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CHAIR TURNER: Good morning and welcome back to our public meeting. Today is Thursday -- let's see, September -- I always have to check my phone -- the third. And we're going to begin with roll call, please.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Ahmad?
VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Akutagawa?
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Andersen?
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here.

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

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Fornaciari?
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Kennedy?
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Le Mons?
COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Sadhwani?
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Sinay?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Taylor?
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Present.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Toledo? No Commissioner Toledo.

Commissioner Turner?

CHAIR TURNER: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Vazquez?

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: So we're missing two, but you do have a quorum.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Great. Then we will proceed. I see Commissioner Vazquez will probably join us again in just a moment. And so we'll start our day out with public comment.

And so good morning, AT&T operator. We're going to thank you in advance for your services today.

Ryan, we'll ask for you to check, please, if we have any public comment waiting. Actually, before we do, let's have the instructions read first, please, Raul.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Ready, Madam Chair.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: In order to -- excuse me. In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the commissioners will be
taking public comment during their meeting by phone. There will be opportunities to address the commissioners regarding the items on the agenda and the process in general. In addition, for each agenda item that requires a vote, the public may provide comment on that particular item. Each time that the commissioners bring up an action item, the viewing audience will be informed that it is time to call in if they wish to make a public comment. The commissioners will then allow at least three minutes for those who wish to comment to join the public comment queue.

So to make a public comment, please dial 877-226-8163. After dialing the number, you will speak to an operator. You will be asked to provide you to the access code for the meeting, which is 5185236, that's 5185236; or the name of the meeting, which is Citizens Redistricting Commission First Commission Meeting.

After providing this information, the operator will ask you to provide your name. Now, please note that you're not required to provide your actual name if you don't wish to. You may provide either your own name or a name other than your own. When it's your turn to make a public comment, the moderator will introduce you by the name you provided to the operator. So providing a name helps AT&T, which is hosting this public comment process,
to ensure that everyone holding for public comment has a chance to submit their comments. Please be assured that the commission is not maintaining any list of callers by name, and is only asking for some name so that the call moderator can manage multiple calls simultaneously and can let you know when it's your turn to speak.

So after providing a name and speaking with the operator, you will be placed in a listening room, which is a virtual waiting room where you will wait until it's your turn to speak. You'll be able to listen to the live audio of the meeting, so please remember to mute your computer livestream audio, because the online video and audio will be approximately sixty seconds behind the live audio that you are hearing on your telephone. Now, if you fail to mute your computer livestream audio, it will be extremely difficult for you to follow the meeting and difficult for anyone to hear your comment due to the feedback issues that will occur; therefore, once you are waiting in the queue, be alert for when you may be called upon to speak, and please turn down the livestream volume.

From the listening room, listen to the meeting and the call moderator. When you decide that you want to make a comment about the agenda item currently being discussed, you can press 1-0, that's 1-0. Then you will
be placed in the queue to make a public comment. When joining the queue to make a public comment, you should hear an automatic recording informing you that you have been placed in the queue. You will not receive any further instruction until the moderator brings you in to make your public comment. The moderator will open your line and introduce you by name that you provided to the operator. Once again, make sure that you have muted any background noise from your computer. Please, do not use a speakerphone, but rather speak directly into your phone.

After the moderator introduces you, please state the name you provided to the operator, and then state your comment clearly and concisely. After you finish making your comment, commissioners will move on to the next caller, and you may hang up the call. So if you would like to comment on another agenda item at a later time, please call back when the commissioners open up public comment for that item, and you can repeat this process. If you are disconnected for any reason, please call back and explain the issue to the operator, then repeat this process and rejoin the public comment queue by pressing 1-0.

The commissioners will take comment for every action item on the agenda. As you listen to the online video
stream, public comments will be solicited, and that is the time to call in. The process for making a comment will be the same each time; begin by dialing 877-226-8163 and following the steps that I just described. These steps are also located on the website. There's a link on the home page. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Raul.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: You're welcome.

CHAIR TURNER: Ryan, please check to see if we have anyone waiting for public comment.

AT&T OPERATOR: As a reminder, if you would like to make a public comment, please press 1 then 0 at this time. 1-0. And we have no one in queue for a public comment.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Thank you. Thank you so much.

Today commissioners, we're going to take our remaining agenda items in order.

So we have agenda items 13, which Marian will be -- the Discussion of Conflict of Interest Code.

We'll go to agenda item 14, which will be a Report on Commission Staffing and a report from the subcommittees.

Agenda item 15, Raul, Training on the State Contracting and Procurement.

We'll move to agenda item 16, which will be the
RFPs, and then 18.
Marian, we will still do our agenda item 18, Discussion of Key Provisions, since it's on the agenda, and conclude our day with discussion of future meeting dates and agenda items.

MS. JOHNSTON: And if I may, I think you should also go back to agenda item 5. I believe there's a recommendation as to how to proceed with the Chairs and Vice-Chair rotation.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So what we'll do, under agenda item 5, when we have our report out -- no; we won't combine agenda items. Thank you. We'll add that in at some point.

MS. JOHNSTON: So would you like --

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think -- and Commissioner Toledo can correct me if I'm wrong. I think we're ready to prepare -- we're prepared to share with you all for agenda item, I believe it's 9 on the census.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to go back to public comments for a second. And I don't think yesterday -- we were kind of in a hurry, and after Rosalind Gold spoke we didn't hear back from Dr. Barreto,
if he had any response to what she had said. So I don't
know if we want to ask him if he had any response. And I
do believe we -- if it's an agenda item, we can engage
with the public comments that come in. We don't just
have to accept them, but we can ask for clarification and
engage if it's a public comment during the general. I
feel like sometimes we just say thank you, but we don't
say -- people are calling saying -- giving us their input
on a map, it's not the right agenda time, but they
probably don't know how we're working. And so maybe just
to invite them to go online and give us their email so we
can let them know when we're in their community or follow
us online. Just so it feels like we're hearing them, and
we're also connecting them to the process; because I know
for some folks, they know how to do the public comment,
but for a lot of people, they'll just walk away saying
okay, once again government didn't hear me. And so I
just want us to be able to -- I really like the way you
make people feel very comfortable. We've all made them
feel very comfortable when they call, but just if we can
direct them to the right place --

CHAIR TURNER: Um-hum. Um hum.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- it could be helpful. Thank
you so much.

MS. JOHNSTON: Just one clarification on that --
CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

MS. JOHNSTON: -- if it's an item on the agenda, then the commissioners can engage with the caller and discuss and give feedback. If it's under the general comment -- it's not related to an item on the agenda, all you can do is say thank you very much, we'll consider that at a future meeting.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Counsel, can't we ask for clarification? We don't have to just say thank you; we can ask them for clarification, can't we?

MS. JOHNSTON: No, because it's -- any discussion should come up during -- when it's on an item on the agenda. So you will be, hopefully, putting it on your agenda for a future matter. If you don't understand what they're saying, yes; but you can't engage into a do you mean this or this.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just in case it's helpful, when I was on the school board, I finally had an aha moment on why that happens, and it's so that no one takes over our agenda -- hijacks the agenda with what they want. And so that's why we can't engage with anyone who's talking about something that's not on the agenda.
MS. JOHNSTON: Correct.

CHAIR TURNER: All right. Okay. We have someone that needs to mute as well.

Okay. And as I'm learning the permission of a Chair role, so please, do join in if you feel like there's something, just step right on in. I may not know where to direct them other than saying okay, so I appreciate the support of all of my fellow commissioners as I, perhaps, conclude this role for this meeting. Let's see how this works.

Okay. Perfect. We'll make all of that happen. Can we start -- and we will get a report, Commissioner Sadhwani, from all of the subcommittees as well. I'll do that under agenda item 14, and so everyone will be prepared for that.

So we'll start the day with Marian you're your report, agenda item 13, under Discussion of Conflict of Interest Code.

MS. JOHNSTON: Thank you. The first provision you need to consider is Constitution Section XXI Section 2(c)(6) which says that you need to apply the article in a manner than is impartial, that reinforces public confidence.

CHAIR TURNER: I'm sorry, Marian. Marian, I'm sorry. Commissioners, I know I just kind of threw the
order on you today, but has everyone prepared and have
your sheet or know where to find it on the screen? It's
the conflict of interest code for Citizens Redistricting,
and we actually got a handout on this.

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes. There are a couple of handouts.
A commission member is ineligible while you're serving
for your ten-year term after appointment to hold an
elective public office at any level; and you're
ineligible for five years beginning from your date of
appointment to hold a appointive state, federal, or local
public office, to serve a paid staff or a paid consultant
to any of the groups that you do the line drawing for; or
to register as a state, federal, or local lobbyist. So
that's specific to the commission.

Other than that, there's a general conflict of
interest rules about not having any financial interest or
not having a member of your family have any financial
interest in anything that the commission does. And we'll
be talking about this more thoroughly when we get around
to doing contracts, when they actually come before the
commission. But for example, if your son owned a
building, and the commission was going to be holding a
meeting there, you couldn't charge rent for it, because
that would be your immediate family profiting. Or if
your spouse were a lawyer, you couldn't vote on hiring
that person as the general counsel for the commission.

So generally, that kind of conflict of interest is linked to financial benefit.

There was a question that came up earlier about if you know someone who may want to influence the commission, just knowing someone, as long as you don't have any financial contact, is not a prohibiting conflict of interest. The prohibition there would be make sure that you don't receive any comments or input from that person outside of the public meeting. So if that were to come up, you would have to say please, send it writing or testify at a public meeting. But other than that, just knowing somebody is not any kind of a conflict.

As to the Form 700 and the conflict of interest code, you all have thirty days from your date of appointment. Hopefully, the first eight -- I believe your time has just run out. When is it?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: I have those.

MS. JOHNSTON: Everyone has submitted one. Great.

For the new commissioners, you were sworn in last Wednesday; so thirty days from that is when yours would be due. And you're assuming office statement is fairly directly -- regulations of FPPC, Fair Political Practices Commission tell you what you're required to provide.

You'd report investments, interests in real property, and
business positions held on the date you assumed the office or position. In addition, income including loans, gifts, and travel payments received during the twelve months prior have to be reported. And that is in the instructions for the Form 700 that I believe you were all sent.

As to the conflict of interest, after the initial form and what you have to provide, there were actually two different conflict of interest codes that the last commission adopted. The current one is much abbreviated. It was when the commission lost most of its staff, and it only lists a very few positions: commissioners, the senior operations manager, and consultants and new positions. That it is the code currently in effect. You also got a copy of the code that was in effect prior to that, which was much more in depth about what types of -- what types of employees you had and what category of disclosure they fell under. What I would like to do, with your approval, is after you set up who you're going to have -- what categories of employees you're going to have, I would redraft a new conflict of interest code for you that reflects those positions and go through the process of adopting that as your new conflict of interest code; because the one currently in effect doesn't cover all the positions that I think you're going to be having.
And finally, on the training, you have to do the training within six months of your date of appointment. You've gotten the website, and if anyone doesn't have that -- I think it was one of the handouts that Raul did about training. If you need that again, it is on the California Attorney General's website, or we can send you the link to it again. It's very user-friendly, walking you through different situations, telling you what your answer is -- telling you what the right answer is, then having you go through a series of questions after you read a section. And when you complete it, you get a certificate of completion, which then you submit to Raul so that we can keep those on file. And then after that, you have to do it every year -- you have to do it by April 1st of every year. So after everybody has done their conflicts of interest training, then we can have more discussion about the specifics, but I don't think you need to know that at the present time.

Any questions? Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Marian.

Commissioner Sinay, did you have any additional questions, or were you able to get your questions answered off-line? Because I know there were some things that we deferred to the conflict of interest time on the agenda? Okay. So she's good. Awesome.
Commissioners, any other comments, questions on these codes or training for the conflict of interest?

Okay. So what we're going to do is to open it for public comment before we conclude this agenda item.

Ryan, would you please check the line to see if there's any public on?

AT&T OPERATOR: Certainly. Ladies and gentlemen, please press 1 then 0 if you wish to make a comment. 1-0. And we have no one in queue.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. We'll move to agenda item 14. And on our original agenda, it read Report of Commission Staffing: The General Procedures. We've done some of this - Status Decision on Recruitment, Executive Director, Chief Counsel, Communications Director, discussion of possible actions. And so what we'd like to do is to hear feedback from -- let's go with the subcommittees that actually working (sic) on the application review.

That subcommittee, please, if you can give us a report at this time on the various positions.

MS. JOHNSTON: There are three different subcommittees, one for each position.

CHAIR TURNER: Um-hum. Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. So Commissioner Kennedy and I, we've reviewed the sixteen applications
that we received. And we were fortunate to have some
good candidates, and we were able to narrow it down to
five that we believe we could interview at that level.
But obviously, we can't discuss the specific people, so
we just -- that would be our recommendation is to move
forward with interviewing the five that we screened.

CHAIR TURNER: Any comments or questions from the
commissioners?

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Executive Director?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes. This is for Executive Director.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, and I'm sorry; it's
Executive Director. I'm sorry. And then also, if we do
agree to move forward, then we would need to set up
meetings for that, which would be closed session.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Forn -- excuse me,
Sadhwani, and then Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Just really quickly, I
forgot how many applications were received again?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sixteen.

CHAIR TURNER: Sixteen. Sixteen.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Sixteen, yeah.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Of those you narrowed down to
five. Did you have a sense of how many were screened out
because they didn't meet the minimum? I'm trying to figure out who was sort of in the middle, maybe not interview caliber but met the minimum requirement. I'm curious.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I would say -- and Commissioner Kennedy, correct me if I'm wrong -- I would say we probably had -- of the sixteen, I would say at least -- the majority of them met the minimum, so I would say thirteen/fourteen met the minimum -- what I would consider the minimum.

Commissioner Kennedy, do you have any -- okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: When you meet in closed session, you could review the applications of those who were not recommended for interview at that time. And if you want to have the further interviews, you could do that.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So there is the recommendation of moving forward with five and discussion in closed session. Do we need a motion on -- Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I have a question in terms of just the process of how we're doing this. If we move ahead, when is the time that we put together -- does the subcommittee put together, like, interview questions, or is that in the next step?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: That's what Commissioner
Kennedy and I were discussing today is -- obviously, coming up with questions we don't want to do it in open form, because it is a confidential process, so it'd have to be done in closed session. And I'm not sure in terms of the requirements that -- Commissioner Kennedy and I could come up with some draft questions, but obviously, we would want there to be consensus in terms of what we want to ask the candidates. And I was -- we were thinking of two different options. One of the options could -- and I don't know if this is feasible or not is -- we could receive input individually from each commissioner. I'm not sure if that's allowed; and if that's not allowed, when we schedule the interviews in two weeks, I would suggest the first day would not be interviews; it would be to come up with questions in closed session.

So it's one of two options, and I'd have to defer to legal as to whether our first option would be feasible, because we couldn't go back and forth in terms of you submit me the -- what you want the questions to be, and then I respond back, because then you run into potential issues there. So that's --

MS. JOHNSTON: But you would also have issues if --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- my recommendation at this point.
MS. JOHNSTON: You would have to do it by the second method. If you did the first method, you would be taking action outside of the public meeting.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. And that's what I thought. That's what I thought.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Marian, would it be appropriate for them to send me the questions? I can put those together, and then when they have the first closed session, I could present the compiled questions for the group to look at.

MS. JOHNSTON: Exactly. And in fact, those could be sent to the commissioners ahead of time, as long as they don't discuss it with each other.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. That would be -- that would probably be a more efficient way to do it, instead of starting from scratch the first day, and it'll give everyone an idea of what type of questions they may want.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. And Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Just as a point of clarification, why do the questions that we develop have to be done in closed session? Because I remember the review committee, they developed their questions in an open forum for us.

MS. JOHNSTON: The concern would be if you're trying
to come up with questions, you would give the applicants
a heads up ahead of time about what you're going to be
asking.

CHAIR TURNER: Though the process -- and I'm
assuming this will be a process that we're trying to
adopt that will follow through with each of the positions
that are open. Right now we're discussing, perhaps, each
of the commissioners sending in suggested questions to
Raul to have him compile them, and then send all of those
questions back out to the commissioners in advance of a
closed session meeting where we would narrow down the
questions.

MS. JOHNSTON: Correct.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Is that a -- Commissioner
Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think Commissioner Taylor
asks a good question. I'll be honest, I wish I didn't
know the questions when we had the interview. It would
have been easier not to have to prepare for specific
questions. But especially, because I'm concerned that
some of our questions may not have been exactly in the
job postings. The way it was put in, we had some issues
about -- anyway, so I'm wondering if legally we have to
do it in closed session, or it's just that for the
majority of us, it feels better to do it closed session.
MS. JOHNSTON: Legally, you may do it in closed session, and I think it feels better to do it in closed session.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, I'm going to defer to Commissioner Kennedy, but let me just put -- I'm just going to put my two cents in. I'm not exactly sure what was discussed prior to our interviews, and I believe that although they decided on -- I think it was four or five questions that everyone would be asked, there were also some questions that were specific to the individual candidate that were not discussed in open session, I believe, correct? I wasn't online when they were discussing the questions, but I do know that we did have standard questions, but then we also had individual questions that were tailored to our --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Right.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- specific situations.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: If I may? With the ARP, which is what you're describing now, there were standard questions across the applicants and then follow-up questions that each of the ARP members developed specifically for -- and that's why you had the variance in questions, because different things needed to be asked for different candidates. If I may, that's not strictly speaking, a personnel selection process. What you will
be engaging in is a personnel selection process. So there will be some differences in the approach and the process.

CHAIR TURNER: Um-hum. Commissioners Vazquez and Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I guess I would like to know exactly if we have to do it in closed session, only because I know for interviewing -- and I get that there are different rules -- but when I interviewed for public position, there had been a couple cases where I have received questions somewhat in advance, whether it was an hour or a day before. And I say this also to Commissioner Sinay's point, that I think we had started a discussion about wanting to see things in particular positions that weren't maybe necessarily reflected in the posting. And for me, I still would like someone to bring their A-game, because they know that I am going to be -- or we, as a commission, are going to be asking for particular things that maybe aren't explicit in the posting. So that would be, at least for maybe a subset of questions -- I would like someone to come explicitly prepared to address issues that aren't explicit in the posting.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioners Kennedy, Turner, Lee, and Ahmad?
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Madam Chair, I'm fine.
Commissioner Fernandez made the point that I was going to make. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

MS. JOHNSTON: If I may just answer the question about what's required? It says nothing in this article shall be construed to prevent a public body from holding closed sessions to consider the appointment employment evaluation of performance or dismissal of public employee. So that's why I was saying it's permitted to hold it in closed session; nothing prevents you from holding a closed session, but it really is up to you whether you want to do it or not.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Well, that's Bagley-Keene. When you look at personnel practice, the deliberative process for developing the selection instrument is typically done in private. And that is because -- it does tend then to do two things. And the major one is to queue then the candidates in terms of what you're looking for and therefore, then slant their responses in that direction. And that's pretty typical. So when you start looking at Freedom of Information Act, that's typically not a disclosable item because of the fact of the impact on the selection process.

If I may also, as far as your selection process, you
are permitted to engage in questions that do look at things like organizational fit, desired qualifications; and that's why it's important, I think, that you be able to take this time, develop your questions, let's amalgamate them, and have a discussion then as you prepare what your final questions are going to be. Because I know that there has been a lot of concern about what you can and can't ask.

MS. JOHNSTON: And you're not limited to the job announcement.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: No.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Understood. I think it's more -- I think I maybe have a different perspective on how best to get at interview candidates' qualifications via an interview, that are maybe different from some, if not all, of the commissioners; and how interviews are generally conducted.

MS. JOHNSTON: Well, for one thing, you're exempt from civil service rules, so you don't have to worry about the technicalities, but it really is up to you if you want to develop your questions in public or in a closed session. It's just you're not prohibited from holding a closed session.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: But I would recommend not to develop your -- I'm sorry. I can't
support that. Sorry. There may not be a law about it, but as far as personnel practice and the way the law applies to it, that's not what you do. Now, that being said, if you wanted to develop your questions and then provide them to the candidates half an hour before they go online, that's appropriate, and that's common practice.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: But that's different than the deliberative process.

CHAIR TURNER: Right. And I'd like to thank counsel and staff. We appreciate your comments and are certainly taking them under advisement. The queue that I have it -- I'm going to -- I have a couple of comments I'd like to make. Yee, Ahmad -- Yee, I see you again, and Kennedy, that will go next.

The thing that I wanted to say and especially in response to Commissioner Vazquez -- I appreciate all the comments that's been said. One of the things that I believe we could do, is to be able to develop the questions that we're, like, wanting to use in closed session and at that time, also identify questions that may get at things that was not on our original job posting. And at that point, if indeed we determine that we should release some piece of some of the questions --
some core questions that would ask everyone, based on the
different job type, we can choose then to release those
early, and then have the others that we want to ask that
we did not disclose in advance. And so that's something
that I would be really comfortable with, and I think that
there is advantage to be able to ensure that -- we are
ensuring that all of our questions are appropriate and
that we are all in agreement before we do it in public
comment.

So for me, I'd like to definitely develop them in
closed session, identify which ones that may be outside
of what we've communicated, and then provide those in
advance -- or anything else we determine -- but at that
point, make a determination of what we want to post prior
to people coming into their interview.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I really like that idea,
Commissioner Turner. I would support that. I think part
of it is the difference between slow processors and fast
processors. As a slow processor myself, I loved having
the ARP questions beforehand, and it really made a
difference for me. I think also posting questions would
provide some assurance to candidates that we're asking
the same questions of different candidates, which would
be a positive thing, too, I think.
CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Ahmad?

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: I have thoughts on the interview process as well, but I was wondering if we can go back to just the three positions themselves and see if the other two positions had any viable candidates to move forward on. It would just help me to try to formulize how many positions are we talking about in terms of the interview process itself at this point.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Thank you for that call.

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm with Commissioner Yee in supporting your proposal. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Thank you. And in light of Commissioner Ahmad's -- the process will, I'm hoping, be the same for all of our positions. And so we can come back and finalize that, but I do want to also be responsive to a commissioner's desire to get back to the positions. So we've heard just from the Executive Director Subcommittee, with sixteen applications received, narrow it down to five, and there were not a lot of other questions about their process. So yeah. Let's go ahead and hear from the next subcommittee, Counsel.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Chief counsel.
CHAIR TURNER: Please.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes. This is Commissioner Toledo, and Commissioner Andersen and I met, and we reviewed the -- and you have a memo in your -- that was sent to you. We met and we reviewed the bulletin as well as the application packages, and reviewed the packages thoroughly. And given the high likelihood of litigation and the commissions' need for a strong legal guidance, we're recommending reposting an updated advertisement for the position. And if resources allow, contracting with a private search firm to help us secure a larger pool of qualified candidates. The background for this is, is we only received four candidates for the counsel position, and the candidates had varying levels of legal experience, all of whom demonstrated very strong knowledge of the state government; most of whom have worked for the State government for quite some time and have extensive experience in that area. None of the candidates demonstrated a significant or -- significant experience with the Voting Rights and Federal Voting Rights Act, whether it's implementation, litigation, or enforcement which was one of the items that went in the bulletin as being a requirement. Although I did have some good experience -- some good legal experience, most have not served as Chief Counsel in the past, so this
would -- and this would be an opportunity for a promotion, but certainly, they didn't have that experience -- or most don't have that experience, except for I believe one person in the pool.

And given all of this, we thought that it -- the limited pool suggests that perhaps this position needs further search. So conduct a more extensive executive search and a more widespread search; maybe just posting it in some of the different venues for a certain amount of time. And we do know that this may delay the hiring of the counsel, which is a very important position for the commission, but given the need for -- given the very high chance of litigation and the need for a strong counsel -- and experienced counsel, I should say, and the feedback we're getting from the lead stakeholders about ensuring that we have a diverse and also just an experienced pool of individuals, this -- we thought it also gives us an opportunity to try to obtain a bigger pool, while at the same time -- given that most of the legal -- more complex legal issues will occur once we start delving into the data, which won't happen until later this year, early next year. We do have a little bit of time, not too much, but a little bit more time than perhaps the other positions to do a reposting of the position. So that was our recommendation. I don't know
if Commissioner Andersen would like to add anything else.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. We really felt that there was more to be gained than there is to be lost just going ahead. And just before -- it just wasn't robust of a pool enough. And unfortunately, it was a very, sort of, obviously narrowly -- the group who saw this posting was obviously rather narrow, because they were just large sections of attorneys who are experienced that we just didn't see. So it was just -- the group was just -- it wasn't specifically that oh, they really weren't qualified, it was just too narrow of a group to say okay, it's this. And we felt that there were experiences that the just didn't quite have, that we really need. And we need a good, strong counsel who can help the group. And at this point, we really need to go back. There was much more to be gained than the amount of time that we're going to lose a little bit; we thought that was more worth it. And we both independently came upon that.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Akutagawa, Ahmad, and Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: First off, I want to thank Commissioners Toledo and Andersen for the work that you did and for the memo. That was really helpful to have just read through this morning. Just a comment that, I guess -- a comment, maybe question. I hear what you are
saying, and I whole-heartedly agree with your recommendation, particularly given the lack of VRA experience. And it does get me thinking that perhaps, like some of the other prioritization that we've been learning about in terms of how we think about the map drawing -- perhaps we also need to take that into account in terms of the Chief Counsel that we're looking to hire; and specifically highlight that. That VRA experience is probably going to be more important than, say, the state government/Bagley-Keene experience. Because frankly, I think people can learn that part, but I think the VRA experience and knowledge of is going to just -- would just take somebody much longer. And I think having somebody who comes in and has a much more intimate knowledge of that, I think is going to be much more useful for all of us in terms of the kind of counsel that we're going to be needing.

And then I will also say that -- and I think maybe this is clarity that I'm going to need from both Marian and also from Raul -- but I'm also thinking that the two of them are also going to continue on with us in supporting us as well, too?

MS. JOHNSTON: That's up to you, but I'm certainly willing on a half-time basis. That's what an RA does.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And that's where I'm
thinking that with their help, they can also help advise staff in terms of the Bagley-Keene and some of the other state government ins and outs. For me, my preference would be to see somebody who has the stronger VRA experience.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Madam Commissioner Akutagawa, if I might address that directly? Our feeling was exactly -- it was like we're picking someone who only has one type of experience, and in a more robust pool, you should have both. And we really thought there are people out there who definitely have both. And we just didn't get them. So that actually kind of really hits on our point that we need a person who has -- and there are people out there. It's not like this is oh, there's only -- there's no one out there that has that kind of experience. There are, but we need -- it is a sort of specialized thing, which is why we did recommend let's go with an actual recruiter. And that is a bit more how you would typically find a person of this position.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Ahmad and Fernandez? Oh, sorry. Could Commissioner Toledo also say something, because --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I was just going to add -- and I think one of the reasons we were able to get to this recommendation is because we do have strong confidence in
Raul and Marian to continue to provide us with support on the government issues, and also with open meetings and all of the support that they've been providing us, and hopefully will continue to provide us.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Ahmad?

