. 
When it is your turn to speak, you will hear a message 
that says the host would like you to talk and to press
star 6 to speak. If you would like to give your name, please stay and spell it for the record. You are not required to provide your name to give public comment.

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

And the commission is taking their general end-of-meeting public comment. And there is no one in the queue at this time.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you. We will wait two minutes.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And the instructions are complete on the stream, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. We'll wait one more minute.

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: While we're waiting, I just want to mention that the meeting on Saturday, which I don't think we have the time in here, it's 10 to basically 2 or 3. It is not go until 6 o'clock, so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Well, thank you, everyone, for a quick and productive day. This concludes our meeting, and our next -- well, there are committee meetings, or a committee meeting, on Wednesday, and then
we have our training event on Saturday. I want to thank you all for your patience and your thoughtful contributions and look forward to seeing all of you on Saturday.

(Whereupon, the CRC Business Meeting adjourned.)
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