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Quick question. Do you all -- obviously, I haven't seen anything -- any of the applications related to this position -- do you all think that this an issue related to the language in the job posting, or the outreach and the recruitment and where the job posting was shared? Because I do see that the job posting itself does have VRA listed as some of the knowledge and abilities that the candidate should have. So I'm just trying to get a clarification on whether you are recommending we edit the job posting and then go back out there, or just go back out there over all in general?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think it's a little bit of both. So yes, I agree -- especially the VRA piece. It is in the job posting. It's in the bulletin. And it may be that the job posting may need to be placed in -- because it's a very specialized position. It's a legal position. And different avenues where lawyers with this type of experience would see it or their colleague might see it and refer it to them. So it may not have gotten to the appropriate -- it may not have had as big of a
dissemination as we would have -- as would have been
helpful to getting a larger pool --

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: All right. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- was the thinking.

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Yeah. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez and

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. And I'm wondering --

and I agree -- I support both Commissioners Toledo and

Andersen in their recommendations. And I'm wondering if

the limited pool also has to do with -- the positions are

advertised as limited term. They're not permanent full-
time positions, so that in itself, decreases your

candidate base -- or potential base. And then so I was

trying to think, like, outside of the box, is it a

possibility to maybe instead of hiring a Chief Counsel,

we also contract with some legal firm that specializes in

VRA and have them be our Chief Counsel in that kind of

general type of area; because I don't know if we'll be

able to find someone who has that VRA experience that --

I agree; we really do need someone that has that legal

background in that area. And maybe if we try to think

outside the box and maybe contract for it versus just

hire someone for it. I'm not sure if this limited term

advertisement actually hinders us in some areas. So I'm
just trying to throw out suggestions to try to get that VRA experience that we all agree we need. But thank you both.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioners Fernandez, Vazquez, Sadhwani, Kennedy, and Raul?

Commissioner Fernandez? Oh, no --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just went, and I think Commissioner Sinay also wanted to go.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think that you meant me versus Fernandez.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh, I wrote the wrong name. Okay, go. Thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, it's okay. We Latinos. So I wanted some clarification, because I feel like the last commission -- well first, the whole what does the general counsel do -- Chief Counsel do? I know I read the job description, but how does than differ than what we're getting right now from Marian? Because I've been on different commissions, and there'll be a counsel that kind of comes in when we're having meetings to make sure we're following everything and is there when we need information. So what does this person do when we're not meeting?
Second of all, didn't the other commission actually -- they hired a whole different firm -- they hired a firm for the litigation part that wasn't the Chief Counsel. That's what I thought I heard, that the litigation was separate. And then also, didn't they have a Chief Counsel and a VRA counsel? So they actually had -- what we're looking for in one person, they actually had in three separate entities, if I'm not mistaken from the reports I've read.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Can I jump in on this, because I think everyone's kind of addressing this? We will still need a VRA expert -- a legal VRA expert. But that person is not going to be there all the time. We need a counsel who has enough of that background, to stop us before we get into it and oops, we should have had counsel. We need a stronger counsel who doesn't just wait for us to oops, well you know what you guys should have done. We need someone who could say, that's a question for later, Commissioners. Who has enough authority and experience in the Voting Rights, in the Bagley-Keene, and the government running of the group to jump in and help us as we go along. We'll still need -- it doesn't have to be the total expert but has enough experience in all those areas. And we just didn't quite have that. We had a lot of up and coming who will be
there in a few years, but maybe not. And so they need
that variety, which is why we talked about a recruiter.
Because they need that variety. So I wanted to jump in,
because I think that might help for a lot of people.

CHAIR TURNER: That is helpful, thank you. That did
help.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. I just was wondering
how much is also, maybe, due to the fact that we heard of
several community-based organizations and partners say
that they had been waiting to distribute their postings
to their networks based on the decisions we would make
about possibly editing. So -- yeah. Well, I should talk
more about that in our subcommittee update, but that was
a question for this subcommittee.

CHAIR TURNER: Um-hum.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Certainly, I think that played
a part a little bit into it and that if we can get wider
distribution. And there was comments that potentially
there are -- at least a couple of stakeholders have said
that they'd help in distributing the job description. Or
that they hadn't yet fully distributed. This presents as
an opportunity to see if we're able to get a wider
distribution and a more qualified pool.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.
Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: All right. Thank you. Some of my comments have already been said, so I'll leave them. Agreed with what's been said. I think agreeing with Commissioner Andersen. We need a Chief Counsel and probably multiple other components there, as the need arises. The VRA component, I think we're California. If we want a top-notch VRA attorney, we need to go after it. I don't think there's a ton of people that are going to fit that bill necessarily. I absolutely agree with the idea of using a recruiter, relying on the community organizations that are clearly tracking this process and really concerned about ensuring VRA compliance.

And then I would also just add, we've had some really top-notch presentations from Prof. Levitt, who is national VRA scholar -- legal scholar. Perhaps soliciting him to help with this outreach. Perhaps there are people within his network that could -- that should be applying. Even former commissioners from the 2010 commission. We've had Angelo Ancheta present to us. I know Maria Blanco on the previous commission had a VRA background as well. Perhaps involving some of them -- they're going to know very well the kinds of capacities that we would need from a Chief Counsel. So I would just add that to this conversation.
CHAIR TURNER: Um-hum. Thank you.

Commissioner Kennedy and then Raul?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think it was Professor Barreto yesterday who commented that we're coming into redistricting season nationwide, and we're trying to find a Chief Counsel when fifty states and all sorts of other jurisdictions are also looking. So I think that probably has also played into the thin pool that we have at this point, and I would agree that we need to go out much more robustly with the announcement on this one. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. And Raul?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: I was just going to describe the thought process last time, if that would be helpful.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: So the general counsel that was hired had a very broad government background. The thought being then that they could bring in a VRA counsel, which they did, Gibson Dunn, and then during litigation, went ahead and got additional counsel that specialized with the litigation. At a certain point, I think we had what, three different law firms working. That's why also the 4.3 million dollars that's specifically allocated for legal counsel. Because at a
certain point as you go through different processes, that need will be there. And Gibson Dunn was there assisting the commission while they were drawing the lines. So the consideration about having a VRA specialist or a counsel while you're drawing the lines, that's what happened last time. Anyway, I offer that if it may be of assistance while you're looking at things.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And that did really help us in thinking through this as well, because we did hear that. I think a part of some of our thinking was that we are in a different environment right now given what's happening with the census, given what's happening with some of the changes that have happened, and really trying to prevent some of the -- we'll likely end up in litigation but making sure that -- and we'll need the firms and -- we'll like need representation from outside firm anyway. But trying to have enough -- general counsel that has both -- that has enough voting rights and electoral -- federal electoral knowledge to keep us from making any preventable issues and identifying them early so that we can address them before they -- so that when we are in litigation, we aren't caught off guard or on something that we missed inadvertently. And that may so happen, but we're trying to reduce the chances of that happening. And so having a more -- a general counsel with this type
of knowledge would be helpful with the federal constitutional, the state constitution, and obviously the VRA and electoral background.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. Hearing what everybody's been talking about and what's been said, I do wonder if it is possible to also make known that while we would like to identify and perhaps hire somebody, we will also have some flexibility over the next, let's say, two to three months where we may not require a full-time commitment just yet. And I'm saying this mainly because of the census lawsuits that are out there. We're also in the middle of what is going to be a very heated presidential campaign. And given all of these kind of other factors taken together, there may be qualified candidates that are essentially busy with other things and just thinking, I don't have time to apply for this right now. I can't commit to this right now. But perhaps after the election, after these -- I don't know. I'm assuming that the census lawsuits are going to need to be resolved sooner rather than later, that we then may have a more open pool.

But if we can try to get somebody identified and make a tentative hire, even if it's to say, look, we want you to start full time but we're willing to wait until
after the November election or into December, which is when we expect that we'll need more of the full-time commitment.

That may -- I'm just kind of putting that out there as a possibility of maybe expanding our pool, given some of the comments that have been put out there already by the Commissioners.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So what I'd like -- so we've had some really good, healthy discussion on it. The proposal from the subcommittee is to repost and contract with a private firm.

We've heard from a few others. I'd like -- let's hear from the last committee before we determine what we're dealing with and make decisions on all three of them based on the proposals. So if we can hear from the Communications Subcommittee, please.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sure. I will -- we reviewed the applications we received. We received twenty-two total applications. We eliminated two based on them not meeting the qualifications. The remaining twenty we looked over. They were good but not -- not especially given we had a much more robust discussion on what we need at the Commission for communications capacity.

And based on our conversation, we didn't find more than a couple that maybe fit what we were looking for.
There were a lot of folks -- a lot -- most of the -- the vast majority of the applications are state -- current state employees who do have a wealth of communications background in state government.

And our concern there, potentially, with having such a -- having a pool that was largely state employees, that we may be losing folks in the private sector, both private for-profit and private nonprofit, who, while maybe not have experience working in government of staffing public commissions, may have sort of the clip -- be able to work at the clip and the speed and the savviness that we will need for this time-limited position.

And so our recommendation is that we keep the posting as is. We thought the posting was fine. But that we would like to repost, hopefully encourage our community-based partners to advertise it heavily to their networks to ensure a greater pool from which to draw interview candidates. Commissioner Taylor, did I miss anything?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: No, I think you hit it on the nose, and I think it sort of addressed with some of the other discussions we had with the positions. We wanted to make sure that there was a robust job search, and if we can put it out there one more time, especially in
light of the public comment, that would be great. And we would choose from those applicant panels.

Those that have qualified we don't want to eliminate. We just want to reach out further, just to make sure that we have all possible candidates.


COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madam chair. If we are going to repost this or extend the search, I do have three things that I would propose to change. I mean, there are some other minor issues, but on the knowledge and abilities, and/or desirable qualifications for this type of position for the work that we're doing, I would say master's preferred. That could go under desirable.

Minimum professional experience, I would up that from five to seven. I mean, my experience in the UN system when I'm looking for someone to do this work at this level, I'm looking for someone with at least seven years of experience.

I don't know that we really need our Communications Director to know Robert's Rules of Order. That seemed a little extraneous to me. Those are the most important changes that I would propose to this. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Le Mons?
COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I don't -- I support whatever decision we make on the repost of the communication in support of the subcommittee. I do want to make a comment, though. I feel like when gatekeepers withhold an announcement to the community, to make that decision, to deny the opportunity to the community, I don't have a lot of respect for that.

Whatever our decision ended up being ultimately was our decision to make. And whether the person applied, and we changed it subsequently, all fine, well, and good. But to come on and make public comment about refusing to distribute the announcement to the community, to me that is an abuse of gatekeeper power and I needed to go on the record and say that.

And I hope that was not the weighted element that is asking us to repost this position. If you feel like the 22 or 20 people that applied are not what we're looking for, great. But if this is more about because some organization has decided that they were not going to distribute the announcement because of whatever position they were taking, that's a very different story.

CHAIR TURNER: Understood. I'll have Commissioner Taylor just so that -- I'm sure he wants to respond to the comment, and then we will go to Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes, that was part of our
discussion. We did discuss whether or not that was
intentionally withheld and the impact that would have on
our selection process.

We also don't want that to work out to our
detriment. So although we don't agree that gatekeepers
should intentionally withhold an application, we don't
want that to work to our detriment.

So on a personal level, Commissioner Le Mons, I can
agree with what you said. I just don't want that act,
whether intentional or not, to work to our detriment. So
we want to increase the pool so that it benefits us.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner, thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez and Toledo.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Now, just quickly.

CHAIR TURNER: And Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Just quickly, I
agree completely with Commissioner Le Mons. And I was
holding back whether or not to say something, but I
agree. I was very disappointed that some may not have
forwarded the announcements that we had. But on a second
level, if we do decide to go out for the Chief Counsel
and the Communications Director -- excuse me. I would
recommend that maybe we put something in the announcement
saying, if you've already applied you don't need to apply
again, only so we can keep the initial ones.
But of course, if they've already applied and now they want to change their application, that's fine, too. But I'm just wondering if that's something -- although you've already said you didn't really have what -- it doesn't appear that you've received what you wanted. I would just want to keep the initial ones, also because the ones that initially applied did make a good-faith effort and submit their application.

So that's just FYI. But thank you both for the -- for the work you did redoing those applications.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Toledo and then Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I would agree with Commissioner Le Mons as well in terms of the community organizations potentially not disseminating the announcements. And my question to the committee is, in terms of timeline, we do have -- and just thinking around this. Communication issues are occurring all the time in terms of the census response, additional things that are going to come up.

And so timing on this position seems like a position we would need sooner rather than later. And just your thoughts around timing and -- timing for the position and whether the delay might impact our ability to respond or to -- especially when it comes to outreach, if we're
going to start outreach sooner rather than later and how we might be able to deal with that with current staffing or whatnot, if we decide to repost.

CHAIR TURNER: I'll ask, please, Commissioner Vazquez to answer in response and then we'll go to Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes, to respond to Commissioner Toledo, the hope was that we not -- we would not revise the job description so that we could both preserve the current applicant pool. Because there were some candidates that might be worth interviewing, but that hopefully, you know, maybe by a couple of weeks while we are engaging in the Executive Director interview process, with a couple of weeks, a few weeks of additional outreach we would then get a broader pool from which to choose a large handful of applicants to interview. That was the thinking there.

And if I could also respond to the comment about gatekeeping. I can't testify to any organization's intentions or -- nefarious or otherwise. I will say that for me, to Commissioner Taylor's point that it was about -- our decision was about impact and the impact that community, the potential broader network of potential applicants wasn't reached for whatever reason, that we needed to make sure that those potential
applicants at least saw the posting in order for us to have a good applicant pool.

So yes, to echo Commissioner Taylor, the impact that it had, we are trying to mitigate so that we have a quality Communications Director. Which is also why our recommendation was also to not change the job description.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Akutagawa, Le Mons, and Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, and to a degree my comment or -- is following what Commissioner Vazquez just says. In some ways my comment is perhaps not as relevant, but I do just want to just say it for the record, perhaps, in case there is a further discussion about this, is around the recommendation to require a master's degree, frankly, for a Communications Director position, I don't believe that a master's degree is going to be a needed requirement to be able to have somebody who is going to be savvy around communications.

I think there's a lot of on-the-job experience that qualified candidates will bring. Also, I want to also just say that not everybody can afford to go and get a master's degree. And that that could unintentionally exclude some very qualified candidates from perhaps more underrepresented communities, but they have the kind of
needed savvy that we're looking for. So I just wanted to say that.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Yes, Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah, I just wanted to make a clarification point. I don't feel like my comments were based on any interpretation but explicit expressions from at least two public commenters that represented organizations that said that they specifically did not distribute it. And they said why.

So my point is based on that. Not an interpretation, not me assuming anyone's intent. The intent was made crystal clear. At least it was crystal clear to me.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Kennedy and Sinay.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think I was pretty explicit last week in my remarks on this, but in case I wasn't, in case there's any doubt, I think that part of the auditor's office support to getting this commission up and running should have included, and so here forward should include communications support.

So I think we would be well within our rights to go back to the Office of the State Auditor and say, we need
interim support in the communications area until such
time and we are able to hire our own.

Second of all, in response to Commissioner
Akutagawa, I really embrace what you've said, and
thinking further about it, you know, another thing that's
often done is offering two options.

You can say, master's degree preferred or and then
have, instead of five years' experience, seven years'
experience with the additional experience compensating
for not having the degree.

I think -- I think, you know, I think that we need
something to bump up the quality of the field, but I
really do embrace what you're saying about possible
barriers to getting a degree and I'm perfectly happy to
have kind of an either/or on this. Okay?

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay and Turner in the
point.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Madam Chair, I wanted to
clarify, you know, having worked in the community for a
long time, there is a difference between a communications
expert and an outreach expert. And a lot of times in the
nonprofit field, because of lack of money we throw them
together.

But in this case, I would say that I mashed them
together when I first read this job description, because
what was really missing in this is the community engagement piece. We don't say experience in -- we say diverse stakeholders, but diverse stakeholders can mean government, administrative, commissioners. We don't say diverse communities. It was never clear. So I highly recommend keeping the job posting the way it is, especially since we have some in the pool that we will be looking at, versus asking them to resubmit.

But we need to have a much broader conversation, and I have this for future agendas -- around outreach. Because outreach was done by community partners last time and funded externally by the Irvine Foundation. And so I would love -- if it's okay with all of us, to kind of put that outreach piece and that engagement piece separate from this communications position, and maybe that will help us kind of just move forward on that communications.

And having said that, would that change Commissioner Vazquez and Commissioner Taylor's review of the applications that we did receive, if we pulled out that outreach piece and said, you know what? We need to really talk about this and it's a different skill set completely.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you, Madam Chair.

First, I just want to thank the subcommittee for you work
on this issue. I am happy to accept the recommendation of the subcommittee as is, to the extent that we have a conversation about whether or not the job description is changed.

I would just offer to the committee, and I very much appreciate Commissioner Kennedy's thoughtfulness around adding things around master's degree and/or additional experience preferred. If we were to go down the road of making a change, I would also just put out there, in the spirit of concern of community outreach and also, media outreach, right? Remembering that forty percent of our state is Latino and that Spanish language media plays a very large role in California.

That is not to negate Asian-American media, it's just a far more complicated process because there are so many different languages involved there. For me personally, I would like to see us -- if we were to make changes, to have a conversation about including Spanish language preferred, simply because I think when we're talking about a skilled communications person in California, often that -- it doesn't have to, but often it does require engagement with Spanish language press.

So I would just put that out there. I'm happy, though, if we keep it as is, but maybe that's just in the back of our minds as we're moving forward.
I think we need to still discuss what exactly we see
the Communications Director doing, and the level of
engagement that they're going to have, both with
communities and with media. But I think that's an
important consideration for us moving forward.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes. The comment I want to make, and
then we'll go Commissioners Le Mons and Ahmad. Yes, and
I keep putting myself back because I'm still thinking it
through, but I'm going to think out loud with you right
now.

Part of the, I guess, challenge that I'm having even
with the seven years masters' degree. I went back and
I'm looking at the product description. There is
something to be said about freshness. Someone that's
been in a role that long, for sure there are some very
valuable things and experiences that they've gained but
we're also looking for people that are creative. I'm
thinking cutting edge when we start talking about some of
the new social networking sites.

And some of the young people that I'm exposed to
just do amazing work at being able to communicate and get
things out into the community, things I never would have
considered or knew was available. And I'm weighing in my
mind, yes, they need to be skilled in all these other
piece parts but are we -- are we losing an edge when
we're looking for someone that's been also in a role for
a really long time.

Five and seven years in communications and when you
start talking technology, for sure there are people that
will stay on top of the leading edge of what's going on,
but I just needed to think that out loud. It's kind of
how I'm thinking through freshness, approach, ability to
be relevant today, reach all markets, and have that level
of experience. So that's what's running around in my
thoughts right now. Commissioners -- who did I say? Le
Mons and Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah, I was going to -- I
wanted to say that I support what you just said,
Commissioner Turner, as well as what you said,
Commissioner Sadhwani. I've been thinking about this in
probably a little bit different way.

And I don't know why I was thinking about it this
way, but I was seeing the Communication Director as
driving a team, and not that all of this was going to lie
with one person.

I think it's kind of similar to what we're facing
with general counsel. That yes, you need to have a broad
depth and breadth, but you're bringing the direction.
You're driving the communication and underneath you are
individuals that have relationships with the press, and I
think beyond Spanish, quite frankly.

That has outreach -- has an outreach team, like, they're all part of a unit that could conceive -- maybe we don't have the budget for all of this. But I'm seeing a robust team of people that's led by the Communications Director.

So again, I don't know why I was thinking about it that way or -- but I think we should be if we aren't thinking about it that way. And that might be looking at our org chart. I know the org chart we reviewed earlier in the week didn't identify all of those positions, but because they weren't there, I didn't assume that that wouldn't be something that we would be expecting that Communications Director to build, as far as a team in concerned.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. That's very helpful because I kept looking at the title "Director", but as I read through the description, nothing really points to a team of support. So I kept oscillating back and forth between, do they need to be able to do it or are they going to be able to hire into hire in for someone. So yeah, good distinction.

Commissioner Ahmad? And then Commissioner Fornaciari and Akutagawa.

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Just before I go, I think Raul
had his hand up. Did you want to respond to anything?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: I just wanted to respond that you have a $2.1 million allocation for the outreach. And so the idea of having a Communication Director during the time of the outreach process is staffed with a variety of disciplines and skills, is very possible. I mean, that's up to you as you design your plan and work with those folks. Anyway, just wanted to say that that is possible.

CHAIR TURNER: Good, thank you. Commissioner Ahmad.

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Commissioner Le Mons took all of my thoughts. So I also, you know, with the discussion about master's degree or bachelor's degree, and my mind immediately went to, yeah, someone from the K-Pop fandom. Have you seen their outreach skills?

And of course, you know, that would be difficult to have a communications direction overlap with the K-Pop fandom. But that doesn't mean that we can't have interns, or we can't have other staff in the team.

So with the census work that I'm working on locally, it's not just on one person to do census outreach. We have people in language, in a variety of different languages. We have staff at all different levels of the ladder. But I think the position that we are looking at here, is the person who's going to be steering the ship
and what qualifications we want that person to have in
order to lead that team however we decide that structure
to be.

And I would imagine that even once we bring on a
Communications Director, that person would take part in
deciding how that team structure would look like. Same
goes for Chief Counsel and Executive Director, that we
should be involving those people since they would be the
ones working with each other more closely and have the
ability to work outside Bagley-Keene requirements and
such. Those were just my thoughts. Just echoing what
Commissioner Le Mons stated as well.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. And I just agree
with Commissioner Ahmad -- Ahmed. I'm going to get it.
I'm sorry. I will get it right at some point -- and Le
Mons.

I was just writing down, you know, in my mind this
is a coordinator role. Right? I mean, Commissioner
Sadhwani said at our last meeting, you know, we ought to
think about hiring a PR firm, right? Because there's so
much that needs to be done, we can't envision that one
person is going to be able to do all this. But I do
think we need to step back at a little bit higher level
and make sure that the person that we are hiring has the
capability to be the coordinator of all of this.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Akutagawa and Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: And Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I do like where we're going in this conversation. Commissioner Le Mons I think you really said it very well and then further added on by Commissioner Ahmed and Fornaciari.

I actually want to build on something Commissioner Fornaciari said about coordinator, and I would actually like to use a different word. I think whoever this -- our Comms Director is going to be, that person has to be more of a strategic overseer. Someone who's going to be -- whether it's in the hiring of a PR firm, whether it's in the hiring of the fresh ideas or the fresh kind of people who are going to be up on certain things.

Whether it's someone who is versed in media relations with the various different communities. And I completely agree in terms of Spanish language, Asian-America media is kind of like a complication in its own self.

And I would say it exists for, you know, the black community as well as, you know, other different smaller communities as well, too. And so those, I think, can be
perhaps delegated out to specialists, but I think we need somebody who is going to be a strategic partner to the Commission.

And I'll just comment, then, in terms of the other positions, and I think someone else said this, too. That's how I see the Chief Counsel, is someone who is going to be a strategic partner to us and then the work may be delegated out to other people. And the same with the Executive Director. I think that's what we need, and I think that that could be also helpful.

And then within that kind of comms role, as part of it, the subset would be somebody who was going to be able to focus on outreach and engagement as well, too, as a separate subset of the work, so.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioners Kennedy, Vazquez and Toledo.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just want to take off a little bit on what Commissioner Sinay was saying. I had similar qualms about the title itself, because I see us having a need for not just communications, but outreach in a broader sense. I had asked the other day for further information on the funding that Statewide Database is getting for educational work, because my sense is that one of the first things that we should be turning our attention to
is educating the people of California to what it is that we're doing, what is redistricting. They may have had some of this, but I think it's incumbent on us to ensure that the public is as well-educated on the topic as possible. And so this -- we need to have that discussion of how we need to broaden or what additional skill sets we need. And again, I look forward to receiving the information about the funding that went to Statewide Database for educational outreach. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioners Vazquez, Toledo, and Turner.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. I want to thank all of the Commissioners for their thoughts and feedback. I think without realizing it I was also -- in reviewing the application -- I think I was channeling a lot of the idea that the Communications Director would at least have a project assistant or an outreach specialist, someone who would be much more in the execution and perhaps maybe supplementing some additional skills that we had also identified. And I think, primarily, I was looking for someone really, again, who could drive the ship at the cliff at the speed, at the responsiveness, that we need as a Commission, given how short of a time line we have. And unfortunately, I just didn't really see that in most of the current applicant pool.
CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Toledo, Turner, and then Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. I just wanted to just to make a comment. I think, given the high-risk nature of the work that we're doing, given all of the feedback and the potential -- when I talk about risk, just the election issues, redistricting issues, a lot of uncertainties. It reminds me of disaster communications, right? When there's a wildfire or.

And those types of issues will arise, and it's important to have someone that has the experience with crisis communication, especially because, given the -- at the national level, the work that we're doing is so important, and at the national level, there's been a lot of concern with -- I mean, all sorts of concerns. But one of them is international intervention in -- inappropriate intervention into our -- into our electoral system.

And given the high visibility of what we're doing, I'm -- not that I was thinking that something like that would happen to us, but potentially, we could be a target for -- in terms of some of the forums, online forums, social media forums, where -- and just having someone that has the savvy and the crisis communication-type knowledge and to be able to help us through any type of
wildfire -- type fire that might arise.

CHAIR TURNER: I wanted to say thank you, and I am in total support of the crisis communication.

I'm going back to what was said. Looking at the actual description -- and I support not redoing it totally, but I want to say looking at it, the fact that this individual will have a team could be inferred or assumed by the title, but I also want to point out that in our other postings, Executive Director, for example, it explicitly states that they're going to be providing leadership in the development of such and such, providing leadership in the execution of plans, et cetera. And that just is absent from this job posting. And so again, I'm feeling like perhaps inferred, assumed, et cetera, but it doesn't state it here.

And I also want to ensure that no one else is reading the posting and thinking, I need to do this, be all, do all. It's saying a Director position, but it's not in here at all. I wanted to call that to our attention.

Commissioner Taylor, I know that you are on the team, and you will have a lot of responses, but we'll go to our required break, and start with you when we come back, if that's okay.

Okay. So let's be back at 11:15, please.
Whereupon, a recess was held.)

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you and welcome back.

Commissioner Taylor, your comment, please.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just to mimic again the comments of my subcommittee partner, I think we did look at our applicants through the lens of a leader or a director. We just wanted to see a more demonstrated community outreach effort. And it's not to say that our applicant isn't in the pool that we have. Again, we just want to maximize our net to get the best-qualified candidate to suit the Commission's needs.

Raul and Counsel, I have a question. Are we able to ask the Auditor for communication support for a period of time as we go through this process, or are we without that function until we make a hire?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: So the support is pretty much completed as far as those types of things. At the same time, the Commission can make a formal request. I guess that's the best way I can say it succinctly.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Got it. And just in -- as this is not normal, might be the first time that it's happened -- how long do you think it would take if we made a formal request to have a -- I guess the title might be a public information officer for a period of
time -- how long do you think it would take before we
have an answer, or have use of that position?

MS. JOHNSTON: I am not familiar with the Auditor's
office enough.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: I think you would
get an answer fairly quickly. I'm really not in a
position to be able to speak for them and say how --

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I got it.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: -- if it was
accepted, how quick that would occur.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I understand. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay, so the initial recommendation
coming out of the communications job description -- out
of the subcommittee, would be to keep the posting as is,
but repost the broader advertisement. And we also have
some suggestions about changes being made to the post.

And so at this point, what I'd like to do is to take
them backwards, so that you can make a decision on the
Communications, and then on Chief Counsel, and then
Executive Director, seeing as how we kind of know the
discussion and what the recommendations were. So for our
Communications, the recommendation from the
Communications subcommittee, is there a motion to change,
adjust, accept the recommendation, or any further
questions needed from the Commissioners?
Commissioner Ahmad?

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: I have a quick question -- and I think this is for Counsel and Raul. If we were to change the description, would that mean we would also have to allot time for the applicants who have already submitted to adjust their applications?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: It would be part of the recruitment process.

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Okay.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: I mean, you don't have to increase the time, but that would be -- in determining the length of time, that would be one of the things, that if they chose to reapply, then that would be the time to do it. And that is if you had a substantive change in the recruitment.

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: I just made -- a slew of more questions. My bad.

CHAIR TURNER: I saw your face. I'm like, I don't know if she still has questions about that or what, so I was kind of paused to see if you were going to continue. I see Fernandez, Fornaciari, and Yee.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Well, I'm just going to try to clarify, maybe, what Commissioner Ahmad was trying to ask. If we do make some changes to the recruitment, can we still keep the applications we have?
Or would those individuals that submitted applications to
the old recruitment at that point need to reapply?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Thank you. I
misunderstood your question, Commissioner Ahmad. It
really depends on how much you change the recruitment. I
haven't heard anything really that substantially changes
the minimum qualifications. The additional requirements
could, so if I was a candidate and you're asking now for
some information about my experience leading teams, that
wasn't part of the former, and so I would want to go
ahead and reapply with that information now.

Did I answer it right this time? Did I hear the
question right?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. So I'm going to
follow up to that, then, because I can't remember -- were
there twenty-two applications?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, so if they have to
reapply, is there any way for us to contact those twenty-
two and let them know that we're going back out? Here's
the new advertisement, and then they can decide whether
to reapply or not. Because I would hate for those
twenty-two to lose the opportunity again. I'm just
trying to be fair to whoever applied initially, and then
if they want to reapply, here's the new recruitment and
here are the deadlines for that. I mean is that something that --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: That's a proper courtesy.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, right, exactly.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Right. It's a proper courtesy to send directly to them, say these changes have been made, and to make a decision on if they want to reapply or not.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. So I -- you kind of answered my question. I mean, to me, we're making a new recruitment, if we change the requirements and -- in that those folks should apply to the new recruitment. But I agree that as a courtesy, we should let them know.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I support that as well. Had a question, though. So in the interim, basically the only communication we have, I think, is our website, right, wedrawthelines.ca.gov? And who -- is anyone maintaining that at the moment and for now until we get somebody on board?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Yes. So I get the communications from the link where people provide public comment, I get that. I also get the information
if individuals want to be added to the mailing list.
Right now, Auditor IT is providing the posting, and Cal
Department of Technology is hosting it. We have -- it's
not out there by itself.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.
CHAIR TURNER: That's it. Okay. Is there a motion?
COMMISSIONER YEE: Could the subcommittee repeat
their recommendation?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: So --
CHAIR TURNER: So --
COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Oh, go ahead, Madam Chair.
CHAIR TURNER: No, please go. Yes.
COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Our recommendation was to
post the job description -- or the recruitment as is for
an additional two weeks and broadly re-disseminate it to
increase the current applicant pool.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioners Fernandez and
Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I do agree with your
recommendation. I'm just wondering if -- I think it was
Chair Turner. Did you mention that maybe we should add
some leadership language to it?

CHAIR TURNER: I did. However, if I'm the only one
that thought down that path, then I can certainly release
on that. I just was concerned about -- not so much about
how we thought of the actual applicants, those that submitted -- but more of a concern of -- did it exclude people that did not apply based on the way it was written?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. I like the leadership piece of it, because I do think that you might have excluded people thinking that they were going to have to be the ones that are rolling up their sleeves and doing everything. I mean, they're going to have to roll up their sleeves and do some of it, but I think that we might have a wider candidate pool if we do include the leadership.

So I just put it out to the rest of the Commissioners. I would be fine with going out with the same recruitment, just if we could add a leadership line to it, that would be great.

CHAIR TURNER: I lost you all for a minute. I thought you froze, Commissioner Fernandez, and I'm like, oh, everybody's frozen -- I think it's me.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah, I mean, I think, for me, in light of the discussion, especially where we wound up, and Commissioner Akutagawa's kind of summary of it, I think what we're looking for is a partner to help us strategically develop and execute on a communications and
outreach plan, and I'd like see that be explicitly in the job posting.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Yee, did you have your hand up as well? No?

MS. JOHNSTON: If that's --

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Akutagawa and Andersen.

MS. JOHNSTON: If that's a proposed amendment, you should find out if Commissioner -- is it Fernandez who made the motion -- would like to accept that.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, I guess I made the motion, but I was actually putting it out to the rest of the Commissioners. I don't want to put a motion I'm the only one on the train, but I mean if that's my --

MS. JOHNSTON: Or it could be a motion --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'd like to have some feedback before I make a formal.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay, so let's hear -- let's hear the other couple of Commissioners and then we'll see. Akutagawa and Andersen.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So I do want to support, Chair Turner, what you said and what Commissioner Fernandez said. I do agree in what Commissioner Fornaciari also said about the strategic partner again, too.

I do think it's important to have that leadership
language in there. I also believe that not only may it have excluded people, but what it may do going forward is perhaps cull down the -- kind of make the pool a little bit more specific.

So even those who may have applied, may have applied because perhaps they thought that, since we're not looking for a certain kind of leadership role, that they felt that they would be capable of doing the job. But now I think this is further clarifying, I think, what we want, so I think that that may also change up the pool of who's going to both apply and reapply.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Andersen, Vazquez, and Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Basically, that pretty much covers what I was going to say, almost. The other exception is, if we do make a modification -- which I believe the whole group, from what I heard, was indeed saying this is a leadership role. And to have that in, that is indeed a doctor then, that you go back to the people who've applied and say, thank you for applying, these are a couple of additions -- if we realize we have to revise our, basically, our appeal -- not our appeal, but what we're asking for -- so would you consider reapplying?

Because that might even, when we get down to the
next group, we also have a couple of things, like, we would like to retailor it because we like the people for the counsel, but there are a few things that sort of it didn't hit the right group. And I think that if we emphasize something slightly differently, that would help us in getting the right people to apply.

But for the Counsel it's slightly different, because we really needed a different --

But that's what -- I just want to add in that I agree with what people have said.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioners Vazquez, Le Mons, and Sinay.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. I want to acknowledge -- we seem to be back at the place where it's like -- Commissioner Andersen had suggested, I think, last week, the process of potentially going back to a group of applicants and asking them for potential additional qualifications based on an addition to the recruitment. And so I -- I lost my question, so I will cede the floor.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioners Le Mons and Sinay.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: So I have a comment and a question. My comment is, if we're going to move in the direction and change, I just -- I think that the crisis communication piece, I mean, if we're redoing it, I would
recommend that that also be included.

And then my question is to Raul as it relates to -- is there a distinction? Meaning, if the first twenty-two people who applied the first time, we send them the new announcement and say -- can we just ask them to submit an addendum if they want to, or do they have to submit -- I don't know what all was submitted. Do they have to submit everything over? So that's my question.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: No, the Commission can't ask them to -- okay, so here's the thing. You can offer them the choice to either resubmit in total or to amend and include, based on --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: -- based on the new recruitment, and then it would be up to them to determine what they're going to amend and include.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay, then I would also want to support that option -- of what Raul just said.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Sinay, and then Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I was wondering if we make a motion. We've given a lot of input, and I think we're watching each other well enough -- that's one of the good things about Zoom is you can see each other. Can we give this back to the subcommittee? Say we agree with the
subcommittee to repost this with -- when we trust you
that you will include our comments -- and let them move
forward, versus trying to wordsmith it?

Having said that, I do have one addition, and I
think you would have caught it, but where it says,
"expand the -- have experience with diverse
stakeholders", that we could include "diverse
stakeholders and communities or ethnic groups" or
whatever, just to be more explicit that this is about
communication and engagement.

So I just wanted to see, with the group, if we could
just make a motion and trust each of the subcommittees to
take what we had said, so that it can get posted and go
up instead of trying to wordsmith it as a group.

MS. JOHNSTON: You could accomplish much of the same
thing, but not exactly that way. They are just advisory
subcommittees. But you could ask the subcommittees to
revise it and submit it to the Chair, and then have the
Chair decide to post it. You can entrust the Chair with
making an individual decision. That does not have to be
a group meeting.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Vazquez and Kennedy.
And then Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: So two things, since we're
engaged in this discussion. I just wanted to let the
rest of the Commissioners know that I have also written
down what I heard previously is potentially a language
component, so language proficiency, in Spanish but also
potentially other Asian language, but specifically
Spanish. And then, maybe, possibly, ethnic media
relations experience under desirable.

And then a question for the group. For me, when I
was reviewing applications, we have in our minimum
qualifications a bachelor's in communications and
journalism. I will say I saw some good applications who
didn't have a formal education in communications. So I,
again, in terms of expanding our pool, I might recommend
that we remove the education specificity. So maybe
requiring a bachelor's degree, but not specify
communications or journalism, or other related. Because
I think there were English majors, there were folks who
are much further along in their career, seemed like
seasoned communications professionals, but were not
formally educated in such.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I bet people with political
science degrees would be great.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Vazquez.

Yes. And as Commissioners responded, again, as they
raised their hands, I saw a lot of heads nod.

Commissioners Kennedy and Fernandez.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Just a couple of other points for the subcommittee to consider. I think the second bullet point, "consults with and advises Commission and Director on all issues which may be of interest to the media", I would add "and the general public". I mean, to me, it's things that are of interest to the general public that are more important. Media is the channel for getting them to the general public.

The next bullet -- I think Commissioner Vazquez may have been the one to mention this last one -- drop the word "web" and just have "develop campaigns to communicate Commission's messages through a variety of channels".

And then the last bullet point under "knowledge and abilities", I think we may also have been the one who mentioned "emerging technology", so I would say, "current and emerging technologies".

Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner, thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I was just going to make a motion now. And move forward. I move that we go forward with the recommendations of the subcommittee of Commissioners Taylor and Vazquez, and that they draft the
changes that have been agreed upon, and then I would say
we give the Chair the final approval to send it forward.
I think I captured everything. That's my motion.
But I would like to have a copy of the final one.
That'd be great. I think all of us would like to have a
copy.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah. In our recommendation,
we had proposed extending it for a two-week period. Does
that need to be mentioned? And for how long do we want
the new posting?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So Raul, correct me
if I'm wrong, but it normally is posted for two weeks
minimum; is that correct? Most recruitments?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Up to you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So what about -- okay, so
Commissioner Taylor, when you said an additional two
weeks, is that -- do you want a month recruitment? Or do
you just want a two-weeks? I guess --

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I would think two, three weeks
at the most. I don't think that we need a month. It's
not a particularly cumbersome application. I think it
can be filled out in a short span of time, so where if we
had that interesting candidate, he can get it -- he or
she can get to it rather quickly.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So -- and I think it would be important to not make it too long, only because if we're going to have another meeting in two or three weeks, hopefully we have the applications by then. And then we can review them and provide a recommendation at that point. And then maybe two weeks, later -- so I'm really not sure what that means with my comment. But Raul has his hand up, so maybe he can simplify it for me.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: In your planning you have to consider the time it's going to take to prepare it, to go ahead and disseminate it. At the point where you disseminate it, then, when you say I'm going to recruit for two weeks, that's when your two weeks starts. But in addition to that two weeks then, though, is the preparation and actually getting it disseminated, which may take an additional week.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay, so by the time -- and I'm sorry. I just have, like, all these weird questions. But it kind of sounds like Commissioners Taylor and Vazquez might be able to turn that around pretty quickly -- not that I'm putting any pressure on you. And then it would go to Chair Turner.

So at that point, when Chair Turner forwards it to you, Raul, how long will you need to package it and then send it out to the stakeholders and everyone else that
you send it to?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Well, I would want to go ahead and touch base with the subcommittee, find out what they're thinking in terms of a widened recruitment. I can start working now in terms of where it went before and have that ready, so maybe -- I'm still going to say a week and try for a day or two.

CHAIR TURNER: Well, and with that, Raul, and with that -- part of what the conversation was is that the first twenty-two would be contacted. And so who would be contacting the twenty-two, and in what time line?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: You have the -- here's your staff. I'm happy to do it. One of the first things that I'll need to do, like I say, is get with the subcommittee, make sure I understand -- I haven't seen the applications -- so to make sure that I have that information and -- yeah, I can go ahead and start preparing all of that in a form letter, work with the subcommittee, so that they look at the form letter and approve it. So all of that behind-the-scenes work. I --

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Yee, and then Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I'll second the motion, and -- but want to ask that we list out what we think we've agreed on. Because I think a lot of good things have been mentioned, and there has been general consensus.
And I liked everything I've heard, but I don't know if,
Commissioner Vazquez, maybe you made a list, a punch
list, that you can read what changes you heard and intend
to incorporate.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes, I can do that, and also
Raul, I'm happy to help draft whatever communication you
will need, as part of my subcommittee duties.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Very good. Thank
you.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: So I heard: adding crisis
management experience, adding diverse stakeholders and
communities. I had --

COMMISSIONER YEE: So did you include whether it is
desirable versus required?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Oh, yes. I'm not sure
that -- so I didn't write that piece down, so I can tell
you my best guess of where that fits. Okay, so I heard:
add crisis management as desirable --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Crisis communication, not --

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Crisis -- sorry -- yes --
crisis communication as desirable.

Adding diverse stakeholders and communities under
minimum -- I'm not sure what that is. Sorry, I'm not
looking at the posting as we chat.

So adding language proficiency in Spanish or other
Asian languages under desirable.

Adding relationship with ethnic media outlets as desirable.

Adding "and general public" to the media component.

That was from Commissioner Kennedy.

Remove the word "web" in relation to developing campaigns.

I wrote down -- sorry, I'm going to need clarification from Commissioner Kennedy on his "emerging technologies", because my note is not clear.

And also Commissioner Kennedy suggested to remove -- or I guess I inferred removing of the Bagley-Keene --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Robert's Rules of Order.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Bagley-Keene -- or sorry, Robert's Rules of Orders, thank you.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: You're welcome.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I think there was leadership language we wanted to add, too.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes, sorry. Thank you.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: And I have that under required.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Required, yes.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: So I was taking notes also, and my notes -- they mirror exactly
Commissioner Vazquez's. Good job.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Oh, sorry. And I missed -- I missed my own recommendation, which was to broaden the education requirements to include a bachelor's degree, but not specify what the degree should be in.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Just responding to Commissioner Vazquez' request for clarification. The last bullet point under knowledge and abilities, my suggestion was on the second line of that to add "or emerging" so that that second line reads -- or the end of that bullet point reads, "using legacy and current or emerging technology".

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Got it.

MS. JOHNSTON: And Madam Chair, we need to ask for public comment before the motion.

CHAIR TURNER: So it's -- we had a -- Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Is it possible for us to kind of bundle these so we don't have to go to public comment after each subcommittee?

MS. JOHNSTON: You could do that.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I'd recommend we do that, like, we'll just do all of the motions at the same time. I mean, go to public comment, then come back and do the
motions if possible. Because otherwise we're going to have to go to public comment just on the Communications Director, come back, do a motion, do a vote, then whatever ensues about the next two that we do. So we have to keep going through that process. I think if we could potentially talk about it all.

COMMISSIONER YEE: But we're dealing with it one motion at a time.

MS. JOHNSTON: But you -- well, you could have public comment after all the motions are made, before you have a vote, on each motion.

CHAIR TURNER: So we can have all the motions on the floor.

MS. JOHNSTON: Right.

CHAIR TURNER: And I don't understand the sweeping vote. Does that mean all of them moving forward at one time? Okay.

Okay, so we have -- I was going to say we have a motion, but did we have a second as to all of the changes? Was there a second? Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, I did. Yeah. Just a comment on the language line. How about "bilingual ability, especially in Spanish", I mean, that would be better.
CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So we have a motion and a second. And so we have a direction, and we will move to the next -- Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I just wanted to put out there, we had discussed having a broader outreach. I know that that includes our community partners and such, and that's great. For all of the positions, if we're doing additional recruitment, we might just want to discuss that. I do not exactly know where people go looking for communications jobs, but we might just want to think about that. I'm just Googling, and it seems like there are some particular websites that we might want to post this on. I saw like a public relations society with a posting, and if we're looking for top candidates, then we might just want to discuss that generally, both for Communications as well as for the Chief Counsel position.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes, there are a couple of nonprofit websites that I can offer that will host.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So we'll go the dissemination. Let's continue to our more pointed motion. For those that we do want to disseminate, we'll just make sure that we're all clear on how they're going to be disseminated.

On Chief Counsel, Commissioners Toledo and Andersen
worked on that. They had a recommendation that we would repost and contract with a private firm.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Repost and update it. So we would make minor changes to the bulletin. Repost an updated advertisement, and if resources allow, contracting with a recruiting firm to search for a larger pool of candidates.

CHAIR TURNER: And Commissioner Toledo, could you add in a time frame for yours, too? You were looking to repost and have it advertised for how long?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: We haven't thought about time frame, but I think -- I would say up to 30 days would be -- just because it is a more lengthy application and we'd be looking out for candidates -- but potentially up to -- I mean -- and of course we would work through the issue of timing. We do understand the urgency of bringing somebody on. We would want to do it as quickly as possible.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So we have their recommendation on the floor. Is there a motion and second?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I motion to accept the subcommittee's recommendation on securing legal counsel as purposed.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Fernandez?
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I will second that but --
I'm sorry, I think I caught the tail end -- my internet
goes in and out all the time. Commissioner Toledo, did
you say that we're going to contract with the recruiting
firm, or potentially?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: If resources allow. So it
depends on how the contract -- I'm not so sure about
procurement in the process for that. Raul will have to
help the committee on that, and the Chair. But if
resources allow we would, but we would be doing a wider
dissemination and working with our stakeholders and
potentially our former contracts and former connections
to ensure wider dissemination. At minimum, but the goal
would be -- a search.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. And I think the wording on
that might have to be not necessarily up to, but that it
should be put in to potentially cut it off sooner than
what someone expected, so we'd probably say like the 30
days or just have some set number of days.

And so we have our motion and a second on the floor.
Motion by Commissioner Le Mons, second by Commissioner
Fernandez.

And so we'll move to our last position, which was
Chief Counsel. Toledo and Andersen, and they're
recommending reposting.
COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I'm sorry, Madam Chair.
CHAIR TURNER: I'm sorry.
COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah, okay. I was going to say that was Chief Counsel.
CHAIR TURNER: Yes. Executive Director. Thank you. Executive Director. Appreciated.
Let's see, and their --- let's see -- I've got too much writing around it. What was the recommendation on the Executive Director? You had six -- oh, that you were going to interview to narrow down to five, and wanted to move forward in interviewing the five.
So is there a --
COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Motion that we accept the Executive committee -- I mean, the Executive Director subcommittee's recommendation to move forward with the five from the pool that we currently have.
VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: I second.
CHAIR TURNER: Who was the -- oh, Commissioner Ahmad?
VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Yes.
CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Ahmad seconds. Thank you. Commissioner Sinay, you raised your hand. Was it for the second, or --
Okay, perfect. Okay, so we have three motions for the issue or for the hiring of executive -- the process
of how we'll forward with the Executive Director, Chief Counsel and Communications.

And so at this time, Ryan, we'd like to move to public comment, please, so if you would give instructions just how to dial in, Ryan, and see if we have any public comment waiting.

AT&T OPERATOR: Okay. Once again, if you do wish to make a public comment, please press 1, then 0, at this time. 1, 0.

And we have no one in queue for comment.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. We will wait a couple of minutes to see if someone will dial in.

AT&T OPERATOR: Okay.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: While we wait, Madam Chair, I just wanted to say that I'll provide the same support for the Executive Director subcommittee in terms of getting those letters out. So I'll be touching base with them.

CHAIR TURNER: How are we looking Ryan? Anyone holding?

AT&T OPERATOR: We do not have anyone in queue.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Then we'll call for a vote for our Communications subcommittee recommendations. This is on the Communications recommendation.
MS. JOHNSTON: Do you want me to do it, or do you want to do it?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Go ahead, because I'm going to take a look at my notes.

MS. JOHNSTON: This is the motion on the Communications Director?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Ahmad?

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.
MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Turner?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: The motion passes.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

MS. JOHNSTON: Okay. The second vote would be on the Chief Counsel position. Commissioner Ahmad?

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes.
MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Le Mons?
COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Sadhwani?
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Sinay?
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Taylor?
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Toledo?
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Turner?
CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Vazquez?
COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Yee?
COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: And finally, but not last, on the Executive Director. Commissioner Ahmad?
VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Akutagawa?
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Andersen?
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Fernandez?
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.
MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Fornaciari?
COMMISIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Kennedy?
COMMISIONER KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Le Mons?
COMMISIONER LE MONS: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Sadhwani?
COMMISIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Sinay?
COMMISIONER SINAY: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Taylor?
COMMISIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Toledo?
COMMISIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Turner?
CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Vazquez?
COMMISIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. Sorry, Zoom is not my friend today.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Yee?
COMMISIONER YEE: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: All three motions pass.

CHAIR TURNER: Right. Good job, Commissioners.

I'm still -- on agenda item 14, there was additional discussion and a decision that needed to be made on the
interim staff. Raul, I believe that we still have some
additional things there.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Yes. I would
like to request the Commission to consider to let me
bring in a couple of RAs to help me. That would be a
great thing. So what I'm looking at, specifically at
this point, is an IT person to start taking over the
posting, to help with that Google cloud account, increase
your access. There's some clean-up that needs to be done
there.

As well as bringing in a fiscal person to provide
support in terms of the invoices and per diems, TCs. As
that ramps up and the 2010 process ends, that would just
be really nice to have.

Asterisk on a budget person. I think I'm okay right
now, but I want to put that on the table in case I do
need to bring someone in with that expertise.

And again, these are -- what I'm looking at
primarily is retired annuitants or individuals on a
short-form -- what's known as a personal services
contract. It's a limitation of $5,000 so it's very
short-term.

The whole goal is to keep your operations moving
while we get that Executive Director in place. And as
soon as the Executive Director comes in to meet with them
and have a plan for releasing those staff and bringing on your regular staff.

MS. JOHNSTON: If they're going to be hired as employees, even though temporary, they'll need to have a special vote.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Yes. Yes. Thank you, Marian. So what would happen is I would do the search, find the folks, present them to you, and then, yes, it requires a special vote, yea or nay.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Fornaciari and Sinay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I make a motion that we allow Raul to hire whatever temporary staff he needs for the support that he needs to execute all the work in the interim until we hire an Executive Director.

MS. JOHNSTON: Excuse me, but Raul cannot hire. The hiring decision has to be done by the Commission with a special --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Oh. Okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: -- vote of three additional subgroups.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: To do the recruiting.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Second.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. And Commissioners Sinay and Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to check. Is it
possible to get an RA to do the communications piece if
we can't get that support from the Audit? Would that be
on your list of people?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: I can certainly
look. The answer is yes. There's a lot of different
ways to do it, and if that's something you want me to
look into, I certainly can, and what I would be looking
at then is, based on the recommendations of your
subcommittee, to find temporary help in an expeditious
manner.

CHAIR TURNER: And the next Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It was going to be me, but
I think Commissioner Andersen seconded it. Correct?

CHAIR TURNER: I think it was -- was it Le Mons, I
think?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, it was Le Mons. Sorry.
I apologize. That's okay. I agree.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Question for Raul. For the
IT support, would that also include IT support for
Commissioners?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Oh, absolutely.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: My computer. Okay. My
computer is -- my computer is being less than awesome the
last few days. I may need someone to remote in at some
point and figure things out because I -- well, the
computer is locked down from the Auditor's office, so.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Okay.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: -- even though I know what's
wrong, I need someone else to do it.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Let me reach out
to you outside of the meeting and find out -- there's a
couple of issues -- but yes, ninety-nine percent of this
is not just help me, but to help me help you with the
different needs that are arising -- multiple
Commissioners have asked for things. I don't have some
of those skills, and so to get you folks who do while we
wait to get your regular staff.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So the motion that we have
right now is to allow Raul to move forward with the
process of the team searching for an IT person, fiscal
person, a comms person, and perhaps at some point, a
budget person, but he's okay for now. And that motion
has been made. It has been seconded.

Raul, before we go to vote, is there anything else
on 14?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: I just wanted
to -- go ahead and vote. It's a totally different topic.

CHAIR TURNER: Um-hum. Okay.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: We need --
CHAIR TURNER: We will have -- yes?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sorry. Apologies, Madam Chair. Do we need public comment for this motion?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes, right. That's what I was going to say. We're going to have to go to public comments first. That's why I was asking is there anything else on 14, because if we can go to public comment before a vote and then vote for the -- also let that be public -- I'm trying to figure out how we don't have to come back to the end of 14 with more public comment.

MS. JOHNSTON: Is your other item an action item?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: No, it's an informational item.

MS. JOHNSTON: If it's information, then you can do that later.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: The only thing that I think might be outstanding, and maybe we don't even have to do a motion, would be if we want to formally request that communications support from the State Auditor. So I don't know if that has to be formally a motion, or is it just something we just ask Raul to draft something up and then maybe give Chair Turner the opportunity to just sign it and forward it? So that's the only thing I have showing that's outstanding. I just want to make sure we
kind of -- close the loop on --

CHAIR TURNER: And what I'm thinking on that is that we've actually pivoted somewhat and we were going to have Raul pull in a -- you're saying for the communications, right? And then so my thinking is that we may not still need that from the State Auditor. Raul had said that that was kind of ended and so it would be almost like a special consideration. And if he's going to be able to bring in someone for comms temporarily until we get our comms person hired, then that would take care of it.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Chair Turner, I didn't want to give the impression that it's over. It is ending, because this is -- really we're in a transition process now. The Commission first became a full Commission here just last Tuesday, and so -- I say it's a transition process. So to give the Commission the opportunity to ramp up its operations. But it's not like it's a shut door, and if I gave that impression, I apologize. That was not the intent.

CHAIR TURNER: Um-hum. And I'd just like to agree with this, and we'll all be gone.

Okay. Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. My understanding, and my personal hope is that maybe we could pursue both on parallel tracks. That we could both ask the State
Auditor's office and also, simultaneously, ask Raul, as he is looking -- what I think probably for his -- his needs, looking at retired annuitants, to include in his search, communications, but that we'd also be pursuing the ask of the Auditor.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Fernandez and then Yee.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. That's what I was hoping also, Commissioner Vazquez.

And again, what Raul mentioned was that, for this RA, it's a $5,000 limit. So theoretically, that could go really quickly, and we don't know how quickly we can do the recruitment and the advertising and interviewing for the Communications Director.

So I think there might be a lapse, or there's going to be some time when we might need that support. So it would be nice to have, like, a backup plan. So I would recommend what Commissioner Vazquez said and try to do a dual.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Let's hear from Raul first.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: I just wanted to draw a distinction. A retired annuitant, the limit is 960 hours per fiscal year. It's the personal services contract that has a limit of $5,000. They are two different type approaches to obtaining assistance for it.
COMMISSIONER YEE: So for the communications -- these internal communications. We said we'd be comfortable letting Raul make that call whether to ask the Auditor's office for further help or to proceed with the RA recruitment as he is able. I mean, he knows better than we do who's available, timing for that, and what he needs.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: If you're going to reach out to the Auditor, if I might suggest it would probably better be served as a formal request from the Commission, rather than a suggestion from me.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Then can I make a motion to --

MS. JOHNSTON: Well, there's a motion on the table.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Oh. All right.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Has it been seconded?

MS. JOHNSTON: Did you want to --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: You could have two motions. That way we're not doing public comment like we did with the position so --

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Right. That was sort of my thoughts.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And I'll second your motion, Commissioner Vazquez.
COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I'm motioning that we ask the State Auditor for communications support in the interim of hiring our Communications Director.

CHAIR TURNER: Counsel? Were you speaking?

MS. JOHNSTON: That's okay. Go ahead with public comment, if you wish now.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Just a quick question. I'm not sure if the motion alone handles the process, if you will. Is this something the subcommittee is going to work with Raul to draft the official letter from the Commission to -- like, how is all that going to work, I guess? Can we just amend the -- I don't know. What's -- bad -- I think you guys know what I -- Commissioner Sadhwani, I think knows where I'm going with this.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Like, I love the idea of getting communications support. I like even the idea of, like, hiring that out. But at the same time, that's its own process in and of itself, I mean, you have to do bidding and there's a whole bunch of communication from the other. And then whatever they set up -- our Communications Director, which we're trying -- it sounds like we're trying to fast track as much as possible, is going to have to start that whole process again. So while I theoretically love the idea of hiring someone in
the interim, I'm just not sure how that works. And I
would need additional clarity on what that's going to
look like, what's the timeline for that?

And in thinking through that process, I'm kind of
wondering if this is our best strategy at this point in
time.

I think Commissioner Kennedy made a really great
point. I believe it was last week. And correct me if
I'm wrong. In the future, I think that our best advice,
right, moving out of this process is that, on day one,
when the first eight are selected in 2030, ten years from
now, there needs to be communications staffing or a firm
or something put in place, and a contract secured for
that. I question, as much as I want that -- that support
right now, I question how we would actually do it while
at the same time looking for that Communications Director
and --

MS. JOHNSTON: Unfortunately, the first eight, the
only authority they have is to select the next six.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Correct. But I think if the
State auditor's office --

MS. JOHNSTON: They could request a state auditor.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Or it can change. Right?

And so just as the State auditor is required to provide
legal counsel, right, to the first eight, perhaps they
can also be required to provide communications support.
Right? I'm talking about a broader change in terms of --

CHAIR TURNER: Absolutely.

MS. JOHNSTON: That would be included, among -- if
you wanted to propose an amendment once this process is
over.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. And then something we
can think about in the future.

CHAIR TURNER: Absolutely. And I see you,
Commissioner Vazquez. The thing that I wanted to totally
agree with, Commissioners Le Mons and Sadhwani on is --
and add the tail end to that to not be repetitive. My
other belief is that, in hiring someone now, I'm good
with that because of the urgency and needs of
communication. And then when we start layering in two
different entities of communications and pathways that
we're hiring on, there's an amount of time to pull that
together -- number 1, as far as drain on resources.

And beyond that, once you have those people in
place, for certain, our new, permanent hire will be able
to set their own path agenda to create and design it in
the way they want. But they also will need to take that
in consideration of these other people that already have
started creating and building and doing something and
make a determination. Do I just throw that out and start
over or did that now kind of direct the area? So I just want to be really cautious about that, too. Because it's so close in time frame about how many cooks we have in the kitchen leading some things.

Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. I hear all of that. And I am as well concerned about, you know, starting on one path and then changing courses midstream, I guess. And maybe this is partially a question for Raul. What I was hoping is that, in conversation with the auditors, we could just do a quick, almost temperature check, even with -- in a formal request to say, is there someone existing? I don't even know if this is possible, that, like, could be reassigned to temporarily access in a more reactive fashion.

So they are not building anything. They are not, you know, for me, they're not doing anything long term. They're merely responding to time-sensitive requests and actions that we need from a communications standpoint.

So if suddenly we wake up Monday morning, and the census question has been resolved, like, it would be nice for us to be able to draft a response to the Commission and have that go out. Right?

So that, for me, that is my hope in talking with the auditor's office through a formal request is, hey, is
their existing staff that maybe we can take as other
duties as assigned and use their capacity on a limited
basis for our purposes. That's the question I would ask
the auditors.

Because I agree. I don't think it makes sense to
have them go through a full recruitment hiring process.
Give us someone maybe three or four weeks from now when
we're already pursuing another thing. So I'm looking for
somebody temp and quick.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: And that's, you
know, and we should have talked about it a little bit
more in detail. That's really what I was understanding.
Somebody who would come in and deal with emergent or
immediate issues, not someone who would come in and do
any type of planning or development. That basically
you're putting that in abeyance until you actually have
the staff to do that. But to have somebody kind of in
your pocket to where if something happens, you have that
support.

Also, too, with the temporary staff that I was
talking about -- that you ask, could I look for one?
Sure, I can look for one. Again, it'd be somebody
looking at, strictly speaking, those types of duties.
That's about all you're going to get, too, on a short-
term basis.
CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: This is a question to Raul. Were you making a distinction between what you would supply in your search versus what we would be asking for from the auditors -- from The State auditor's office? So that's one question. Yeah. Let me stop -- stop there, and have you answer that. And then I have a follow up.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: I think the way Commissioner Vazquez described it is how I was thinking about it. And I'm glad this discussion is happening. Because it needed to be put on the table. But yes, I was looking at it as just the emergent need, and not someone who's going to work with you on any kind of planning.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: No, I understand that portion.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Oh. I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: What I'm asking is, in terms of securing this person. Were you suggesting that that's something that you could potentially secure outside of this formal request to the State auditor's office? Or it is contingent upon us making this formal request to the State auditor's office to secure something like that?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: As I understood it, the discussion right now is for me to pursue both.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes, I understand that. But
I'm asking a -- I guess --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Oh.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: -- a very specific question --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: -- about the pathways. And so it sounds like they mirror. It doesn't matter whether this is something you pursue. Based on what we just discussed about you pursuing support staff versus us reaching out formally to the State auditor's office. The end result will be the same.

MS. JOHNSTON: The State -- if the State auditor were to loan you someone temporarily, that could be done immediately.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Uh-huh.

MS. JOHNSTON: If we were to recruit an RA, that would have to come back before the Commission for a hiring decision.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Yes.


INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay, perfect. Okay. I'm clear.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. And we have both motions on
the floor, and both motions were to formally submit a request to the State auditor for someone loaned. And also, the motion has been made and seconded to allow Raul also to move forward in getting someone temporarily. That will, then, of course, have to come back here for a vote. But just allow him to start that process. Okay. So we have -- Ryan, we all need to go to public comments, please.

AT&T OPERATOR: And as a reminder, if you do wish to make a comment, please press 1, then 0 at this time. 1-0. And we have no one queuing up at this time.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. We'll got to vote, please.

MS. JOHNSTON: So the first motion is to have Raul recruit retired annuitants to fill in on IT finance, perhaps communication, and budget. And to bring it back before the Commission at their next meeting.

Commissioner Ahmad?

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.
MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Turner.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: The motion passes.

The next one is to have -- would be that Madam Chair send a letter which she could draft with the assistance of Raul or myself to request the State auditor to loan you temporary assistance as a communications person.
CHAIR TURNER: That request, I thought, was coming from the subcommittee based on information that they had.

MS. JOHNSTON: Well, the subcommittee can't take any action.

CHAIR TURNER: I got it.

MS. JOHNSTON: It's just advisory.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Thank you.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Ahmad?

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes.
MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Turner.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: That motion also passes.

CHAIR TURNER: So we'll move to agenda item number 15, Raul, which is the training on state contracting and procurement.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Okay. So I've got quarter after 12. I can start the presentation.

CHAIR TURNER: I think we have 30 -- it'll be longer than thirty minutes?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: The latter part of it. It segues into number 16.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay, so then, can we do this? Can we go to item 18 and complete that at least? Marion? Because I think you mentioned before, most of this one has been covered. That is the discussion of key provisions of Commission constitutional provisions.
MS. JOHNSTON: Sure. There's been a lot of
discussion already about Elections Code 21003 on the
Commission having the discretion to decide if you want to
have prisoners counted where they used to live before
they were incarcerated. Unless there's any further
questions about that, I won't continue it.

On the amendment process, I wanted to -- the reason
to bring this up now, even though it won't happen for a
while, is that you can make notes as we go along of
issues that you see coming up that you would like to have
changes made in the law. For instance, if you wanted to
have the auditor provide communication support as well as
staff support while you're doing it.

The provisions for amending -- the way an initiative
works is that normally, an initiative cannot be amended
by the Legislature unless in the initiative itself, it
provides that the Legislature may amend the initiative.

And in this case, it is said,

"The Legislature may not amend this chapter
unless all of the following are made. This
means that the amendment has to start with the
Commission. By the same vote required for the
adoption of the final set of maps, the
Commission recommends amendments to this
chapter to carry out its purpose of intent to
the exact language of the amendments provided
by the Commission must be enacted by the
Legislature by two thirds vote of each House of
the Legislature and signed by the Governor.
The bill must be in print for at least twelve
days before final passage. The amendments must
further the purposes of the Act, and the
amendments may not be passed in a year ending
in nine, zero, or one",
which means the earliest it could be done is in year
2022.

The two significant amendments that were made during
the last -- by the last Commission, proposed by the last
Commission and adopted by the Legislature, one was to
extend the time four months earlier to give the
Commission more time to do its work. And the second was
to change the process for the getting the Commission
going. The way it was originally drafted, it was first
started with the selection of the applicants by the State
auditor. And then, it switched to the Secretary of
State's office to get the Commission rolling.

And the thought of the past Commissioners was that
that was rather cumbersome. So they proposed the
amendment that, again, the Legislature Select
suggested -- agreed to -- to have the State auditor do it
1 all.
2 So it's those types of amendments that really do
3 make the work of the Commission easier that you are to
4 keep in mind.
5 Any questions about that process?
6 CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Ahmad?
7 VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: I just want to put this on
8 everyone's radar. I would like to meet in 2023. I have
9 some thoughts already. In three years from now, let's
10 chat about these amendments.
11 MS. JOHNSTON: But just keep a note of them as
12 you're going along of things that you think would make
13 the process work smoother. That's it.
14 CHAIR TURNER: And is it that it can't be done in
15 years zero and one? So it could be done as soon as 2022?
16 MS. JOHNSTON: Correct. Cannot be done years ending
17 in nine, zero, or one.
18 CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So Commissioner Ahmad, can we
19 have your discussion in '22?
20 COMMISSIONER YEE: Meet at the top of the Empire
21 State Building.
22 CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay?
23 COMMISSIONER SINAY: If this -- is it the whole
24 process? I mean, I think that there's definitely -- we
25 don't want to lose what we may be thinking right now
about the application process. And is it possible, does that have -- I mean, I don't know if everything's going to be an amendment or some things are going to be a recommendation.

But I do think it's important for us to debrief on the application process now versus try to wait till 2022, and remember at all. I mean, I've taken notes as well. I've got some notes for 2022 as well. But I -- I don't want to lose -- yeah, the application process is the beginning of how you engage with the community.

MS. JOHNSTON: I would suggest you start a running list that you could provide to staff of items you'd like to take up as potential amendments.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: I'm kind of curious. What you were thinking about is on the front end with the selection, or --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. It was more on the front end. And that's why I don't know if it needs to be an amendment or it's just thinking things through.

MS. JOHNSTON: It depends on whether it's something that's in statute or not. I don't know what you're referring to specifically.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Right.

MS. JOHNSTON: The initiative spelled out in pretty significant detail the process for selection, what was to
be done by the State auditor.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. So what I'm hearing is, the best step is just to start sending our thoughts to the staff. There will be a running list that will be kept. And then, in 2022, we'll come back to organize the list in a way that we can have a conversation and know what are amendments, and what is just suggestions that we put in a report like the 2010 group did.

MS. JOHNSTON: That's what I would suggest. Yes.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: You could go just for the clarity of process. Should we send our suggestions for future agenda items in 2022 and there's a running list? Is that something that needs to be made public or is that just kind of an administrative list that, for example, that the staff will be keeping track of in that, when appropriate, the list will be publicized or agendized as appropriate in 2022.

MS. JOHNSTON: It depends on whether you want to discuss it ahead of time. You can't take any action on it until then. So if you don't want to discuss it, then you could just send your suggestions to me. And I can pass them on to whoever is the Chief Counsel who'd be the one working with Legislature on drafting the legislation.
So it depends on whether you want to use your time before 2022 to discuss things.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Thank you. We're go to public comment so that we can close out agenda item 18 before lunch.

Oh. Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: My apologies, but I have a recommendation I want to make as it relates to public comment. And this is based upon us having had people call in and talk about challenges with getting through. And I'm wondering if our internal team -- maybe the video team or someone on that side of the shop, can test the line each time we go, like, to see if someone actually gets through to the AT&T operator. So when the person says no one's in queue, we at least know that it's functioning properly. Because there's no real way for us to know whether it is or isn't. So I've been kind of contemplating that, going like --

CHAIR TURNER: Understood.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: -- how could we kind of be aware. So I don't know if that's possible. If there's somebody who can do that.

MS. JOHNSTON: Kristian, are you aware when there's someone in queue.

MR. MANOFF: We test the call and public comment
call-in system from end to end. So that includes calling
in, talk back with AT&T and so forth. And sometimes
issues do occur. And we try to troubleshoot those as
best we can. We do have a little bit of ability. They
can communicate directly with us, AT&T can, if they have
any problems. And for the most part, like, we can check
and see if there's -- we have the ability to communicate
with them from staff. If we get a note from staff, we
can check the queue for you at any time.

MS. JOHNSTON: But I thought you had some indication
when someone was in queue, you could tell.

MR. MANOFF: We don't know. We get some data from
AT&T, but it's not in real time. It's not as good as
theirs. So that's why we always ask the AT&T operator to
just request and you know, see if there's anybody on the
line. Because the information that we're getting is --

MS. JOHNSTON: And the other thing is if you think
this process is cumbersome, we're using the process that
the State auditor selected as what they thought would
work the best. But we're not wedded to stick to it if
you think there's a better system than AT&T.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah, I'm not raising that at
this point. I guess what I am asking is, I understand
what you're -- it sounds like what you're capable of
doing, but I guess, does it happen, like, every time we
go to public comment, does someone from your team attempt
to actually call in, not on a special line, just on a
regular phone and can go through that whole process and
get in queue?

MR. MANOFF: Not every time. But if that's
something that the Commission wanted to do -- you know,
what was happening at the auditor's office, just in
context, was they had quite a few auditors that were
watching the live meetings every day and were testing the
line because they have the people internally to do that.
So it is possible. Right now, what we're doing is we're,
you know, we have a way of, you know, making sure that
AT&T is logged in. We have, like, an interface that they
provide to us.

And I'm also on the phone with them right now as we
speak. I'm logged into the host line of the call. And I
can see that I'm in the call. So that's what we're doing
right now.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay. Could we test this? I
mean, if other Commissioners are comfortable with it, if
we could actually test it to see if it reveals any
problems at our current assessment and evaluation may not
reveal.

MS. JOHNSTON: Well, perhaps one of you could try
calling in on the line. It's hard for us to do it from
CHAIR TURNER: What's the number? What's the telephone number?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: We can -- or we can certainly do it from this end.

MR. MANOFF: Yeah. I mean, any time anybody wants to try calling in -- again, that number is 877-226-8163. And the code is 5185236. And for any of the Commissioners, you can also watch the live feed that we're doing at any time at wedrawthelines.ca.gov.

MS. JOHNSTON: Someone is trying to call in right now to test it.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Okay, that would be great. I would rather the Commissioners not be burdened with trying to call in and test it.

MS. JOHNSTON: Right. But we can't do it, either.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I would rather we identify somebody to do that.

MS. JOHNSTON: We just don't have any staff.

MR. MANOFF: Well, we're doing it now.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: One thing I was told by -- back when I was chairing at the auditor's office is that's why every single time we had -- we went to public comment, we actually had the instructions read and were
told to wait at least a couple of minutes because there is the -- when somebody, oh, it's public comment time. It gave them enough time to actually physically get to the phone, dial in all the numbers, have their tablet work, have it ring, have it be answered. So that was what we were doing.

Every single time we went to public comments, we would we re-read the instructions. And then we would talk. We would ask if there was any anyone in queue. And then wait for a couple of minutes. And that gave -- I do understand. We're actually checking to see how things are going. So the recommendation was that we pause for two minutes; sometimes three minutes, to allow people the time to get in -- get in on the line.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you for that. The thing that I have, I guess I was not feeling beholden to was that when we announced public comment is going to be at the beginning of lunch, or at the beginning of the meeting, and when we actually are able to adhere to that. And so then, we would call for public comment, if there's no one there, it doesn't seem to me it has an -- it seems to me -- I don't know, be so moved to wait additional minutes, you know.

But I do want to hear what you're saying and be reminded when we are having public comment like now to
wait a little bit longer. And I try to do that.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. It was really particularly when, like, after an action item, when it comes at different times, when we switch to -- they expect it in the morning. They expect it after lunch. That again, we didn't have to go for pause, but it was after action items in the middle of the day.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I appreciate what Commissioner Andersen is saying. I think I'm speaking to something a little bit different. Never once when we heard from the public that they had problems getting in, have we heard from the AT&T operator, the State auditor's office, or anyone else that there is a problem with the public getting in. So to me, it's like, I don't know, whatever it was we were doing -- and I'm not trying to troubleshoot what we were doing -- I thought that the simplest way is that somebody try to call in each time. And not one of us, but somebody try to call in each time we go to public comment. Because to me that's the point that, if you're the outside caller, you know, whether there's a problem that maybe they don't see yet or maybe hasn't been revealed. It may be burdensome. It may not be a direction that we want to go. But I want to distinguish that from the waiting part, because that's
not what I'm really talking about.

MS. JOHNSTON: One of the videographers just tried
doing it and says it's working fine.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: And are they prepared to do
that each time we go to public comment through the rest
of this meeting today and tomorrow?

MR. MANOFF: No. I would say -- I would say that
right now, I've got, you know -- right now, we're focused
on making sure your broadcast is working. It would be --
I'm going to defer to staff on that. And I would direct
that request to staff. And we can talk about options on
how to do that. You know, because right now, with the
team that I have in the room, quite honestly, we are
busy, but we can apply resources to that at the direction
of staff. Is that fair?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I don't really know what that
means, to be honest with you.

MR. MANOFF: Okay.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Does that mean, Raul, that we
bring somebody else in who can handle the phones?

MR. MANOFF: Yeah. It means that -- we can discuss
options on how to do that with Raul basically. If we
need to make sure that there's somebody that calls that
number every single time, then we will task that to
somebody on our team. But it won't be somebody that's in
the room right here. It will probably be somebody on remote.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: So that would be my recommendation, fellow commissioners, if you're open to that or if you guys feel that that's too cumbersome, you know, that's fine, too, but --

CHAIR TURNER: Right. I think we heard the comment a couple of times through public comment and we really would have nothing to come back with. And so we -- I appreciate the thoroughness of the team in the room testing what they can, however, if public comment is still saying they've had trouble. So I think it just is the due diligence that we should.

Commissioners Vazquez and Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: You made my comments, Madam Chair.


COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I know in previous conversations there was a recommendation to ensure that on the instructions on the We Draw the lines website that, in addition to the call and phone number and password, that there also be a line that says make sure that you press 1-0 to be put into the queue. And I don't see that. And I think that that's perhaps one of the
challenges that could be occurring.

I definitely hear what Commissioner Le Mons is saying because I do recall hearing from at least more than two and over the space of more than one day that there was problems getting on the line. I'll just make this recommendation. I don't know if this is viable. You know, if somebody cannot get in through the phone line, there is no other option to just text or email and say, hey, I'm trying to make a comment, but I'm not having success in getting through.

We're not getting a lot of comments right now. I'm just wondering if it makes sense to perhaps offer some type of cell phone line where somebody could text and say, I'm trying to get through, I'm having problems, or even just to email someone saying, I'm trying to get through, I'm having problems. Just so that, then, this kind of process of trying to call in, you know, and someone testing to call in doesn't become so cumbersome.

And actually, real time, it -- you know, someone else from either staff or the video team may be able to get in, but for whatever reason, someone else is not able to. And perhaps if somebody just alerts us that there's a problem going on with the line, then at least then some troubleshooting can take place.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Okay.
CHAIR TURNER: Raul and then Commissioner Andersen.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: I just wanted to note, so I do receive communications from the Auditor's Office if they're getting any communications. It only happened that one day, and what we ascertained was that the callers weren't receiving the instructions from the operator to dial the 1-0. There hasn't been any other issues communicated to me since then.

That being said, what I'm hearing is that there's a concern that because there's not much public comment so far that maybe there's something wrong with the telephone system. That's kind of what I'm hearing. So we can certainly go ahead and figure out a way to keep that tested. The videography here -- the videographer staff, they keep an eye on it but we can add something periodic to maintain that alertness.

CHAIR TURNER: And Raul, add that line that Commissioner Akutagawa talked about, the instructions --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Oh.

CHAIR TURNER: -- online as well.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: So I was going say, there's a link to the instructions right there on the home page. And so all someone has to do is click that and it takes them -- I mean, well, no. The instructions on the website are the ones that I read
CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Akutagawa, where are you at?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'm going to say, I've seen those instructions and they're really long. I think it's just a very simple just underneath the phone number just put, be sure to press 1-0. And I think they could read the rest of it, but I think that that's the one important instruction that's missing that some people, I think, might not realize that -- or they think that they are, but they just need to be reminded.

And putting it on the website may also remind them to make sure that if they haven't pressed 1-0, they need to do that. And to be paying attention because if they press 1-0 again if they've already pressed it, it takes them out of queue also.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Well, I can send that communication over to --

CHAIR TURNER: I see you.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: -- Auditor IT.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. Can I just say there -- these issues did, indeed, come up the first time around. There was a lot of stuff going on in the background. The Auditor staff was very involved. There
were extra people making sure this aspect was working. And what I would actually say is can we just ask the staff, especially Raul and Marian and Kristian to please just coordinate back with State Auditors and find out exactly how they were doing it because they did have -- if we need to -- then if we need to add, like, another line onto the website to say, please do this, this, this, we can at that point do it.

And we will probably need another person, but at this point, I think we've all said exactly what -- you know, Commissioner Le Mons brought up a really good point. We need that extra help, and we don't have that right now. We did have that with the auditors.

And if they could just get back with the auditors, find out exactly what we need, and then go ahead, and then, you know, bring it back to us and say, hey, this is what we're doing, we've got it covered, as opposed to us actually having to spell out exactly what we need to do. I think they're -- if we just say, guys, this is the issue, and then we'll go ahead and we'll figure out what to do. It will probably involve at least another person.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I was just going to say at the risk of belaboring this point, I'm on the livestream right now. To everyone's point, it can be helpful to
include the 1-0 note because when you're on, if you're watching this from home, all you see is the phone number and the code. You don't see instruction about zero-one. I'm sure people can figure out the part about say which meeting you want to want to comment on, but the 1-0 piece. If you just have this video stream bookmarked, you're not going to see the instructions.

CHAIR TURNER: So like a running banner that's there? Um-hum. Okay. We have five minutes before we have to break. Ryan, is there anyone waiting for public comment?

AT&T OPERATOR: We do have one person that's in queue. Please spell your first and last name for the record. I'm opening the line of Michael Wagner (sic). Please go ahead. Your line is open.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

MR. WAGAMAN: Hi. This is Michael Wagaman, W-A-G-A-M-A-N. I spoke to you previously about the budget allocation issue. Two things. One, on the negotiations on the statutory amendment process, just to kind of clarify how things were done last time, there was actually a subcommittee of the Commission that was appointed to work with the Legislature to try to work some of those issues out.

So it wasn't a process of the Commission coming up
with a set of amendments and then forwarding to the Legislature. There was a much more collaborative process because it does require both the supermajority votes of the Commission and the Legislature, and we have to be very precise on that language because of the way it is written. Even if there's a comma difference between the two versions, it wouldn't go into effect. So that is how that worked.

And I would highlight in the recommendations from the last Commission, one of the things they did talk about is potentially starting that process earlier and be getting those interactions earlier so that things weren't lost as was discussed. So just to put that on your list as you move forward.

And as one of the commissioners mentioned, just so you know, we have already reached out to the Auditor's Office to request any feedback of any potential statutory amendments they may be looking for relative to the application phase. So I wanted to highlight that.

And then on your discussion on public testimony, one thing just to mention, in your instructions, it talks about how there is sometimes a lag between the video stream and your actual discussions. So what that means as a practical matter is if a member of the public is -- if you all are talking and you say, please dial in now
for public comment, by the time the public actually hears
that instructions it may be thirty seconds later. So you
may be like, oh, we've been waiting a long time, and they
may just be hearing that instruction that they need to
dial number, dial a code, give their name, dial 1-0.

So just keep that in mind and figure out how long
you -- of that pause, maybe, is -- you got to add in an
extra 30 seconds just to allow the video to catch up with
the public -- what the public is actually hearing. Thank
you very much.

CHAIR TURNER: Um-hum. That's very helpful about
the lag. And thank you so much for all of your comments.
We appreciate that. Is there another caller?

AT&T OPERATOR: As a reminder, it is 1-0 if you'd
like to make a comment. One-zero. Right now we have no
one in queue.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. I was just looking -- I
didn't quite understand the last caller's comments about
looking for input -- that the State Auditor's Office was
looking for input. And so I was just -- I wanted
clarification, but I don't think he's there any longer,
so we'll just have to --

MS. JOHNSTON: I think what he was saying is that
they have also asked the State Auditor if there are
any -- now that they've been given additional duties that used to belong to the Secretary of State, if there's anything that they would like to change. Even so, if they had a change that they would like, it would have to come through the Commission first.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Raul?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: So just a quick update maybe to assist with this discussion. If you go on to the live stream now, it has underneath the Brady Bunch pictures --

CHAIR TURNER: Um-hum.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: -- it's -- it says public comment, gives the help number or the code, and then it says press 1 and 0 to queue.

CHAIR TURNER: Wonderful. Thank you.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: So if you'll go on there, you'll be able to see that.

CHAIR TURNER: Great.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: And we'll see.

CHAIR TURNER: And thank you. Appreciate that.

Good job.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: We'll still figure out -- thank you. We'll still figure out some additional things we can do. So if you don't see me
here, maybe I'm testing the thing.

CHAIR TURNER: Um-hum. Okay.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: I laugh, but you
know, I don't want you to think that any of us here in
this room don't take it seriously the responsibility for
transparency. We take that very, very seriously, and so
we're here. We'll figure it out on our end what else we
can do to help support the effort on your behalf.

CHAIR TURNER: Outstanding. At this time, I think
it's time for lunch. And so we'll recess for lunch until
2:15.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: 2:15.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Sorry. Do you mean 1:45?

MS. JOHNSTON: 1:45.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh, I wanted a longer lunch today.

MS. JOHNSTON: Oh, do you?

CHAIR TURNER: Well, apparently.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: All those in favor?

COMMISSIONER YEE: All in favor?

CHAIR TURNER: No, Mary. No, Mary, I don't.

MS. JOHNSTON: (Indiscernible, simultaneous
speech) --

CHAIR TURNER: I think in my mind -- I keep messing
up on these times. In my mind, I'm thinking, okay, we've
got to go an hour and a half till we get a break. You
know, that --

MS. JOHNSTON: Yeah.

CHAIR TURNER: -- hour and a half time frame. So thank you. 1:45. Thank you.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, and welcome back. We will begin our time with our public comments. And so yes, please. Do we have anyone in queue, Ryan?

AT&T OPERATOR: And as a reminder, if you do wish to make a comment, please press one then zero. One-zero. Currently, we do not have anyone in queue.

CHAIR TURNER: Well, then we will wait for the delay.

MS. JOHNSTON: There are some documents Raul is distributing you might want to take a look at while we're waiting.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. AT&T, will you check again, please? Ryan, will you check to see if we have anyone waiting, please?

AT&T operator, Ryan, are you there? I don't know. Am I here? Do you all hear me?

MR. MANOFF: Yeah. Stand --

CHAIR TURNER: Oh. There we go.

AT&T OPERATOR: I am here. Sorry. My mute button
was on. We have no one in queue. Just a reminder, it's 1-0. If you'd like to queue up for a comment, please press 1 then 0. And we have no one in queue at this time.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Okay. So at this time, we will move to our -- we have now agenda item 15 that will then dovetail into agenda item 16 and 23. So we'll start with the agenda item 15, Raul.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: You caught me in the middle of a send. One moment, please.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh, sorry.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: No, no problem. Kristian, if you could share my desktop, please? And if you find the little red -- three red dots at the upper right corner of your screen, you can click on that and click on pin, and that'll open it up full screen for you.

So by special request, you get PowerPoint slides.

CHAIR TURNER: Woot woot.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: So this is about state contracts and procurement. So when you talk about contracts and procurement, one of the things to know is that the statutory authority for purchases reside with Department of General Services, okay? That's under the Public Contract Code.

Public Contract Code is developed primarily for a
few things. One, because you're working with public
money; two, to ensure equitable playing field for
prospective contractors; and three, to provide a strong
framework for how contracting procurement occur. DGS
also has statutory authority to grant purchasing
authority to other state departments.

So what happens if you don't have your purchasing
authority? Well, basically, you're non-IT goods and
purchases can't exceed $100. You can't obtain IT goods
and services of any dollar value. You can't make
purchases against leverage procurement agreements, which
I'll tell you about later, and you can't participate in a
CAL-Card purchase card program. The CAL-Card purchase
card program, think of that kind of like the State's
credit card.

There are other activities -- purchasing activities
that can occur under different authorities. So if you
don't have delegated authority, which is what it's
called, you can make purchases under $100. You can
obtain telecommunication goods and services. You can
obtain non-IT services pursuant to the State Contract

You can get IT goods and services pursuant to Public
Contract Code 12-100, and those are really related to IT
projects. And you can't get the non-IT goods over $100
unless they're exempt by statute. So the Citizens Redistricting Commission does not currently have delegated authority. What that means then is all purchases and contracts have to go through the Department of General Services and the Office of Legal Services, DGS OLS.

So to get delegated authority, you need to be able to provide certain things. One, that you have a procurement contracting officer who's a member of the executive team. The CEA and above is a state classification level. In terms of the job classes that the Citizens Redistricting Commission has, I went ahead and asked for one to be developed at this level. Should you and the Executive Director wish to pursue delegated authority for purchases, then you would have somebody in that position to be able to do that for you.

It also requires an individual below that level, and they're designated as your non-IT and IT purchasing authority. And what you're looking at there really is a separation of duties. So the individuals who do the contracting, approve the contracts, make the purchases, approve invoices for payment, are different individuals. And so if I -- as I go through this, if you have any questions, please ask.

Another part of the delegated authority is
establishing the policies for how you're going to train the personnel in the purchasing law and procedures. DGS or CalPCA has training in three different levels. Some of it's free; some of it you pay for. Your policies have to be in place for how you're going to control and review the purchasing, how you're going to auditing -- audit the purchase and contracting activities, and how are you going to delegate purchasing authority within the agency.

In other words, a separation of duties. And it's really a cross-system of checks and balances so that you don't have one person doing it all, and therefore, potentially increasing the risk of improper purchases or contracting.

So when we talk about purchasing and contracting, the purchases are called procurements, okay? In terms of how the State does it, you can't just go to Amazon or Walmart or Costco and buy whatever you want. There's procedures in place so you have to purchase from approved sellers first. There's a special consideration for small business, micro business, and businesses from the DVBEs, which is disabled veteran business enterprises. You can also make purchases using leverage procurement agreements. I'll get into those a little bit more later.

When you do your purchases, depending on the type of purchase and the amount of the purchase, you have to show
evidence of -- that you've done some kind of a cost
comparison and that you're getting a good deal,
basically. So purchases over $100 require approval.
It's usually a two or three-step approval. IT purchases
have many more levels of approval, about four or five,
and take considerably longer.

In this next part, I'm going to talk about different
types of contracts. So consulting services contracts are
defined under the Public Contract Code as services of an
advisory nature that provides a recommended course of
action or personal expertise. If you obtain the services
of, oh, like Matt was when he was doing the VRA analysis,
that was a consulting services contract.

So those can be acquired different ways. There are
some leverage procurement methods for doing that, an
invitation for bid, and depending on the way you approach
it is how long it takes and what it takes to do it.

Another way is the interagency contract, and that's
a contract between two or more California state agencies.
This is probably one of the quickest ways for certain
types of contracts. You currently have three that are
under consideration, the one with fiscal services and HR,
which got discussed on Tuesday the 26th. Those are ready
for approval and signature.

The one with IT, who basically is supporting your
networking and Wi-Fi. I'm still in negotiations with them on how that's going to work out, and so I didn't have that ready for you. Should you want to get a recruitment firm, there are a couple of public sector agencies that do recruitment, in which case, then, we would be able to do an interagency contract which can happen as in as little as two weeks.

Your leverage procurement are also known as master agreements. They're statewide agreements that DGS has already pretty much vetted. That means they've gone out to bid, they have evaluated the folks who are bidding their work practices, their costs, they've negotiated the costs for services, and depending on the type of agreement, quite often, they will already have designated that if you are in a certain area in California or doing specific types of work that those would be the people that you choose -- or the contractors that you choose.

Examples of that right now are -- and I'm kind of jump in a little bit ahead to what your subcommittee will be talking about, but for your transcription and for your American sign language, those are both master services agreements and those will be presented to you today.

So the advantage is it takes advantage of the State's buying power because the cost is pre-negotiated. If you need them, the bidding process has already
happened. They're pretty much ready to award. Some of them do have caps on the amount -- on the maximum out of the contract, and we can obtain them under $50,000 without Office of Legal Services approval. Over $50,000, then we have to go to the Office of Legal Services to get that approval.

You already have a contact there in the Office of Legal Services and through some of the procurement and contracting parts. That's one of the things that I was working on for you. And so sometimes a process that may take four weeks, six weeks, eight weeks or more, we can get it -- we can get it through much, much quicker, which is good.

So competitive bidding methods. So when we talk about an invitation for bid or a request for proposal, those are what's known as competitive bidding methods. The Public Contract Code and the State Contracting Manual are replete with a number of rules and regulations and laws that apply to these methods. The requirements for when you post, how you -- not so much the when but how you post.

The CSR is the California State Contract Register, which ones are required -- requirements regarding the bid opening, the basis for awarding with the asterisk there that you, as the agency who's going to be doing the
awarding, you set the actual criteria. Some of the how
of that occurs, though, is already set in law.

So for example, with the RFP with the line drawer
where it said that the cost portions would be provided
sealed and not opened until ready for consideration,
that's really part of the standards and requirements for
RFPs. You don't have a choice with that. How you award
it and the basis of the award, the criteria for the
award, is where you would come in.

They're required to have a statement of work.
They're required to have some basis for experience
factors and cost factors. I'll go into that a little bit
more in a bit. And they also have requirements in terms
of what's known as small business or DVBE, disabled
veteran business enterprise preferences. And those are
usually either in terms of additional awarded points or a
percent consideration from their bid. And again, that's
to support those two types of contractors.

Another form of contracting is the small business
DVBE option. This is an option, a contracting method
that is specific and only for small -- excuse me -- small
businesses and disabled veteran business enterprises.
Generally, the contracts are limited to greater than
5,000 and less than 250,000 which requires quotes from at
least two certified small businesses or two certified
micro businesses, or two certified disabled veteran-owned businesses. And you can't mix and match. You can't have one small business and one micro business.

Now, that being said, sometimes your disabled veteran-owned business is also a certified small business, in which case, then, you could use that solicitation with them as a small business. Award to the low quote is not required, but you need to be able to document and support business reasons and the cost reasonableness as the basis for selecting if it's not the low quote.

And again, when I say these considerations, again, it's because of factors in the Public Contract Code and in the State Contract Manual. You also have legal services contracts. They're not subject to competitive bidding or advertising. Generally, they're authorized by the Attorney General unless specifically exempted by statute.

During the 2010 cycle, the Commission -- the Commission's legal counsel wrote a letter for exemption to the Attorney General, and it was accepted, and so it didn't require authorization. So that's something that Marian really knows a lot more about the specifics and could go into detail for you.

Generally speaking, again, they require DGS Office
of Legal Services approval. The last go-round, yours
didn't because of that exemption that was granted by the
Attorney General. The copy of the contract and
amendments need to be sent to the Bargaining Unit for the
attorneys, and the Commission last time was required to
provide that notification.

So are there any questions? If not, I'm going to
move on.

CHAIR TURNER: Raul --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Yes.

CHAIR TURNER: -- I think there is, but you're
screen-sharing so I can't see all the hands. I think
Kennedy and Fernandez. Commissioners Kennedy,
Fernandez --

MR. MANOFF: Chair, you can go to --

CHAIR TURNER: -- and Akutagawa.

MR. MANOFF: -- gallery view. You can go to gallery
view if you like.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh, got it.

MR. MANOFF: Switch from speaker --

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

MR. MANOFF: -- view to gallery view.

CHAIR TURNER: I thought I was stuck. Yeah. So
Commissioner Kennedy. Now, I forgot the hands. Kennedy
and the others I just said. Fernandez.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Here.

CHAIR TURNER: Akutagawa. Okay.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Raul, are we again in a situation where what the 2010 Commission did has now lapsed completely and we have to start over?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: In regards to the attorney contracting?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: In regards to the attorney, but really in regards to any of this procurement procedures.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: That's an excellent question. So the 2010 Commission decided not to go and obtain delegated authority. When we were looking at the amount of time we had and how much time it would have taken to acquire the delegated authority, what we decided to do was to negotiate processes and form partnerships, and we were able to get avenues for procurement and contracting that were much more rapid than normal state operations.

This go-round, you have a little bit more time so it becomes more of a consideration. But to answer your question, yes. Whatever happened in 2010, it's done. We're starting over.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Which doesn't make a whole
lot of sense to me. But what does make sense is that if we do have time, if we are able to pursue some of these things now and leave them in place for the 2030 Commission, it would --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILANUEVA: Right.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- a, make our lives easier during our term, but also hopefully make their lives easier during their term.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILANUEVA: No argument there. That's probably one of the more difficult things because of the amount of law and regulation attached to it. And if delegated authority could be obtained and we could negotiate a way -- because delegated authority is in place for the organization, but it's also contingent on the capabilities of the staff to exercise it. But then that becomes when your hiring for the 2030. So yes, I'm with you a thousand percent.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you. Yeah. So just a couple of questions. One, if we do choose to try to get some -- get delegated authority, what's the process and how long does that take? And then, two -- so I actually have three questions. But the second one would be the timelines for procurement if we have to go through this whole process where it has to go through DGS
and all that.

And then three, and I think you might have kind of
gone into this, if we don't have delegated authority but
somebody else has delegated authority, can we somehow use
their delegated authority? So that's the three that I've
got.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Okay. I'm trying
to figure out which is the easiest first. Can we use
somebody else's delegated authority? The primary answer
is no, but under special circumstances that can be
contracted. It doesn't happen often, but it is possible.

As far as procurement time, one of the things that I
worked on while the State Auditor was really strongly in
place with your operations was to obtain as much of the
procurement on the front end as possible. And so your
IT, the office supplies that are coming in. So basically
to set up the office, and then afterwards, some of the
infrastructure for you.

So for example, your phones. That couldn't be set
up on the front end because you didn't have a CATR. Now
that you do, then -- or almost, it needs to be signed --
now you can go ahead and get your cell phone service,
your telephone service, your 800 number. So as far as
time lines, it depends on the type of purchase. Last go-
round, it took us four weeks to get computers, four and a
half weeks. Generally, it takes about two weeks to get office supplies.

So when the 2010 talks about staff going out and getting computers and office supplies, that was one of the primary reasons why that things had to get started up and running so fast. You now have the advantage that you have all those basics.

There was three questions. What was the other one, the last one?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: The other one was the -- and when I talked about can we use somebody else's authority, I was thinking of the State Auditor because we're kind of tied but not really tied to them. So that was kind of like my initial thinking.

But my third thing was, if we decide to go the delegated authority time --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Oh.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- route, what would be the time line? And I realize that you said we'd probably wait until we hire those positions, but I mean, is it something that we can start now instead of having to wait, you know, another month or so to start that process?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: I can initiate the process for you in terms of the request. The
paperwork is easy to obtain, but it can't move forward until the hiring. But again, that becomes then one of the criteria for hiring. It also then outlines a little bit of the internal organizational structure that has to be there for the separation --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: -- of duties.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I realize we have to have the positions first in order to put that on the form saying we have these positions, we have our internal controls in place. But once we have that, then how -- do you have an idea of how long that would take, that process would take?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: You know what? Really, I'd want to make an inquiry to my contacts in the Department and see how we could fast track it with -- it's kind of like god bless them, but with the Department of General Services, who have done a lot for you, there's such a layer of bureaucracy that it -- I'd rather work with the contacts I have and see how we can streamline processes. In general, it could take six months to eight months, and we don't have that time.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm going back to, I guess, it's the Government Code 8253,
Citizens Redistricting Commission Miscellaneous
Provisions, Subsection A, sub 5 says, among other things, quote, the State Auditor shall provide support functions to the Commission until its staff and office are fully functional.

Now, it seems to me there may be some room for debate over what support functions comprise, but until its staff and office are fully functional, we're nowhere near fully functional. And to me, this is saying that the State Auditor should be providing the support functions that we need.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: If you go to a couple of sections just below that, it'll -- you'll also see where the contracting and staffing authority is exclusively under the Commission and that the Commission makes those decisions by super-majority vote. I only bring that up -- and I bring that up respectfully, not argumentatively -- because in discussions with the State Auditor, that is one of the places that we had to stop and look at how far can decisions be made, quote unquote, on behalf of the Commission.

And that appeared to be a very bright line that couldn't be crossed that, based on that language, the Commission has the sole authority for its contracting and staffing. So that could be -- that could be one of those
2022 considerations because I agree with you, Commissioner, that that really would be helpful the next go-round and shedding a little bit more light on exactly what that language means. Because you're right. It seems to contradict itself.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. I'll look forward -- excuse me -- to a very interesting discussion with General Counsel once we have General Counsel. But I mean, 8253.6, Sub. B talks about may hire staff and consultants exempt from civil service requirements --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Right.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- and shall have full procurement and contracting authority doesn't say shall have exclusive procurement and contracting authority. To me, that says we will have it once we're up and fully functional, but in the meantime the Auditor's Office needs to be supporting us in any and every way we need so that we can get up --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Right.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- to the point of being fully functional.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: The --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Otherwise, we're stuck in a catch-22 that we don't have the authority to do what we need to do to get up to the point of being fully
INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: I think that's a question for the attorneys. I can only report to you what discussions have occurred. The language about the staffing is really in regards predominantly of why the May is because you're not required to be under civil service. The exemption under Article 12 is regarding constitutional exclusion from civil service, and those are appointed by the Governor's Office and fall under Cal HR, neither of which those considerations affect your staff.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: All right. All right. Thank you.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: You're welcome.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes. And Marian, I can't quite tell when you're wanting to talk or just close to the mic, but maybe you and then Commissioner Sinay.

MS. JOHNSTON: No, I have nothing to add to that. Thank you.


COMMISSIONER SINAY: It's post-lunch, and this is all in bureaucratic-ese. I guess if you have legalese, you have bureaucratic-ese.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can you simplify this in a way
that non-State people would understand? I mean, it sounds like we can't do anything unless we do this. If we do this, it's going to take some time. There might be ways to get around it, right?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: So there's two primary ways. One is the delegated authority. The other one is the method that was used last time, which I've been pursuing until now, because there's -- basically, the Commission needed to come into place to make some of these decisions. And this is -- this is about as close to English as I can get it.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Got you.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Yes. If you were to actually read the State Contracting Manual, while it's more consumer-friendly than the Public Contract Code, it's very dense.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So I guess the bottom line is we save money and effort if we go this way, but it takes us more time?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: You save time and money through delegated authority, especially the time, depending on how much delegated authority you get. The biggest factor here is time. When you have to deal with multiple levels of authority with an external force negotiating that process, this becomes a primary factor
on how fast it goes, the rapidity of it. When you hold
more of that decision-making and authority on your hands,
that's where the time factor comes into play.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think, following on
Commissioner Sinay's request, I think I need perhaps an
even bigger level of just some simplification. What
exactly would -- are we talking about in terms of all of
these things? You know, I see that IT and non-IT. I
see, you know, other different kinds of things. I mean,
what I am -- what I am surmising is that it could be a
whole host of different kinds of services and items.

Just how much of it is actually really urgent in
terms of getting us further up to speed and how much of
it is things that we're going to need but doesn't fall
under, like, you know, within the next couple, three
weeks' time frame?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Your priority --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And I have one more
question after that.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Your priorities
right now are your meeting services. So that's your
videographer, your American sign language interpreter,
your court -- the transcriptionist/court reporter, your
captioner. Because without those, either your meetings
don't happen or they happen but they're missing pretty solid pieces for engagement and transparency.

After that, comes some of the pieces that you've been discussing today. So as you consider -- you want an external entity to do your recruitment, so that becomes priority, right? Looking at those things that are going to require an actual request for proposal or invitation for bid because it takes a while to actually create that document, run it through legal, and get it ready to post. And you're talking three to four weeks there. And so those should be identified and become priority just to be developed now. So kind of rough and ready.

That's a really good question, by the way. And if I may, one of the primary purposes for this presentation is not to get you up to speed on contracting and procurement. Let your staff do that, you know. But to really understand that this is a process, and so for you, the decision-making and planning so that these things can occur in a timely manner becomes very critical.

So if you want to get an external agency to help you with your public engagement, that's something that needs to be thought about now because that will most probably have to be an RFP. And so that's going to require a lot of thought and planning on the front end just to be able to develop a solid scope of work that will accomplish for
you what you want.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. So that, I guess -- thank you for that because I guess we have the videographer, the American sign language interpreters working. The transcription, I guess I just thought that that was already all set up and you know, going to continue on.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: All of those services are being provided under contract with the State Auditor right now.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Can you tell us for how long? Because that, I guess, wasn't clear. And then I guess that would then also mean that's where the line drawer is going to also fall under this kind of contracting work --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- that we're doing. And then my last question that I had is, it's interesting that disabled veterans are called out but minority or women-owned businesses are not called out. It's just more generically small business.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Right.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: And so --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: They used to --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- is that just the statute
of the language -- I mean, the language of the statute? Is there a way that we can also say that we want to focus on, you know, a diverse business, which is either minority or women-owned?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Absolutely. And actually, every agency is not only supported but encouraged to have as part of its procurement and contracting plan an approach for encouraging and obtaining small business, minority businesses, women-owned businesses, disabled vet businesses. Absolutely.

CHAIR TURNER: So Raul and Counsel, to separate items 15 and 16, 15 was your training on how the State does its contracting and procurement so that we have that --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Right.

CHAIR TURNER: -- understanding and then make a decision on whether or not we want to allow a delegated authority there or if we want to follow the requirements. Was there an action item to 15 so we can go to public comment before we go into some of the broader discussion of --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: No.

CHAIR TURNER: -- a more detailed discussion on the report --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Right.
CHAIR TURNER: -- for the RFP, videographer, and all that conversation.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: If I might suggest, Chair --

CHAIR TURNER: Um-hum.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: -- I would table that until you have your Executive Director. And then that's a discussion with your Executive Director in terms of -- because that will affect, like I say, the organizational structure, the staffing, the hiring, so that they -- so that is -- if that is something the Commission wants to go after, then that becomes a primary goal and direction in working -- you know, and just starting operations with your Executive Director.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. And is that then the recommendation that you're making for item 16?

MS. JOHNSTON: No.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: No. For --

CHAIR TURNER: I don't understand.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Okay. So you asked, is there an action item, and my recommendation --

CHAIR TURNER: For --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: -- is no.

CHAIR TURNER: For 15, for 15.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: For 15, yes.
CHAIR TURNER: Um-hum.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: And my answer is, no, I would wait till you have an Executive Director.

MS. JOHNSTON: If you wanted to pursue the delegated authority.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Correct.

CHAIR TURNER: Got it. Okay. Commissioner Fernandez.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Thank you, Marian.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I don't necessarily think we need to table this action item. I think we can actually close it and then open up another action item in the future when we do have our Executive Director. That way, it's clean-cut, we're done with the action items on this agenda.

Because the whole issue about delegated authority or would be something that we would bring up later and I don't know how I feel about leaving agenda items open for that long. I think it's clearer -- cleaner to just close it out and then bring it up again when we have that position.

CHAIR TURNER: I like that. And because the agenda item is there as trained on it, I think we have the training on it, and then perhaps I would prefer closing
it out as 15 and reopening it as a decision --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Yes.

CHAIR TURNER: -- for Executive Director if that's the direction we go.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Just for our -- could we get a copy of your slides, please, (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: I sent them.

MS. JOHNSTON: We sent them.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: They should be in your mailbox.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh. Okay. Great. Thank you.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: You're welcome.

It'll be in a PDF.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Andersen --

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- you might --

CHAIR TURNER: Oh. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm sorry. I was going to say they may be in your personal email. Some of the emails have gone to my personal email rather than my Commission email.
INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Oh, have they?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So if you're missing -- yes.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: My apologies.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: That's okay. So if you're missing --

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- some stuff.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Some went to my spam.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: I can't control that one.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just wanted to just be -- I get what -- that there is no action right now. If we wait until we -- is there -- did we agree that paperwork would get started or we're not doing anything, and then once we hire someone, it'll still be a two-month -- two-month or however long it takes to get the different authorities?

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: My understanding from Raul was that we can't actually do anything or move forward until we actually have positions in place because we need to specify who's in those positions when we submit the request to have delegated authority, right? Is that correct, Raul?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: That is correct.
I can obtain the paperwork. I can reach out and start identifying how we can streamline the process. That I can do. But Commissioner Fernandez is right. That'll only go so far. But I can do those things if you would like me to.

CHAIR TURNER: That's helpful, Commissioner Sinay. Thank you for bringing that up, and thank you for the response.

So then, Commissioners, then we would need to, I would imagine, make a motion to have Raul move forward in that if that's our desire. Or do we want to wait?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I guess I can make a motion that he move forward as far as he can, because obviously he can't move forward all the way until the position is filled. But in terms of trying to figure out the -- making the -- reaching out, having the conversations, going as far as he can, I mean, I would prefer that once we have an Executive Director, we're ready to go in terms of we've already figured out the process and here it is.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I go back to part of what I was saying earlier. To me, the amount of time that we should invest in this needs to be considered in light of how much of this is for our benefit and how much of it are we going to be able to
leave as a legacy for the 2030 Commission. If it's only for us and if we are only going to have occasion to make limited use for us, we need to think carefully about how much time we want to invest in versus how much time it would take us to do things without delegated authority.

In other words, if we're only going to do it once or twice and we can't pass it on, what is the time factor on that side versus the time that would go in to getting delegated authority? If, on the other hand, we're either going to make frequent use of it and/or we're able to pass that on to the 2030 Commission, then it makes sense to devote more time to it. Thank you, Madam Chair.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Kennedy, could you help me and say a little bit more and then lead me into how we -- being informed by what you said, what would be the direction?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I guess a question to Raul at this point would be, you know, how much use of delegated authority do you think, based on your experience with the 2010 Commission, we might actually use it? And the second half of that would be, is there any way directly or through the proposal process that will start in 2022 where we begin to make recommendations for the future that we could pass the delegated authority on to the 2030 Commission.
Understanding the requirements and so forth, but there may be a way to meet the requirements, whether it's through, you know, putting the Commission's delegated authority into hibernation for eight years and then reviving it without having to start over. You know, some approach so that the 2030 Commission is able to benefit from our work rather than having to start from scratch.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Right.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: So delegated authority is provided to the entity, not to the people, the staff, while it's relegated to having staff that are able to support that authority. So I think you've stated it really well that what you would be doing is getting the delegated authority for the Commission, developing an agreement that it's going to be in abeyance for X amount of time and that it -- and that once it's back up and running -- you know, like right now, they have a routine reapproval process just to go check, check, check, check. Could it be as simple as that the next go-round and have that documented and in place?

I mean, I'll ask, but to me, that's -- that makes a lot of sense. As it is right now, you have an organization. Joe or Josephine leaves, that doesn't mean they lost their delegated authority.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right. And part of what the 2010 Commission told us is that, you know, they had all of this enormous administrative workload to deal with before they could get started, and it seems like in a lot --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- of ways, we're ending up with that same burden. And even if we have additional time that they did not have, whereas the desirable state is that we wouldn't have the same burden --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: I promise you --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- because it's been done and put in place.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: No. What we worked with -- what we worked with is way different and really was a burden. You don't have that. You have certain hurdles. And I'm not diminishing them, but it's -- my first two weeks, we were -- we were sharing in an office with Gov Ed and borrowed desks, et cetera, okay? So you can't see your operations here very well, but this is incredible to be starting with this and what you have to.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Maybe we can get a tour at some point.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: There's a rumor
that staff were borrowing trash cans because there weren't any.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Ahmad.

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you, Madam Chair. I appreciate the conversation around delegated authority and just looking forward, and I appreciate, Raul, your experience and insights into how 2010 started. But we're starting with a pandemic and wildfires, something that 2010 didn't anticipate.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Right.

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: So without getting too ahead of ourselves, 2030 might have something that we can't even conceive right now. So I appreciate that we're trying to check our boxes while trying to check as many boxes as we can for 2030, but I would hope that we don't lose sight of what our objective is right now --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Right.

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: -- is to get up and running to the best of our abilities. So just throwing that out there for consideration.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Commissioner Kennedy, the other part to his question was how much was it used. If you use last time as a guesstimate, we ran through over $4 million in contracts and procurements between January and August, and that's not counting an
additional four-point-whatever million in attorney's contracts that ran from, I think, April through December.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: So was that two procurement actions or was it 20? I don't care about the dollar amount so much as the number of times that we need to go through a process.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Well, that's very helpful.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Le Mons.
COMMISSIONER LE MONS: With that level of frequency, did you find that, the process that was used before, there were a lot of obstacles to getting these things done in a timely fashion which would make us going in this other direction make sense despite the fact that it may take us a little bit of time to make it happen? Or were there strategies for navigating the process outside of having authority to get those things done in a relatively -- I guess, what is the time differential from your estimation, if we have one path or the other?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: It'd be quicker if you had the delegated authority. That being said, either way, it's a must that you have folks in place who can work through the system and negotiate speed and process, negotiate the decision-making and approval process, especially. It took a while to get that, and once that was in place, we probably broke world's records for getting RFPs and things done.

Can that happen this time? That's what I've been working on is building those relationships for you, making those contacts. But it's work that is ongoing because you're right, it takes a while to establish that, and I've only put a certain number of contracts and things through just to test the process.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Would you say, Raul, that it
would significantly increase our ability to get things done quickly? I'm still not getting a real gauge on -- I understand, it'll be faster --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Right.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: -- but is that a week? Is that, you know, thirty days, ninety days? I mean, I think, to me, that makes a difference.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: It depends on the level of delegated authority. If it goes up from 50 to 100K on different things, it makes an incredible difference. If it stays at 50K for a lot of things, it will still save you time. That's a hard -- if I may, that's a really difficult off-the-cuff question -- well, thing you're asking me to provide to you. I mean, I could go back and look at some information and actually try to ferret that out. How fast is fast is what I'm hearing, and --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah. I appreciate your response. I think your response gets to my question sufficiently.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioners Fernandez and Sinay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I do appreciate the discussion. I guess what I was trying to get at was,
because I've been in this position before many times, and
it's almost like -- I'll try to put it in my terms -- is
I'm going to go out and buy, whatever, a car. I can go
and buy it today, that's great. But if I don't have
delegated authority, I have to go ask for someone if I
can buy that, and then they go out and do what they do.

They go out and solicit the information and check
with different vendors. So instead of me being able to
buy it directly and buy it quickly, like, today. Okay,
now I put in my request. So it's still pending and I
haven't been able to close it out, and now I'm waiting
for somebody else to come and tell me the process has
been closed.

And during that time when I find out -- at least
when I was in that area -- I would continually check back
with DGS, what's the status, what's the status? Instead
of my ability to just go and purchase it and then I can
concentrate on other things. Because I know that our
staff's going -- there's going to be other duties that
we're going to want them to, to perform. And if we can
somehow alleviate that piece of it, in my opinion, I
think it's worth it. And again, it's not -- we're not
the ones actually going through the process and doing the
paperwork. We're just trying to get to the point where
we can start the process for them, and then they're the
ones that are going to try to get that delegated authority.

So I'm just trying to look ahead in terms of it'll be more efficient for the staff that's hired to be able to have this authority. And I guess that I'm just trying to think back to nightmares when I was in procurement and having so many open items --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- plus new items, and it does, at some point, get to be a little overwhelming.

CHAIR TURNER: And so Commissioner Fernandez, you're saying that we should -- you're suggesting delegated authority? Okay.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Answered my question.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: This is sort of a question for Mr. Villanova. And similar to what Mr. Fernandez just said, basically the way you're going about things now is, you know, I don't have authority, can you go out and do this for me, gather this stuff together. Is that also limited on you have dollar amount limitations? So you can't actually look at can I get someone who's going to be doing, say, interpretation and do all our interpretation for every place we go. Are you having to
do individual little, small procurements because you're also limited by amounts, which if you have the delegated authority, that would be a much larger amount, then you could do one contract and take care of it? Is that also part of the difference between the way you're sort of inching along now and delegated authority?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Yes. And you know, with the interpreting, that's a good one to bring up because there's several approaches. You can do that small business. You can do that through master services agreement. You can do that through the California Master -- the CMAS, California Master Services Agreement.

Each one of those has its own benefit, and last time we ran a lot of small business because it was very quick and we could find reliable companies that could be on location and provide reliable services quickly, right? Quite often, the request was twenty-four hours in advance. Okay. Fine. What do we need? Can we get the people there? Once they're there, are people satisfied with the -- with the service they received?

So the small business was a really good way to do that. And it tops out at 250 -- 250,000, so sometimes we had we had to get auxiliary contractors in place. I don't know if that answers your question. Cost is part of it, but the service is, too.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So actually, it's more in terms of speed. If you have the delegated authority, does that give you a much greater, like, right -- the way it is right now, you can -- you know, it's a time factor, or I have this time factor so I can only -- I can only have these couple of vendors, where if you have delegated authority, does it give you, regardless of time factor, a lot larger range of options? That's, I guess, the bottom line of the question.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: It can, depending on the type of service you're pursuing.

MS. JOHNSTON: It does give you less work to do to set it up.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No matter what they are.

MS. JOHNSTON: Right.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: No matter what they are. That's true.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioners Sinay and Yee.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: This may or may not be the place for this, but I would hope, as a commission, that we would agree that we would pay anyone for their services, be it a nonprofit who is going to do translation or do outreach for us. I mean, that we, whenever -- you know, there will be some things we can't
quantify, but that the expectation isn't for the
community to step up and do any of the services that we
would need. So if this can help us with that, that's
great.

COMMISSIONER YEE: So the current services we have
through interpreters and reporters and captioners, so
forth, how long do the current contracts run? Are we
under any time pressure there?

MS. JOHNSTON: The end of the week.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Also, just wondering, have we
been -- the various presenters that we've had, have --
those have also been contracted with us as well?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: So there is a
desire to have us engage Commission services. That being
said, the State Auditor will not -- will not stop its
support of the Commission's ability to have -- to have
its meetings and do them in a proper manner. But there
is encouragement to go ahead and obtain the services for
the Commission, which, if I may, is also in your best
interest.

CHAIR TURNER: And well, there was the second part
to Commissioner Yee's question about the previous
speakers and if they were contracted because they were
paid.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: For which -- I'm
sorry. What, please?

MS. JOHNSTON: The --

COMMISSIONER YEE: The various presenters that we've had in the training.

MS. JOHNSTON: The speakers been paid.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Oh. No, the speakers provided their services pro bono.

MS. JOHNSTON: Oh really?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: They were -- yeah. They were --

COMMISSIONER YEE: Bless them.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: They were just so interested and with such passion to be able to give you that information and to spend time. There was a commitment by each and every one of them to ensure that they provided additional time so that you had that question and answer. So that was a strong commitment by each and every one of them on the front end.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Ahmad.

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: I just want to make sure I heard that correctly. Did you say that there's -- the State Auditor is providing these services currently to the Commission --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Yes.
VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: -- without it coming out of our budget?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: No, I didn't say that.

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Or who's paying for it --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Okay. So --

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: -- I guess?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Okay. So there's an appropriation -- part of the Citizens Redistricting appropriation is that $5.2 million.

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Right.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Okay? Once that gets expended, then what happened last time is they sent a bill, basically, and we paid it. The Secretary of State also sent a bill for services, and we paid it. Always pay your bills. You know --

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Or we can -- we should expect a bill from where?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Well, --

MS. JOHNSTON: We don't have an accounting --

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Nothing is free, right? So we should --

MS. JOHNSTON: We don't have an accounting --

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: -- expect --

MS. JOHNSTON: yet from the State Auditors. We
I don't know how much of their allotted money they've used up.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: And see, that's the way --

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Got it.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: -- to think about it.

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Okay.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: That was --

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Got it.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Those were funds allotted to the State Auditor --

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Right.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: -- not for redistricting, not --

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Right.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: -- to the Citizens Redistricting Commission that you gave to the State Auditor. It's a very important distinction to understand, so thank you, Marian.

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you. Thank you for that clarification.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think some additional clarification then on that last question. We had an
earlier conversation, I think it might have been last
week, about remaining funds with the State Auditors that
was not used specifically for the process of
redistricting but for the process of the selection and
everything like that.

If I'm hearing correctly, then, whatever services
we're receiving right now in terms of, you know, meeting
services, the American sign language and the translation
and the transcription services, I assume is coming out of
that pot of money, and that whatever then is remaining
whenever we're able to get our operations up and running,
that is then the question that was discussed, I think,
last week about will we get that money added back to our
budget?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: So you're
probably running about -- and I haven't done the math
completely yet, but I was thinking about it the other
day, and that is cost per meeting just because that's the
way my mind works. Your cost per meeting, I would
estimate right now, with per diem, is probably 18K per
day, okay? So when you take out the per diem, so that's
14 times -- let's say 400 just for ballpark figures, y
You're still looking at 13, $14,000 per day to run these
meetings, and that's all coming out of that 5.2 million.

That also includes the AT&T, which is really
expensive. Nothing against AT&T, I'm just talking, you know, in terms of costs for services. So you've had, what, three days? It'll be seven days of meetings, is what, ninety-some-odd thousand?

So the reason I mention that is it's probably best not to think about it in terms of what's going to be left of that 5.2 million that was really appropriated for the State Auditor but to be thinking about, in your operations, how are we providing services and what are the cost-effective means? Are we going to contract them? Which is basically what my side of the table does and then informs you.

But I do want to be able to provide you a report that says this is what it cost for this first -- these first meeting days. So I'm working on it for you.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Agenda item 15. Is there a motion --

MS. JOHNSTON: There's no action.

CHAIR TURNER: -- for -- no action? So we will go then, Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I thought Commissioner Fernandez did make a motion to basically prime the pump so that when the Executive Director is hired, they can start.

MS. JOHNSTON: I don't think that needs a motion.
You can just direct Raul to be working on that, and then when the Executive Director comes in, he can take it over.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Just tell me to do it.

CHAIR TURNER: Raul, please do it.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Madam Chair --

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: -- you've got it, and with pleasure.

CHAIR TURNER: Outstanding. Okay. Wonderful. We will still go to public comment, Ryan, because we are at the conclusion of Agenda 15.

AT&T OPERATOR: Thank you. If there is any public comment, you may press 1 then 0 on your telephone. Once again, if you wish to share a comment, you may press 1 and then 0. There are no comments in queue at this time.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. We will wait just a moment as instructed.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Which by the way, Madam Chair, we did do a test ourselves, the videographer staff, of the system before coming online.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes. And the test was great, everything worked out, you were able to get in?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Everything was
1 good.

2 CHAIR TURNER: Outstanding. Commissioner Le Mons.

3 COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah. I caught a little

4 piece of that test, so I want to thank everyone who was

5 involved in that process in making sure hearing us and

6 making sure and all of that. I didn't want to miss the

7 opportunity to thank you all or anything. Appreciate you

8 on that. Much appreciated.

9 INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Well, on behalf

10 of everyone here, you're welcome.

11 CHAIR TURNER: And the time does always seem really

12 long because I set my timer just for one minute and we

13 still have ten seconds left, so.

14 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We better not wait too long,

15 hearing about how much it costs for each one of these

16 days.

17 CHAIR TURNER: Come on. All right. Ryan, check for

18 us again, please.

19 AT&T OPERATOR: Certainly. If there are any public

20 comments, you may press 1 then 0. There are no comments

21 in queue.

22 CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Okay. We'll move to

23 agenda item 16.

24 INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Kristian?

25 CHAIR TURNER: It was closely tied into 15, but
there was -- go ahead, Raul.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: No, I was going to have Kristian put my screen back on. This presentation segues to the line drawer.

CHAIR TURNER: And I think it -- there was some recommendations from some of the subcommittees, the finance subcommittee in this part as well, right?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Right. I'm setting it up for them.

CHAIR TURNER: Outstanding.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Teamwork.

CHAIR TURNER: Makes the dream work.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Okay. The line drawer RFP issued by the State Auditor's Office, the date for closing the RFP occurred August 17. There were also no submissions for that line drawer RFP. So at this point in time, it's closed. There's no submission and it's done.

So the Commission, at this point, has three primary options. One, to, quote unquote, keep it as is and reissue or to start completely over or to use the current RFP as a base on which to build from. The rest of these slides kind of go into those considerations, number three, so that as you make your decision, you're fully informed.
So the line drawer RFP, there's certain requirements. It has to have a statement of work. The line drawer RFP asked for information about the technical skills. It talked about -- in other words, you've got to be able to do line-drawing. The database, you've got to be able to use the Statewide Database that's provided for redistricting. And you've got to be able to manage to do in-person and remote line drawing for the public hearings. So that was kind of what the statement of work talked about.

It also had contract requirements were in terms of the types of software being used, the IT security, these things called technical services for the Commissioners and Counsel, the types of reports when, when and how to provide invoices. And again, the requirement for doing -- for working in remote meetings. And again, those are required. So whether -- whatever RFP happens, these are the types of elements that have to be included.

Another part was qualifications. So with an RFP, you have to be able to create a -- to create a basis that, a, allows the contractor to describe the how and why that they're qualified, but also, two, that allows the Commission to be able to judge these statements equitably and on the same criteria across bidders.

So with the current one, it looked at project size,
scope and complexity, and racial and ethnic diversity in terms of what kinds of line drawing it had done. It looked at the experience based on relevant California factors. And again, it created a means of evaluating experience on a comparable basis. So these last two, having something that's based on relevant California factors and the comparability of the valuation is something that's a must with the RFP.

So when it asked about project size, scope and complexity, it basically said, have you ever done any redistricting in cities of the top ten in population size in California? When you do the plus or minus fifteen percent, it goes down to, I think it was the top thirteen cities in California in terms of population. And these are the ones that are listed. The numbers here is their rank order. This information comes from the work of the Department of Finance and its demographic workers.

In terms of project size, scope and complexity. It said, okay, fine, if you've done redistricting in a relevant California size of city, have you done it with a city or a body that has the type of complexity in terms of groups? And one of the easier groups to look at is one based on race and ethnicity. And so that's why these cities are there.

And so all of these figures come from the 2010 to
2019 -- what is it, ALS? ACS, American Community Survey. The ACS survey from the census. But that's the reason this was here, was so that when the bidders are saying we have relevant experience, that we're looking at projects of the type of complexity and size that they would encounter in redistricting the state. Could you use other cities? Absolutely. But that's why that -- but anyway, that's why.

With the Line Drawer RFP, we also need to have, and you must have, a means of evaluating costs on a comparable basis. And then this other part, there's some budgetary implications and why you do things the way you do. They require you to look at fixed costs and optional costs. For this RFP, the fixed cost was thirty public input meetings, forty Commission meetings, designated cities, and forty hours of technical services.

If I may, one of the Lessons Learned last time because it didn't have the technical services is that became an add-on that created a little bit of discussion between the attorneys and the line drawer and the Commission. And so it was kind of like, well, let's go ahead and put that in and cost it upfront. So this doesn't mean you can only do seventy meetings. This was just to create fixed costs so that you can look at those costs across bidders in a
comparable way. The optional cost, ten public input
meetings, ten Commission meetings, plus travel and
another forty hours of technical service.

So again, part of it's for comparability. The other
reason, though, is in terms of budget. When you start
going, okay, we've done thirty public input meetings,
we're starting to project now, and we're going to do
probably another thirty public input meetings. What is
it going to cost us? Do we have enough in the contract,
or do we have to allocate more money into that contract?
Well -- oops. See, this isn't good planning. Here we
go. My mouse did that.

So that ten gives you a basis, then, for cost
estimation in a fairly reliable way, in terms of the
contract, and also in terms of looking at your
expenditures in the future. But again, it doesn't mean
that you can only have forty public input meetings. It
allows you to do that budgeting and that cost comparison.

They were also asked to provide travel costs. Okay.
Should it ever occur that you can do a roadshow like they
did the last go-round, it's important to have a strong
basis of understanding, what is that going to cost you?
And also to be able to look at that in relation to how
does that compare across borders.

So that's why this scheme was developed. Seven
different regions. The reference city is just to give a target point. The number of meetings. Okay. How could you take these, allocate them across thirty? And so they had to estimate thirty public input meetings based on their home, their primary workplace in California, to each of these places. Again, that provides them with two things, a basis of comparable means of evaluating costs per bidder. And the other thing it does is it provides a basis, again, for projecting costs across different meetings for different regions.

So if you say I've got to go to LA County at least four more times, because now we've done some of the VRA stuff, we want to provide more time for public input. How much is that going to cost us? Well, here's a nice place to do your cost estimation. We indicated that out-of-state travel was not reimbursable. That's fairly typical. That's up to you, if you want to pay somebody to come from Pennsylvania out to California each time, but it's not typical.

And so hopefully that provides a basis then in making a decision on where you would like to go in terms of that Line Drawer RFP, but also to help you understand what was the basis in it, because I don't think, based on the comments, that there was really an understanding of the different pieces and how they function and what their
true meaning is in terms of an RFP. And so I pass it on to your subcommittee.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Raul. Commissioners Kennedy, Fernandez, Andersen, Sadhwani subcommittee. Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I feel very strongly that we need to separate out the public meetings component. We don't know how we're going to have to move forward with public meetings, whether we're going to be able to have in-person public meetings, or they're all going to be virtual, or we're going to have some mix. I also see the public meetings element as a very distinct skill set from the technical line drawing skills. And I don't exclude the possibility that someone could bid on both. But I feel very strongly that we need to split that out. And that would also include splitting out -- I believe it would include splitting out the remote participation item C10.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Kennedy, you said, split out public meetings and split out remote --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Madam Chair?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Remote meetings participation.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Madam, if I can --

CHAIR TURNER: Participation.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- if I can clarify, please?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So the RFP is for the line drawers to attend all the public meetings and to attend the meetings of the Commission. So those meetings are in there because the line drawers are going to be there helping us gather public input. Part of the -- part of the RFP says that it's the role of the line drawers to capture and digitize, you know, in a way they can use it, the communities of interest, you know, on a map. But also capture the text of, you know, what makes this community of interest, what the what the input was, and then geotag it so we can go back and find it later.

So --

MS. JOHNSTON: But it wouldn't be all meetings because you could have business meetings that didn't include public input on online drawing.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Right, but --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: He's just talking about the RFP.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Right. And so -- it's just -- this RFP says the line drawers are, you know, nominally -- we'll decide ultimately -- but the line drawers are going to attend thirty road trip meetings,
with an optional ten more road trip meetings, and forty
meetings in Sacramento, with an optional ten more.

And also in here, it says -- there's a caveat
specifically about the meetings, you know, may instead be
held remotely, and the line drawers have to have the
capability to do what they would do in an in-person
meeting remotely. And specifically, be able to, you
know, broadcast the map information in a way that folks
can see it on their computer, right, you know, and
understand what's going on and provide input. So I hope
that provides some clarity.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you for the clarity. I want to
understand, though, in the RFP, is this specific numbers
that, then, we're locked into, or as Raul explained, was
this just for a matter of cost estimates.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: It's for -- okay. So it's
a little of both. So the original cost estimate is for,
like I said, forty Sacramento meetings and thirty road
trip meetings, with ten optional in each of those
categories. But if we get to a point where we decide we
need to, we can always do an addendum and add more
meetings.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And if I say anything
that's incorrect, Raul, chime right in.
INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: No, no.

Commissioner Fornaciari is being very accurate.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: The short answer is, no, you're not locked into anything. There's a caveat that there's no minimum or maximum amount of work implied or promised. That's pretty standard across state contracts.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: And if you look at the table that Raul showed for evaluating travel costs, it's kind of a notional idea. We're going to go to San Diego four times; San Bernardino four times; LA six times. You know, it's just kind of a notional idea so that when the respondents bid on their travel costs, that both of -- or however, many -- all of the respondents are bidding the same, so we can compare apples to apples on travel costs. It doesn't mean that we only go to those, you know, cities. It just gives us a way to compare when we're looking at the RFP.

But ultimately, it's up to us to decide, you know, what our road show looks like. And you know, I went back and looked at last Commission's roadshow. You know, they were on the road -- what was it, April, May and June? Where's my note. I lost my note. Something like that. April, May and June, ten and eleven meetings. And they
bounced all over the state. And so it's really up to us
to kind of define -- you know, finalize what our road
trip looks like. This is just kind of a notional table
so that the respondents can have a basis.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Fernandez,
and then Sinay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, thank you. So the
subcommittee also as well -- and I forgot to ask Raul
this part of it, in terms of there were no bids
submitted, and on page 11 of the RFP, it talks about if
any of the prospective bidders have any questions to
contact the state auditors. I guess my question to you
is, I mean, one, I'm disappointed there weren't any
bidders, but two, did we receive any questions to the
RFP? And then also, did we receive any feedback as to
why prospective bidders decided not to bid? Because my
concern is, if we go forward again, I mean, there's no
guarantee there's going to be a bidder the second time
around. So I'm just trying to see -- you know, I'm
trying to understand why that nothing was submitted.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: No questions were
received. And I think that -- no, I'll just say this. I
don't think anyone really knows why nobody bid. I think
that there's a lot of different guesses that may or may
not have different levels of prospective validity. But I
personally haven't heard anything that would lead me to
say that this is why folks didn't.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And so maybe a little bit
of information as to how widespread this RFP -- I mean,
who was it sent to? I mean, I'm assuming that hopefully
it got to the right people, but maybe just a little bit
of education on my part, if you could give us that
information?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: So it was posted
and released in the same way as your recruitments.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: So to the --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I want --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: --800 plus on the
mailing list and --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- I want to say, like

RFP --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Oh, no. It was
on the contract --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- I don't remember --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: -- it was on the
California State Contracts register, in addition. You're
absolutely right.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. That's what I was
trying -- I thought there was some sort of other
mechanisms that if I'm in this type of business, I can go
to that specific website --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Right. Yes.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- and that's the
recruitment or the RFP information.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Yeah. I think it
went out sometime in June. Stayed out there until
August.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioners Sadhwani and Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you. You know, at
this point in time, I don't have any particular issues
with the RFP or more specific changes that I would want
to see made. And that's in large part because --
especially because we can't consider applicants at this
point in time. I actually, quite passionately feel like
we should have a conversation first about what our
process will be and what we would want or need from a
line drawer and the kind of skill sets that we think that
they would actually need.

And to that extent -- I also to some extent, think
we could probably use a little bit more training in terms
of the kinds of line drawers who are out there. I mean,
there has to be a reason why we received 0 applicants.
We're California, right? I mean, we have more
Congressional districts than any other state. So if I
were a line drawer, I would be all over that RFP, right? So why is that?

And perhaps that something -- and you know, I think we can brainstorm what that might look like. But perhaps having a couple different line drawers actually come in and provide, you know, some sampling of their work or some kind of training so that we can better see what various line drawers might look like, so that we better know what to put in this RFP process, right? There are different softwares that are out there. Which ones are they using? Do we have a preference in that? Right.

So I just feel like we need to have a greater conversation about our full process and what that's going to look like. We've talked about the potential, and we have been advised by many of the speakers who came in the last several days to be putting out maps. Whether those -- you know, and I kept bringing up whether they should be computer generated or not. It doesn't matter, really, but like, if we're going to be putting out various discussion maps before an actual drafted map or even be thinking about these kinds of things in order to solicit additional public comment, then I think that we just need to have that conversation before we can kind of finalize and move forward on an RFP or this agenda item.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Ahmad.
VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you, Madam Chair. I just have a few questions. So some background, I dealt with a very similar situation at work where we put out an RFP and got their proposals back. And to Commissioner Fernandez's question, we actually went out and contacted everyone who had opened the RFP but did not submit, to ask why they didn't continue on with the application process. I don't know if we can do that here or if we even have access to that information. But to that, I would ask if it is permitted to do some targeted advertising and promotion of the RFP itself. So you would set out, Raul, on your slides, some cities that have done redistricting and line drawing. Can we go and look at who those line drawers were and say, hey, there's an RFP open for California Citizens Redistricting Commission, apply if you are interested? That's one question.

And then the other question I have is related to the timeline of the line drawer. If you can, advise us on when would be the most urgent time to actually have a line drawer in place, and if that timeline differs from our executive team and how much we can involve our executive team in the RFP process as well for the line drawers.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Right. I would
like to say that two of the individuals who presented to you are line drawers, right? So Doug Johnson and Karin, and you got to see their line drawing and I think they brought it up in their presentations. To me, there's two kinds of line drawers. Those who have enough experience to do the work for you and those who don't. And that's why setting a criterion that they've done the type of line drawing that they're going to encounter in this state is important.

Commissioner Ahmad, you can do targeted in addition to the required. And I'm sorry the state auditor did that. They had a spreadsheet of about ten different groups that were line drawers that they made sure to contact and said, hey, here's the RFP. And I think you could -- I mean, that's -- Marion, I would defer to you -- but couldn't they take that list of folks that the state auditor had contacted and send some kind of a survey that they could respond to confidentially --

MS. JOHNSTON: Yeah.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: -- as to why they didn't.

MS. JOHNSTON: I don't know if they would answer it, but you could certainly send it.

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Just to jump in real quick. I'm not suggesting that we do that, but that is an avenue of
exploring if we were interested in finding out more information, but it was more related to targeted advertising. And then the other question about the timeline of when is the absolute last date that we absolutely should have a line drawer in place?

MS. JOHNSTON: Well, we'll know more about that when we know about the census timing.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: You did have various presenters, though, who really across each other, reinforced that being able to start sooner and looking at the public input --

MS. JOHNSTON: The quoting information --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: -- and doing that work now would be of benefit to you.

VICE-CHAIR AHMAD: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Fernandez. Le Mons -- I'm sorry, Commissioner Le Mons. Commissioner Fernandez, Le Mons, Sadhwani, and Andersen.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Do we need to time check for the Commissioner.

CHAIR TURNER: Yeah. Thank you so much. We're over. So what we'll do is come back at 3:33. We do need to take our break because it should have been at 3:15. We'll come back and start with you, Commissioner Fernandez.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner (sic) Turner, I keep getting skipped over.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh, thank you, Commissioner Sinay.

Got you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: What time are we coming --

CHAIR TURNER: 3:33.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you so much and welcome back.

We are continuing on in comment on our item number 16 and right as we were going to break, Commissioner Sinay let me know that I have been intentionally overlooking her -- no, I'm -- Commissioner Sinay, if you would start us out for Commissioners Fernandez, Le Mons, and then Sadhwani, and Andersen, please.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. And I didn't think you were doing it on purpose. That's a tough job.

CHAIR TURNER: I know.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: A couple of things. First, I think if we open up the public comments, we may hear from the public why people didn't submit, and the public comments can be -- so I don't think we should make any assumptions and stuff, but maybe we just need to open it up because there was a public comment that said they had something to say on that when we got to this agenda item.

The second, I do agree with Commissioner Sadhwani,
that we -- I know there's different ways to hold meetings. There's public meetings, there's these business meetings, and there's also, at least in my school board experience, we did workshops. And I really feel that we need to do a workshop of what this might look like. I know that the line drawers have told us to draw maps and stuff, but as someone who's worked in the community and with COVID out there right now, I think there's better ways that we can use this time to learn about the communities without putting a map out there and scaring folks. We need to listen before we put any maps out, is kind of my personal feelings, but based on the communities that I would like to hear from.

And we also need to remember that last time there weren't a lot of people who submitted applications for the line drawer, and it became very political. That there was this -- there was an issue of you couldn't -- you know, and it says it in there, you know, ten years. Ten years is a long time. And you might have started on a political campaign, and that's how you learned, and now you've moved on. I mean, you know, ten years, you could be eight and twenty-eight. There's a lot going on, you know, twenty-eight to thirty-eight.

So I think that that political dynamic is one that we need to discuss before we put the RFP out there again.
What this might want -- what does this look like? If we can all be objective and we have high integrity, even though everybody knows that's political affiliation, then, can we expect the same from some line drawers? I mean, in this day and age almost everybody has a political affiliation. I know, some of you on here don't have a political affiliation.

And finally, I do feel that there was one piece that was really missing on the RFP, and that was this whole idea of wisdom of crowds. And this is something that we can actually do during COVID, and people are home, wanting to do something. And the wisdom of crowds' idea is that the more people give you their input -- and they may not be experts. Sometimes the nonexperts are the ones who actually bring you the most creative, innovative ways of looking at things.

So if we could put mapping software on our website and people play with it and they learn our criteria and it becomes something fun for people to do, that becomes a public education component, and eventually we think that -- you know, we can have -- appoint a certain amount of time where people learn how to play with it and stuff, and then, later we say, okay, now you can submit maps this way. But I think we need to just take a step back and really think through all the innovative, creative
ways that we can be using this COVID time, and when do we actually need the line drawers?

Again, I would encourage us to listen to public comments sooner rather than later, because I think some of our answers would be there and we would have to go in circles wondering why people didn't speak or apply.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner. I have Commissioners Fernandez, Le Mons, Sadhwani, Andersen, and Kennedy, then Fornaciari. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you, Chair. I do agree we probably need to look at this RFP because there were some comments that I made throughout the language, and I'm sure everyone else has comments and changes they might want to make.

I don't know if this is appropriate or not, but is it possible for us to have one of the line drawer experts that won't be bidding, have them look at our RFP and provide feedback in terms of, you know, the language and what should be in there -- or what language should be in there because I don't know how the language was developed this time, but I'm just thinking maybe that's something that would be useful. And then also, as Commissioner Sinay said, I think public comment would be good to hear as well. So thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Okay. Commissioner Le
Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I have a question about, I guess, more of a conflict-of-interest question. I'm hoping that the presenters that we had who were line drawers by virtue of having presented to us, did they somehow, A, disqualify themselves or B, did they infer that they weren't interested in pursuing it by coming to us as an expert? So whoever could answer that, it would be great as to whether or not they are eligible.

MS. JOHNSTON: The only one I know that's disqualified herself is Ms. MacDonald. She didn't do it as a state database director; she did it as a separate company she had last time, and she has told us she's not interested this time. I don't know about anybody else.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: But there's nothing inherent in any of the statutes or anything that says that if an organization or group presents to us, that that somehow disqualifies them for pursuing an RFP or a contract or some kind of paid relationship with us?

MS. JOHNSTON: No.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sadhwani, Andersen, Kennedy, and Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I had the same concern as Commissioner Le Mons. And I think that there's a list that was developed by --
MS. JOHNSTON: Could you get closer to your mic, please?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. I thought I was -- can you hear me better?

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. Great. If there was a list of ten, then I think it would behoove the members of the Commission to at least be able to see that list and to know more about who are some of these other line drawers in California and how we can (audio interference) we don't know if they are interested or not, but I (audio interference).

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, Madam Chair. One thing about the RFP, and this is -- no one sort of said maybe why -- it could be a -- what reason why people did not apply is shortly after the RFP went out, we were -- the state auditor's office and the group of eight were inundated by negative comments. The public comments were, the state auditor overstepped its bounds. The scope should not be -- you know, this -- you never should have done it. We should throw all of those out. Don't look at it. And only when the full Commission is together, then write your own RFP. And the state auditor was very, very clear. They were doing that only for the
idea to move the Commission along. But there was a huge push back, and I would think that that would be a reason why people sort of said, I'm going to wait on this.

So whether, you know, for a valid reason or not valid reason, don't know, but the state auditor, again, they kept on saying, look, either hand it to the Commission and what they want to do with it, throw it all out, rewrite it, whatever, we were only doing this to move them along. And it appears that that's exactly where we are.

So what I was actually going to -- oh, and second item is; I totally agree that we could go out with mapped drawing early and jump in because there's nothing that engages the public more, you know, instantly than something they can identify with. Rather than, we're just coming out to talk to you, you know, who are you guys? Which is wonderful, but they can -- the line might be here. Then all of a sudden -- and people actually see that, it's just like road construction. No one pays any attention to the documents or anything until you start seeing someone in your neighborhood. And it's the same idea. If we send maps out that are draft, draft, draft, then you're going to get people coming in being very interested.

Also, it would -- two reasons why jumping into maps
is it will give us the ability to practice how to do it all before we're actually really doing it. Because we're engaging the public, we're getting the public's comments where we can get an idea of where they really are and then we actually get the numbers. We'll do it all again.

So I would -- what I was going to propose is that we basically get are options. We go with -- use the current RFP as a base to build from, modify the RFP, and then go from there. So I was actually going to propose that, but then, I believe, we need a full discussion about our scope, and you know, write up -- modify the RFP because it does need a few things added to it. I think we're all in agreement, but I would not say completely start over.

Look at the group of ten. If we decide that we would like to bring someone in, I'm not sure how that fits with what we can and cannot do. I don't want to conflict anybody out, but that's what I would propose.


COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I think I'm along the lines with Commissioner Sinay. I would very much like to be going out and collecting information on -- or input on communities of interest before we get into mapping, because I feel like we're
going to get more genuine input on where communities of interest are if we're not talking about lines at that point.

I mean, there is one political science principle related to elections. You know, you kind of make changes when the level of uncertainty is greatest in order to minimize the opposition to those changes. And I just see that, you know, if we're not talking specific lines, we're more likely to get a more genuine and accurate description of where communities feel that their communities are.

Second of all, if and when we do want to solicit input early, before we get the data that we need to be drawing maps, I'm wondering if it's getting input somehow about the current maps could serve as a conversation starter. That way we're not -- you know, we're not putting our work on the line. I don't want -- I don't want to throw the 2010 Commissioner under the bus, but I think that it would be interesting to get the public's reaction to the lines drawn by the 2010 Commission.

And finally -- and this, I think, is at least tangentially related to this RFP, you know, and our discussion of are we going to be able to have a road show? What's it going to look like? Are we going to be limited to Zoom meetings? How do we -- how can we
structure all of this? I know that last time a Statewide
Database worked on setting up redistricting resource
centers, but there were only four or five or six around
the whole state. And I mean, I've run resource centers,
so I'm very keen on the idea of having resource centers.
I'm wondering if there is a way that we can enlist
the California Library Association and/or the California
Community College Network so that our reach on the ground
is that much greater. And it might involve bringing in
librarians from the public libraries or community college
libraries or community college political science faculty
for some sort of training, even if it's online training.
But I think there are interesting and creative ways that
we really can expand our footprint without necessarily
having to be logging thousands of miles in these
difficult times. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Fornaciari
and Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Thanks. Yeah. So listen.
So you know, I've looked through this RFP a few times,
and my initial reaction was, look, I don't know what I
don't know at this point. I mean, we've got a little bit
of training, but I certainly don't feel like I have
enough training at this point to make a decision on
whether an RFP for a line drawer should look like. I
agree with Commissioner Sadhwani. We need to figure out, you know, what our strategy is and what, you know, how are we going to do this.

I appreciate Commissioner Kennedy's thoughts and ideas. I mean, I think we need to come up with some really clever and different approaches this time, as opposed to last time. I mean, I don't know, but I can imagine if I was a line drawer and I looked at this RFP, I'd think, hey, I have a family. I want to spend time with my family. I don't want to spend, you know, two plus months on the road. And that may have been one of the reasons.

So you know, again, I think we just need to come up with some clever ideas. So I do like this idea of a workshop. If we spend a day or two, we come up to speed a little more on line drawing and what's required. I'd like to see if we could get some feedback from previous commissioners. Lessons learned, their thoughts, their ideas for the future, not just looking backwards, but for them, you know, having gone through it and looking forward and some ideas from them. You know, I don't know if it would be appropriate, but if Karin has already opted out and is committed to being opted out of the program, I mean, maybe there's some Lessons Learned from her and some ideas from her.
So I think that -- you know, I think that we really need to spend a little more time on this upfront, figure out what we're going to do before we go out with this. And I'll just stop there. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. We will go next to Commissioner Vazquez, but right before we do, I just want to announce that when she finishes, I want to go, in honor of what I believe Commissioner Sinay said, open for public comment on this agenda item only, as it relates to the RFP for line drawer, and then we'll go back again.

Commissioner -- yes, Commissioner Andersen. We're going to Commissioner Vazquez next. Commissioner Vazquez, no?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sorry. I thought you were going to Commissioner Andersen first. So I would like to hear from public comment as well about, you know, the reasoning, if any, the public has for, you know, possibly not applying. I think I agree with folks who have said that they -- I think we should go out early. I think Commissioner Sinay brought this up. I think we should go out early. There are community groups. I remember when I was a young baby analyst, ten years ago, working at Advancement Project, that Advancement Project and their healthycity.org folks had created several community-based mappings.
So you know, they weren't official line drawers, but that they -- if I'm remembering correctly -- had facilitated processes where communities could gather and say, this is my community, right. It's a very informal process, and they were literally drawing their own lines around -- this is what my neighborhood is. These are where my friends' neighbors live.

And so again, even if they're not going to map specifically on to, you know, census blocks, it starts to give us an idea of where communities of interest are, so that we can have things to anchor, even draft maps for folks to then react to. I do think in some ways people either need something to react to. It's sort of hard to just go and give a blanket, say, hey, who is your community? Where is that?

So there either needs to be a process to draw that out for people or they need something to react to. To respond to, to either tear apart and say, no, that's not it. Let me show you how it is. Or yes, that's sort of right, but here's some tweaks. So those are those are my thoughts.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Andersen, and then Fornaciari, please, before the public comments.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, thank you, Madam Chair. I totally agree with what Commissioner Vazquez just said.
And I want to make sure that -- what I'm really talking about is, we definitely need -- in the map drawing process -- in the RFP, we need to have that we're drawing several sets of maps. I don't mean that we should, oh, no, we can all only go to the communities of interest right now with maps. I think we should engage, but shortly thereafter, with a map. Which is kind of almost exactly what Commissioner Vazquez said.

It's just that I want -- in the RFP right now, and the way we've kind of been thinking a lot, it's like, okay, well, we do all that, and then we start drawing maps and I don't want to divorce the two. I mean, we need to be connecting maps to our communities of interest so we can really get their valued information and input. Where I think if we just separate it completely, it won't translate. And that's where I believe in the RFP when they added that the line drawers, essentially, have to come with us so they can digitize the information that we're going to be hearing. I think it's totally, totally crucial.

And I just want to make sure that in the RFP, we are upfront with the line -- with the draft drawer or line drawers, that they're responsible for helping us get all this community information out there. It's not just, okay, and now we line draw separately, abstractly. And
that's where it appears to be, and that's where I just want to make sure that we don't have to divorce one from the other. I don't think we should.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Fornaciari, and then Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. And so I missed one of my bullet points, and that's public feedback. I went back and reviewed the letters to the state auditor and the feedback that we got initially on this topic. Just the two -- the one letter from Angelo Ancheta and Lilbert Ontai, former commissioners made two bullet points, right. One was, you know, eliminate it because the commissioners are not prepared to make that decision. And number two, is the public not ready to engage and weren't allowed to comment.

And then the multi feedback letter written by Common Cause, "It infringed upon our responsibility to determine the redistricting process." Which, I think we've come to a point where we have to figure out what the process is first before we can get a line drawer. And two, it deprived the public of the ability to engage. And I think stopping for public comment now is good, and we need to. But I think on this topic in particular, based on the amount of feedback we've gotten, I think we need to be really deliberate about allowing -- is hearing from
the -- giving the public the opportunity to know when
we're going to talk about this and give us feedback. I
think it's really important, and I think because now, you
know, whoever's listening and is ready to pick up the
phone is going to be able to give feedback. But on this
particular topic, I think we need to be a little more
deliberate.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. I hear that. And thank you.
I do want to also say that it's also been on our agenda
for a while for written comments as people have engaged
also, and I think we've announced it for today. So it's
much later in the day than what I think we anticipated.
So I hear you. Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madam Chair. For
over a decade, I've been receiving a regular newsletter
from the Election's Community, and there was a piece in
last week's newsletter -- it comes out on Thursday --
about a new group called U.S. Digital Response. U.S.
Digital Response, according to their website, connects
Government with volunteers skilled in technology, beta,
design, communications, and operations for COVID 19 Rapid
Response.

That got me thinking that, you know -- and I
remember from the 2010 Commission's write-up, that
capturing and organizing all of the public input was one
of the most difficult aspects of their work. And I'm wondering whether an entity like this might be able to come up with a way that would really help us and help the line drawers capture and organize all of the public input.

So I just wanted to bring that to the attention of the group. It's something that I came across in the course of my normal weekly reading, but I wanted to share it with you all.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. You know, we need to go to public comment just for a minute, but Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just quickly. Building on what you said, Commissioner Kennedy, creating conferences for hackers to do social good is the in-thing right now. So there is that opportunity to create something like that where individuals could think through a lot of ways to use technology to help us. So there is that. So I don't want us to brainstorm. Going to strategy is very easy to do that. That's the fun part that we're not allowed to do yet.

But I do want to go back to the comment that Commissioner Andersen said and Commissioner Vazquez, and what we are talking about is power. I'm going to put it point blank. The line drawing is all about power. And a
lot of communities don't even know that they have power.
They don't feel that they have power.
So drawing a line and asking where they are, they're not going to know. And so there are other ways to facilitate these conversations in the community, especially the groups that are totally disenfranchised.
And it's not that we can't find them. We will be able to find them. But we need to be able to have these conversations about power and not about lines.
We first need to let them understand what the power is, how the power is worked. And I'm not saying social justice, and I know it's sounding very social justice, but we have a fear of talking about power in our society, and so I'm just putting it out there that what we're trying to do is let people say, I do have the power to give you input to help you draw these lines.
So we do need to take that step back and have those conversations, especially in specific areas, in rural areas, diverse areas, and areas where there is the Voting Rights Act. So I just don't want to just leave it there. This is a much larger conversation we all need to have, and I apologize that I jumped in one more time, but I couldn't leave it the way it was.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Ryan, we're hoping that there is some community waiting online to give public
comment. Please check.

AT&T OPERATOR: Okay. Once again, if you would like to make a comment, please press 1, then 0 at this time. 1-0. We do have one in queue. It's the line of Douglas Johnson. Please spell your first and last name.

MR. JOHNSON: Oh, hello. This is Douglas Johnson from the Rhodes Institute, again. I've just caught the last half hour of your conversation. Oh, and sorry. It's D-O-U-G-L-A-S. Johnson, is J-O-H-N-S-O-N. And so one thought I had is, as you guys are very aptly describing, you know, you're new to this. You're getting ideas. You're looking for ideas. So don't try to lock in an RFP. You know that sixty-two-page behemoth of a nightmare, it was going to take me, I don't know, eighty plus hours to respond to that, and it wasn't worth it.

You know, really, all I would suggest you do is do an RFQ. A request for qualifications, and then get people in and you know, put together the team you want, or do a basic -- you know, a two-page RFP that lists, here's what the commission has to do. If you have experience with this and you would like to help us, tell us how you would help us. You could even put legal services and outreach all together into one document.

So something to ponder. I would strongly urge you not to try to put your whole plan in the RFP because it's
too early; you don't know. And as you may have heard ten
years ago, they put out an RFP with, I think, calling for
twenty public meetings. They got proposals in, and then
in the middle of the process, they doubled that number to
forty meetings. And so the firm they hired then had to
handle twice what it had expected to handle.

So something to consider; you could just put a very
basic RFP out there and let people respond to parts of
it, you know, or all of it. You know, give people the
option to only respond to parts of it and see what ideas
you get and work from there. Because I think ideally,
you're going to end up putting together a team. You're
not just going to pick one provider to do everything. So
just a thought; put out something, either an RFQ or a
very simple short RFP see what you get. I hope that
helps. Thanks.

CHAIR TURNER: That is helpful. Thank you, caller,
Douglas Johnson. Thank you. I'm trying to be very
careful with my pronouns, Commissioner Vazquez. Let's
see. Do we have another caller in queue?

AT&T OPERATOR: We do. It comes from the line of
Renee Reed. Please spell your first and last name.

MS. REED: Yeah. First name, R-E-N-E-E. Last name
R-E-E-D.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Please go ahead.
MS. REED: So I just wanted to go ahead and speak to Commissioner Sadhwani's earlier point about embracing flexibility before locking yourself into an RFP process.

I would recommend the Commission consider a secondary versus primary RFP. And as a quick briefer to turn bureaucrat lingo into English, under a primary RFP, like the one issued by the CSA, proposals are evaluated basically as a pass fail. If multiple proposals meet the minimum standards, the contract goes to the lowest cost bidder no matter what. Under a secondary RFP, proposals are scored on multiple criteria, with price being only one of the factors considered.

In other words, if you have multiple applications that meet those minimum standards, you are able to pick the marginally more expensive one if it delivers significantly greater quality. The services you're looking for are very complex and unique. Professional methods can vary greatly. Creative and innovative approaches are not only needed, but they're required. They meet the minimum standards for a secondary RFP under chapter five of the state contracting manual, and I encourage you to strongly explore that option.

Also, to the question of whether you have time to make this and other changes, I just checked -- I checked your website, and the last Commission didn't select their
line drawer until March 19th of 2011. And if you
followed that same timeline as at base minimum, that's
six months from now. So you have more time than you're
allowing yourselves. You can afford to be deliberate and
rewrite the RFP to suit your needs and allow for
meaningful public input as well, and we'll still be way
ahead of the last commission.

So those are just some things to think over when
you're considering secondary versus primary RFP. Thank
you very much.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you so much, community member,
Renee Reed. That was extremely helpful. I don't know
about a secondary RFP and primary, so that was very
helpful.

Do we have another caller?

AT&T OPERATOR: And once again, it is 1-0, if you
wish to make a comment, 1-0.

AT&T OPERATOR: We'll just move on in a few moments
here. We have no one in queue right now.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. While we're waiting,

Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. Again, while
we're waiting, this is just going back to public comment.
You know, I have to confess, the time of day, I always
get tired between 3:30 and 4:30 so I'm a little out of
it. And I'm also not familiar with state contracts like I should be. But this is exactly what we were doing RFQ for.

You know, in my profession as structural engineering, basically the large engineering firms don't necessarily do RFPs unless we're forced to do that. You always go for RFQs because that way you get your qualifications out there what you can or can't do. You put a certain, a certain minimums in there, we need this and this and then you can actually compare and get the qualities. I didn't realize that the document was indeed behemoth. He's absolutely right, Mr. Johnson. The way his approach is, I believe, exactly what I believe we should do. I totally agree with him.

And then the second person calling in, again, I also did not realize that you can do a secondary. So again, I think, still going back to do we do a workshop do we learn more and then we decide how to come out. I think it's great advice.

CHAIR TURNER: I agree. I think both of those callers were very beneficial and very helpful for me. I also enjoyed and am excited about an RFQ as an option and that will be able to draw in more interest in the -- and be able to actually kind of curtail what they're able to do and what their skills are for, what they're offering
to this Commission.

Any other comments, questions? I'm sorry.

AT&T OPERATOR: We have none in the queue on the phone.

CHAIR TURNER: Right. Thank you. Thank you.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. I definitely support, again, taking time to get more education and training about this. I mean this is the very, very heart of our job and so it behooves us to really prepare thoughtfully and at length to get the help we need and to do it well.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes. Marian.

MS. JOHNSTON: I just wanted to call to the Commission one procedural rule that stood out in statute. And that is that you are to solicit broad public participation before you draw any maps. So it's not a matter of being able to start with maps and get people's reaction to it. You've got to start with input, public input.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. I thank you very much for that comment. I'm just jumping in. But I don't think that prescribes exactly how, not that, again, not that I'm advocating that we have to go out with a map but if we put out a way that someone could draw something, I don't think that precludes us from talking about it with
a map. That's (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

MS. JOHNSTON: The problem, I think, the Commission last time was putting out draft maps is the people grabbed onto them and they didn't think them as drafts and that created a lot of unnecessary tension. I don't know if that was behind the way the statutes written but it's pretty clear that public input has to come first.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. And I think we were told about that. We cannot call them draft maps because -- and I misspoke when I said that. You're absolutely right. In the statute it says, draft maps shall be such and such. These would be just a straight preliminary thing. This is for a work --

MS. JOHNSTON: No. It said you can't put out any commission maps.

There is a requirement that you put out draft map by a certain time but before that it says you may not put out any maps before public input.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It doesn't mean you cannot ever, well -- that doesn't mean you have to do all input and then take -- pull a map out. I think there's a time when you can kind of use it as a tool as well, right? Is that -- is it a hard and fast no, no, no, you have to just --

MS. JOHNSTON: Just not as a beginning statement.
You can't create a set of maps just to get public reaction.

CHAIR TURNER: I'm going to need a couple of other Commissioners in. Commissioners Le Mons, Sadhwani and Akutagawa and Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I appreciate the discussion, Commissioners. It's been very educational as well as I think helpful in us determining a process of moving forward. I think we're going in the right direction.

As far as the creative ideas that are put forward I think we should really explore some of those more. I was particularly drawn to creating community level opportunities whether it's communities developing drawings, I won't call it maps.

MS. JOHNSTON: The community can just make --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Drawings to tell us who or where they are. I think that could be fun. And I think to Commissioner Kennedy's point, I think there would probably be zero harm in getting feedback on the previous commission's maps that have already been drawn.

So those could be conversation starters. And I think that's more the spirit of what we're talking about is conversation starters with community as opposed to presenting a plot up for them to react to that we're holding up as our product.
And then finally, I also like this RFQ approach. And I also like the sort of decentralization approach to the activities. We kind of talked about that early on and I think we got some clarification feedback as to what certain things meant. But I think if we do look at this in a more creative way, we may find that there are line drawers that want to do certain aspects.

I'll just sum it up and say this, putting together a team that has the task might get us more of what we want. I mean I think that remains to be seen. I'm not saying that is the approach but I think the fact that we're exploring all of these different options is in our best interest and I think will serve us well. So thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Um-hum. Thank you. Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I think Le Mons just said everything that I was going to say anyway.

CHAIR TURNER: Outstanding. Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So I think, sorry. So the only thing that would perhaps go in there is that I think this is worth a longer conversation and I would encourage us not only at the end of our agenda when we're meant to talk about our process moving forward that I think that (audio interference) mentioned around the idea of a workshop in which we would further discuss all of -- come
up with a more concrete plan.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. And I'll have a question about that in just a minute.

Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I will say that, yes, Commissioner Le Mons took what I was going to say as well too. I do just want to just comment on a couple of things in addition to that.

One, I would like to also have some more opportunity to dive deeper into this. I also wonder if whether it's now or whether it's sometime after we get some additional, I'll call it training or more opportunities to dive deeper into this that the formation perhaps of some kind of subcommittee to help us think more about what this line drawing work should consist of.

I will say that my initial reaction to decentralizing, I'm calling it decentralizing, the line drawing work, is a little concerning to me only because I think like the earlier conversations about having somebody who is a strategic partner to us whether it's at the communications or at a Chief Counsel level, in some ways I look at the line drawer in a similar way. You know, we need somebody who is going to be able to see the whole entire bigger picture and whether they put the team together or whether they subcontract out to somebody
else, I think there has to be somebody who, frankly, I think we just need perhaps one person that is going to be a partner but also be held accountable by us rather than trying to hold a bunch of people accountable. I think that's where there's going to be room for some miscommunications and other kinds of things that we may not want to set ourselves up for. So I wanted to just put that out there for consideration.

CHAIR TURNER: Um-hum. Um-hum. Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: My comments have been stated elsewhere.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. The comments that I wanted to just kind of lift up not in disagreement with anything, but understanding, we continue to talk about the workshop and I think maybe we have used it before. And wanting to understand what exactly do we think the workshop should and how does it actually take place.

So when we say create a workshop we can get more understanding around it and talk about bringing in people from additional training and then we have a subcommittee on kind of we've just thrown out, to determine, you know, how we should move forward for example, for a line drawer. I am very much interested in a workshop so that we all have understanding about all of the various
components of a line drawer as this seems to be a crucial component of the work that we're going to do. And so I guess to staff or yes, to staff, workshops on what in this current moment would still be back on the Zoom type of call that we have. But what is the thought process of the suggestion about moving forward with a workshop specifically as the thought to invite someone in similar to Ms. MacDonald or someone else to give us further training and allow us to -- what does that look like?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: On the front end, I like the idea of a subcommittee to gather ideas and based on this discussion, I can obtain the speakers for you. It would look just like this meeting because of Bagley-Keene requirements and your requirements for transparency. But being that the agenda would primarily be the sequence of events for your workshop.

CHAIR TURNER: And I guess the workshop piece I would want to ensure that would look different. My concern about a subcommittee, subcommittees typically those that would be assigned to it, are those that already have some familiarity with it. They would go away for sure and pull together I am certain outstanding recommendations but it does nothing then for me. I'll speak in I terms, it would do nothing for me to build capability and understanding just in direction. I like
workshop and I'm thinking in terms of workshop of someone
that's going to actually come in and not just read a
document to me but actually train, I guess I'm thinking
of workshop in a whole different way.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Right.

CHAIR TURNER: Where it is more interactive where we
are raising our level of understanding and capability
together as opposed to just sharing any -- moving on.

Comissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: You're absolutely right,
Commissioner Turner. When I was saying workshop, I mean,
the way I differentiate it is, the meeting we're having
now if we were in person we would be sitting in a diasis
(sic) or however you say it. This is a half-circle up
above and if there was a public, they would be below.
While a workshop is actually the opposite, we're down
below, our sleeves are rolled up. There is a bunch of
paper and all that and people are speaking to us but
we're also interacting and putting our ideas on paper.

And then the audience is still there so Bagley-Keene is
still -- yeah, they're on the outside looking in at us,
they still are but now -- but it's more of, instead of us
sitting there and listening, it has to be someone who is
facilitating us in the learning and moving us forward in
the work.
INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Right.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: So it's not -- we would be engaged in the process. Hoped that helped.

CHAIR TURNER: It did. Commissioner Le Mons and Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I think the only differential I might have is the content of the workshop. I don't think it's necessary for us to become schooled in map drawing.

I think it's a particular -- we're trying to put together our process for securing line drawers, how we utilize them in terms of community engagement, where the community intersects the process. I'm thinking more of a workshop that focuses on those things as opposed to deep dive into line drawing. Because that's not -- that's why we're hiring them to do that.

I mean, we certainly want to have the understanding but I don't -- and I don't know if I misunderstood what Commission Sinay was just describing but unless I don't really understand the value of us getting granular on the line drawing itself but what -- this is dovetailed from the RFP process and us wanting to feel that we can make an intelligent choice as to who we select, based upon a better understanding of what our needs are.

And so I just would hope that whatever kind of
process that we use, be it a workshop or some other process to get to those points would be the purpose of it.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah.

CHAIR TURNER: So I want to respond, let me respond, please.

Two things. One is the -- through public comment and on the discussion today. I'm hearing that it's important that we be able to articulate what our desire is in a line drawer, what we want to see, what this Commission needs to see without having some training and understanding as to how the line drawer is doing the work, what they're doing, and a whole scope of what they do. I really don't think that I personally can have a lot of input in saying what I desire as a line drawer without that understanding first.

Secondly, when all is said and done, regardless of who draws the lines, as I understand it, it is this commission's responsibility to approve whatever lines that they've drawn. And I don't want to get so far down the pipe at that point and then saying, well, yes, I'm voting yes just because you're the line drawer. I want to maybe not need to be deep detailed but I want to have some sort of workshop to where I feel educated enough,
comfortable enough with whatever the line drawers are
doing to be able to say, yes, I'm in agreement with that
or no, I think you still left something out. That's as
far as what I'm willing to go for our workshop and have
an understanding for this piece part.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Akutagawa and then
Andersen.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I want to agree with what
Commissioner Le Mons is saying, too. I want to propose
maybe a few ideas.

One is, I was just looking at the line drawing RFP
that was put out by the auditor's office and I'm not
necessarily saying that we have to follow what they did
or what they've put together. But one, I think, and I'm
sure, I think, following on what you were just saying, it
does strike me that maybe we could use that as a guide to
say, here's where we need someone to come in and help us
understand what this all means. Like, what's the
difference between one computer software versus another
software.

You know, perhaps it's actually maybe having -- in
my mind I'm envisioning possibly three different kinds of
speakers.

One is to speak about the kind of technical kind of
stuff.
Another one is perhaps maybe someone from the previous commission who could speak to the conversations and some of the considerations that they had to go through so that we'll be mindful of either understanding how do we avoid some of the challenges or even being able to understand -- even though they gave us that handbook, being able to then pick their brains a little bit more for are there other best practices. Because when I read through their -- I just went back to their handbook too and it doesn't give a lot of detail and I think that there's more that perhaps that we could get.

And then the third part is, and this gets to maybe some of the public input kind of perspective as well too that we're looking for from the line drawer.

Perhaps there may be also as a third speaker, some value in having someone from one of these community organizations who are very invested in this redistricting process, who also understand the line drawing and asking them to also come in and give us a perspective that is not from the perspective of somebody who could potentially even be a potential contractor to us. So then we're getting a more holistic look and enabling all of us to, I think, get a better understanding of all of the considerations that we may need to get.

I just feel like, yeah, we could just say, okay,
this looks good but if you honestly ask me, like, do I really understand it, I feel like -- even if I read through this and I've read through it already once, I feel like there's still something missing and I would really feel more comfortable being able to do that deeper dive in but to be able to get different perspectives of understanding.


COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Yes, I think this -- there's a great deal of confusion on this in terms of what your line drawer is really doing and what is our role and we're all concerned. We don't want to turn over our role to someone else to draw up these lines and then, I guess we'd have to live with it.

And I think the idea of workshops would actually maybe be like scenarios running through and actually having like essentially a few guinea pigs or just some volunteers who even qualify. But someone like Karin MacDonald who said she is not going to be bidding while playing the role of the drawer and actually having an advocacy group who was willing to help us and say, well, this is my community and this is how I plan to bring this in, and so we can see how that would actually fit together.
And then -- so it's almost like we have to get people who would be willing to work together, again, remotely, so we can actually understand, as well as then the actual technical part of because of the actual line drawing itself.

And again, on that, as I think Raul is saying, we actually aren't going to physically draw the lines, we're going to have, and my analogy is a draftsman. I'm the engineer, I lay out the design, I know how it's going to happen and then have someone else draw it up. And we want our lines people to be basically like that. We're actually telling them what to do. And the particulars of that, and they're not at a level of they're telling us what to do. And they need to know enough about the Voter Rights Act, all the different databases, how they all fit together so we need that part of explanation.

But what we're looking for at this point, I think Commissioner Le Mons was actually saying this, is, we need to see how was it going to happen, we can't quite put our brain around the process involved in this. And I think that's the workshop that we're trying to propose. Is that where I'm kind of -- I think that's what I'm rehearing from everybody. And then -- so we need to think about this and put a couple of people together who might be able to emulate that for us. So then we know
enough to ask really good questions.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioners Sadhwani, Sinay, and Kennedy and then me.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I love where this conversation is going. I was in total agreement (audio interference) --

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sadhwani, your mic is having a little difficulty today for whatever reason so -- thank you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yesterday and today both. I don't know why I'm having issues. Is that any better?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. So I am in agreement with what Commissioner Akutagawa was laying out.

I like in theory, Commissioner Andersen, what you're saying about the scenarios. I'm not sure in practice how we would have those simulations exactly so perhaps one thing that we, at some point, whether it's in this workshop or not. There have been cases around, less so around the 2010 lines but there have been a number of California Voting Rights Act issues. And while that does not apply to us, perhaps we could actually get some of the line drawers who had to draw those lines in some of those districts that face suits under the California Voting Rights Act.
Now, I recognize that that might confuse us or add additional burden so I'm okay if we don't do that too. But just in terms of that scenario part, I'm not sure how we would operationalize that.

In terms of what Commissioner Akutagawa and Commissioner Le Mons were talking about, yes, I agree, I think that we need to perhaps, and maybe this evening we kind of do our own personal needs assessment. What kinds of things do we feel like individually we might need and then develop that list to kind of further flush out what such a workshop would be like. What I'm envisioning is that there would be this training element conversations, I loved the idea of bringing in community-based stakeholders from the many organizations that are obviously following along in this process. But so that it can lead to a conversation for us, I hope that we can facilitate that conversation ourselves and in creating such an agenda we would do that. If we needed an outside facilitator we can explore that too but to facilitate a discussion about what will our process be and kind of come up with what's our plan, right?

So what do we need to know first, let's get that information. And then ideally so that stage two of that workshop leads us to a more concrete plan that we can move forward with it. And from that plan, hopefully,
we'll have a much better idea of what we're looking for in a line drawer and if it's an RFQ or an RFP or whatever that might be. But that's my thought and I think I'm on the same page as a lot of the folks that have already --

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Sinay, Kennedy, and Yee.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just adding on what Commissioner Sadhwani said. I'm going to go back to your question, Commissioner Le Mons, that my idea of a workshop wasn't just about the line drawing. I think, and the truth is, there's a lot of pieces on this and we're all brought in because we have different pieces and we're jumping to the line drawing as a scenario planning but we also need to understand what the listening, and even what are the reasons.

You know, looking at the map of California, there has been two -- yeah, people have been giving us little breadcrumbs of what they want us to do and someone showed us a region that was breaking down the regions very different than the one that was used last time. So there's a lot of pieces in this and an idea of a workshop is thinking through some of these different pieces so that we can build out the plan.

I, you know, going on what you were saying, you figured out what this is already, right? I have been
sitting here, I know, Commissioner, I can you laughing
too, Commissioner, but I have been writing down every
time someone says we need something and tomorrow is about
building an agenda. I have no clue -- you know, I
haven't spent the time to actually put this together to
figure out how we would move forward but I have been
listening to all of our conversations and we're working
on the little stuff. And I just want to remind that this
is a big picture and sometimes we grab onto what feels
the most common or what feels comfortable and so for me
maybe it is talking to the community and listening to the
community while someone else might be about data and
someone else might be about lines. But that we're all
here because we know the big picture. So yeah, I'm on
the same page as you, Commissioner Sadhwani.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioners Kennedy and
then Yee.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I'm
also just wanting to build a little bit on what
Commissioner Sadhwani said. You know, the We Draw the
Lines website at least has links to all of the video
archives of the 2010 Commission if we want to see how
these sessions worked in 2010. I don't know that the
links are working currently. Raul can tell us whether
they are or aren't, but if they're not, I know that I've
already expressed to Raul that for archival purposes,
those links need to be somewhere live so that not only
can we get to them, but the general public can get to
them and see what happened in 2010. I think that would
give us a good sense of the flavor of how these things at
least worked then. And then we've said that our process
may be different, but it would at least give us a good
idea of how that went.

Second of all, again, following on what Commissioner
Sadhwani said, we have jurisdictions all over the State
setting up local redistricting commissions, and I had
posed the question to counsel a month ago or more as to
whether we could attend those in our capacity as private
citizens. I don't think I got a response to that, but my
sense is that if we're attending as private citizens, and
we're not speaking, and we're not taking input on the
lines that we're drawing on, it seems to me that our
attending local redistricting commissions could be a big
plus for us. So thank you very much.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. So the goal at some point
is to hire one or more line drawing contractors to help
us do our work. It sounds like we're just a long ways
away from that goal because there's a lot we all need to
learn. So I absolutely support whatever efforts, workshops, whatever it will take for us to get up to speed enough to do that. So I support, if we can form maybe a subcommittee to collect all those little Post-it notes that Commissioner Sinay has, and all those thoughts, and start to develop -- and work with Raul to develop that workshop, that would be fantastic. I mean, I don't even know what other options we have to get to the line drawers. So the RFP, 62 pages. Doug Johnson said it would take them eighty hours. So how else do you get line drawers? I don't even know. If that's not a particularly good way, issuing 62-page RFPs, what other ways are there? He did recommend that we consider issuing an RFQ. I don't know if it's way too early to do that, or whether that's a move we can start fairly soon to help us on this long journey to get there.

On a completely separate matter, but something that was mentioned earlier, about going out to get community input first. Counsel mentioned that we are required to not go out with any kind of draft maps first. And just wondering where exactly was that in the statute? And I wasn't able to find it, and just wanted to have that language very precisely in my mind as we go forward.

MS. JOHNSTON: 82 Section -- Government Code 8253, Section (a)(7).
COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. And by draft map, I mean that means a map that has some district lines of any kind proposed, notional, whatever on it, because, of course --

MS. JOHNSTON: It just means that -- it says --

COMMISSIONER YEE: -- you go out with a blank map, that's --

MS. JOHNSTON: -- any commission map. So I would assume that would be anything that created districts, which is what the Commission does.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. Right. But to go out with a blank map, or a map that just has landforms and major streets and say, okay, you tell me --

MS. JOHNSTON: Well, that would be fine.

COMMISSIONER YEE: -- where you're. Yeah.

MS. JOHNSTON: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. But to go out, for instance, with a map with four notions of Koreatown, that would not be -- even if we didn't come up with those notions?

MS. JOHNSTON: I think that's right.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. We could not do that.

MS. JOHNSTON: If a community group brought that to you, that would be fine.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Akutagawa, Commissioner
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think Commissioner Vazquez was first. I'll go after her.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I think I really -- that's the line that I was thinking of earlier, Commissioner Yee's point, is sort of have a blank map, and get community reaction. Tell me where you live. It's not going to be a district, but it will give us an anchor for communities of interest by which we then engage in the more formal line drawing process with a line drawer. And that's the kind of community engagement work I think we can do in parallel to setting up official line drawer staffing and processes, et cetera. That's the stuff that we can start thinking about, like, what is the process for doing that? And start scheduling those out, because I also think we're going to need a lot of outreach to get people to come to even a virtual meeting such as that. And so that's just going to take a lot of time to even get initial public input, and I would recommend that we pursue that in parallel.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: So a couple things. One is I think this is for Marian. Commissioner Kennedy had suggested one option maybe is using the previous 2010
maps as just a kind of conversation starter. Question one, is that considered showing, I guess, a draft map? I mean, could we do that?

MS. JOHNSTON: I think you could do that because those are not your maps. They the prior commission's maps.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Yeah. And I asked that because I mean, love them or hate them, whatever it is, I think in ten years, the likelihood is that things have changed, communities of interest have changed. So it just is just one way of having a starting point.

To build upon what Commissioner Vazquez just said, I think it was one of the presenters that did say that there -- or it may have been in in in some of the reams of the pre-reading that we had to do, there are different sources of how neighborhoods, communities of interest can be defined. I'm going to speak to at least the City of Los Angeles. I'm aware that they have what's called neighborhood councils. And so those neighborhood councils could be one way of starting with them as a way of speaking to a potential community of interest and hearing from their perspective, how is that work out? How has that evolved and changed? Of course, there are other community groups in other areas as well, too.

I think I'd like to also have us consider, in terms
of the public input, whether it's in person or if it's virtual. And I will say that I'm the first one that probably is not really a huge fan of trying to go out in public somewhere, but at the same time, I also see that there may be a need for us to perhaps consider a very well socially distant type of environment, where we can be together and where the best way to get public comment may be by going out to their communities. And specifically, I'm thinking about some of the places in the far northern reaches of California, near the Oregon border, around there. I know that they're under big fire watch right now, so maybe this isn't the right time, but I would be concerned that if we don't go to them, they may not come to us. And I would say the same in parts of the Central Valley as well, too, and perhaps parts of the Inland Empire and the far eastern reaches of San Diego County, as well, so those locations may be difficult for them to come, either online or in other ways, and we may just need to find ways to get to them.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. I see you, Commissioner Vazquez.

Right before you go, Marion, I think I'm just -- the Government code 8263.67 (sic), when you read it, you read it to say the Commission may not go out with any Commission map, and then we're saying, but you can go out
with the 2010 Commission map. But to me, it still seems
like -- well, for sure, I'm not still clear. When you
read any Commission map, I'm wondering why the exclusion
of a 2010 Commission map because it's still a Commission
map.

MS. JOHNSTON: Well, I probably was paraphrasing
when I read it. What the actual language is, "the
hearing process shall include hearings to receive public
input before the Commission draws any maps".

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: So that's before you --

CHAIR TURNER: The Commission's maps.

MS. JOHNSTON: -- do your map drawing.


MS. JOHNSTON: Sorry for that.

CHAIR TURNER: I wrote it down the last time
(indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

MS. JOHNSTON: I probably didn't say that correctly.

Sorry for that.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Vazquez? Thank you.

Okay, Commissioners. Should we go back to public
comment? I know we're not at a conclusion, but we are at
the end of the day, and if we have public waiting, I want
them to be able to weigh in as well.

Commissioner Sinay?
COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Actually, we do have a conclusion in that we jumped into kind of agenda building, and our future, and what we want in the future, so I think we're okay stopping here and actually taking it back up tomorrow. So I think we're okay. Because a lot of what people are saying is they need workshop, they need more trainings, they need more this to be able to figure out the line drawers. So I think for right now, there is no action on the line drawer.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Looks like Raul wants to say something.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh, thank you. Raul?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Well, I just wanted to point out that you're only partially through agenda item 16. You're basically tabling the decision on the RFP, which is within your right to do so because what you're doing at this point is further action, because the RFP itself is done. It's over.

Does that make sense? Yes.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Yes.

CHAIR TURNER: Because there was no -- no one replied to the RFP. So it's --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Exactly.

CHAIR TURNER: -- done and this is further action.
INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Exactly. There's no action to be taken on that. Any action is what you're going to do in the future. So putting that into the future to make that decision as you plan your workshop is appropriate.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. That's perfect. And I'm not -- I know we're not at the conclusion of 16 because we still have the other bullets to go through. Just that we were at the end of the day, and in case there was public waiting that wanted to comment on the discussion that we've just had, I was suggesting that we open for public comment for that.

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I definitely want to go to public comment, but I'm also curious because I have been looking for these other documents, videographer solicitation, language interpreter solicitation, transcription contracts, and ASL interpreter services contract. I have not been able to put my hands on, so I don't know whether others have seen them, whether they're posted somewhere that I just haven't been able to find them, but --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: They haven't been --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- and I can't
(indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: -- they're just -- they were submitted to your subcommittee. If your subcommittee has a recommendation for action, at that point, then they would be provided as public comment. Not public comment, for public posting and discussion. We haven't gotten to their recommendations yet.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Can I ask, what subcommittee do we keep on talking about? I don't recall an RFP, or I mean, a subcommittee was -- what subcommittee are we talking about here?

CHAIR TURNER: Finance.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, these went to Finance Committee. And who is on that one again, please?

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioners Fornaciari and Fernandez.

Commissioner Fernandez --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: -- go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I mean, I don't see a problem with putting up the information on the -- was it the videography, the language that went out? I think
that can be shared with everyone because it's going
to be very difficult to discuss it tomorrow if the rest
of the commissioners haven't read it yet, if they want to
read it.

And then in terms of the other ones, I don't think
we had --

CHAIR TURNER: American sign language?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- the transcription one,
that was a standard agreement, correct, Raul?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Um-hum. Yes,
about the transcription?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yeah. So that one, you
could probably post as well, the transcription, because
we really -- I mean, there's not much we can really do
with it. It's a standard agreement.

And then I think the American sign language is also
going to be a master service agreement?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Correct.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I haven't seen that one. I
haven't seen that one yet, though. And then language
interpreter, that's the one -- we have not delved into
that one yet.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: No. That one
was --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. So I think it's
appropriate that anything that was sent out, like to bid
or to request information, I mean, I don't think we
should share the cost information yet, or what came back,
but I do believe the language can be shared and posted.
I don't know, Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I think we should
definitely share what was posted so folks can take a
look.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So that'll be shared out	onight.

Ryan, I'm wondering if you would check to see if
there -- if we have any public comments, please?

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Actually, that'll
be shared out tomorrow morning.

AT&T OPERATOR: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Okay. But I'll
share it to the commissioners tonight.

AT&T OPERATOR: Great. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Ryan, we're ready.

AT&T OPERATOR: Thank you. And ladies and
gentlemen, as a reminder for public comment, please press
1, then 0 on your telephone keypad. Please also spell
your name for the record.

And first, we turn to the line of Alejandra Ponce De
Leon.

    Please go ahead.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

MS. PONCE DE LEON: Hi. Good afternoon, Commissioners. My name is Alejandra Ponce De Leon, A-L-E-J-A-N-D-R-A P-O-N-C-E D-E L-E-O-N. Want to appreciate the time that you've been taking today, and throughout these trainings and these sessions, but today in particular around the RFP to really think through and discuss, you know, what is needed for a demographer. I'm calling on behalf of the Advancement Project, and -- and we're part of a -- of a -- a coalition of 15 Statewide and regional networks that are heavily involved with -- with different communities of color across the State, and really committed to racial equity, racial and economic equity. And so for us, I mean, we just want to uplift and -- and really appreciate that you are open, you know, to getting more information, learning more on, like, the technical side of line drawing, of -- of being open to getting recommendations even from line drawers that are not applying, and also looking at, you know, engaging the community for feedback.

    We were one of the groups that, you know, had recommended that the Commission take some time to review the RFP, given that it was drafted ahead of time, before
you were seated, and so we wanted to make sure that --
you know, that all of you had an opportunity to weigh in
and really think through on visions that you have in
terms of what you need from a line drawer. And so thank
you for -- for taking that time to do that.

I just wanted to reiterate that, you know, for --
you know, as at Advancement Project, we work in this
coalition, and with other diverse partners across the
State that have expertise within particular racial and
ethnic communities. And so we just want to encourage
that you see us as a resource to share the expertise that
our partners have to inform the community engagement and
outreach efforts that you will be leading, as well as
deepen, you know, your vision of what you would like to
see in a demographer. I think that this is a -- a great
opportunity as you're -- you're -- you're going to be
discussing more and kind of planning this out more,
again, that -- you know, that there are a variety of
several organizations that work very, very much in line
with the Black community, Latinx community, Asian Pacific
Islander community, Asian-Americans, the -- the Native
American community as well. And so we are here as a
resource to you, the -- as Commissioners, and -- and
we're also a resource for the communities that we're
working with to be able to bring folks together. And
knowing that the redistricting process is something that is very abstract for many folks, something that for many communities already feel disempowered when it comes to political participation. And so you know, we're here to be able to be that bridge between the community and -- and -- and -- and the Commission. And so again, just wanted to uplift that for you. So thank you for your time.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Can we interact with -- before they leave, can we interact with the speakers? It's agendized, right? We can -- yeah.

MS. JOHNSTON: This is on an agenda item, so yes.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Great. So Alejandra, thank you for your comments. And I'm curious, since I was a former Advancement Project staff member, you don't have to answer this now, but I'm curious if Advancement Project staff, at this point, given the current work, would Advancement Project and/or its partners be potentially speakers for any sort of workshop that the Commission may want to put on around educating us on community-based mapping efforts. Sort of a general question, but I'm curious about how you would be able to support us, if at all?

MS. PONCE DE LEON: Yeah. I mean, we -- we are
starting conversations among partners to see what -- you know, what are the resources and the capacities that folks have, and -- and some have expressed interest, like the -- there is openness for sure, from our partners, from AP -- from Advancement Project as well, in terms of being able to -- to either participate in workshops, lead workshops for the Commission. And so we're very much open in terms of having those conversations and -- and hearing from all of you, you know what would be helpful in a workshop? Would it be helpful to have multiple partners be able to bring you the -- the information and -- and their -- their knowledge of the variety of communities that can speak to, you know, language access, that can speak to, you know, community engagement, like best practices, outreach. What are the nuances, the challenges that are distinct for each of these communities? And so there is an openness from our partners in Advancement Project to -- to work with y'all. COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Great. Thank you. Looking forward to staying in conversation. CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. MS. PONCE DE LEON: Perfect. Thank you. Appreciate it. CHAIR TURNER: Ryan, are there other callers in queue?
AT&T OPERATOR: Yes. We turn to the line of Sophia Garcia.

Please go ahead.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

MS. GARCIA: Okay. Hi. Hello? Hi. My name is Sophia Garcia, and that's spelled S-O-P-H-I-A, G-A-R-C-I-A, and I am the GIS analyst for the Delores Huerta Foundation, and we are also a member of that Statewide redistricting network that Alejandra just spoke to, and I do want to uplift everything that she said. And she said it really beautifully, and that we, at -- at DHF agree.

But I also want to turn directly to some of the specific things that we, at DHF, and then also as a person in the GIS field, would ask for you all to look at when reviewing a demographer, specifically the history of community input for the demographer, the demography firm. We would also like you to look for a demographer that does not have a history of incumbent gerrymandering. I am -- I am assuming a lot of the demography firms who would bid for the contract have a long history and a big profile that they would be able to share with you.

We'd also ask that the firm have a framework that also follows the new redistricting bill by both the AB 849, otherwise known as the Fair Maps Act, that was
passed in 2019, and while I know that that specific bill does not directly affect Statewide redistricting, it does only mandate for counties and cities, but it has a really great outline of best practices of community engagement in the bill. And so we would hope that whatever demographer firm would be up to date with community input in how to work with communities.

Also, I just want to note that in -- in 2019 and -- or 2020 and heading into 2021, the tools for online mapping, and community input, and transparency are a lot more readily available. There's a lot more mapping capacity specifically for online, a lot more capacity specifically for community input, and so we would also like to see -- I know communities of interest have been talked a lot, and I would -- you know, we would like to see what exactly that -- that demography firm would be doing in terms of communities of interest, how they would be collecting that information for the board, how they would be displaying that information for the board, and then ultimately displaying that information to the public for transparency.

We know, again, that there's a lot of data -- data that's available, so we would just be interested in more of a robust view specifically, not only for the Commission, but specifically for the community, and --
and with what Alejandra just said to the -- the language
and access that would be needed specifically for this
firm. So again, it's all in -- all in the name of
transparency in community, but really, the -- the
framework that this specific demographer would be looking
at data, and what best practices are they would be using.

We say this because we've been involved in a number
of redistricting efforts that have happened since 2018,
and have been able to interact with a number of different
demographers, and all of them have come with displaying
their maps and information in different ways, and we
really look forward to working with whatever demographer,
and hope that they have a strong interest in displaying
that information for community. So thank you, again, and
I really appreciate this discussion.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioners, do you have any questions? Thank
you.

Ryan, how many more callers do we have in queue?

AT&T OPERATOR: We only have one in queue at this
time, ma'am.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Yes, please.

AT&T OPERATOR: Thank you. We turn to the line of
Rosalind Gold.

Please go ahead.
MS. GOLD: Hi, it's Rosalind Gold, R-O-S-A-L-I-N-D, and the last name is Gold, G-O-L-D, chief public policy officer with the National Association of Latino Elected and Appointed Officials, NALEO Educational Fund. Thank you, Commissioners, again. I will make this brief.

Ten years ago, we actively were engaged in mobilizing the Latino community and working with partners in other communities in California, mobilizing underrepresented communities to participate in the redistricting project, to provide maps on their communities of interest, to provide perspectives, and so we would be also happy to join in any kind of effort to provide information to the Commission about best practices in community input and engagement. Thank you very much.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, and we appreciate your offer as well for support to this Commission.

And any more callers?

AT&T OPERATOR: We have no further callers in queue.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Thank you, Ryan.

Okay. Commissioners, we'll recess for today. We'll pick back up with agenda item number 16 to complete our other bullet items, and then go to agenda item 23 tomorrow, which will allow us to get a report from all of our other subcommittees and plan out our future agenda
MS. JOHNSTON: And items 5 and 9 are still waiting, too.

INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Didn't we do 5?
CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. And items 5 and 9.
MS. JOHNSTON: I think I'm right on those.
INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: That's right. 5 is --
MS. JOHNSTON: Yes.
INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Yes. 5 (indiscernible, simultaneous speech) --
COMMISSIONER YEE: 9, yes.
CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Yeah. The number 5 was one of the follow ups, so yes, yes, yes. And item 9 --
MS. JOHNSTON: Is the census.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Whether to write a letter, or so on, so on.
INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Right.
CHAIR TURNER: Oh, that's one of the follow ups. Okay. Perfect. Got it. All right.
INTERIM ADMINISTRATOR VILLANUEVA: Plus all the subcommittee reports.
CHAIR TURNER: Thank you so much. We'll see you in the morning.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, everyone.
CHAIR TURNER: We are now recessed until then.

(Whereupon, the CRC Business Meeting adjourned.)
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