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CHAIR TURNER: Good morning and welcome to the California Redistricting Committee. We would --
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: (Indiscernible).
CHAIR TURNER: I would -- I would -- we are resuming on today, Friday -- yay, it's Friday -- September the 4th. And we will begin our day with roll call, please.
MS. JOHNSTON: Thank you.
Commissioner Ahmad?
COMMISSIONER 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 Toledo? I'm sorry. Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I'm present.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Taylor, yes. Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Present.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Turner?

CHAIR TURNER: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.

MS. JOHNSTON: Two absent, but you have a quorum, Madam Chair.

CHAIR TURNER: Outstanding. And with the quorum we shall move. And we'll begin our day, Ryan, with public comment. And I'll ask, Raul, please, if you would read instructions before we begin.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yes. Good morning. 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 a comment for 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.

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 either the access code for the meeting, which is 5185236, that's 5185236, or the name of the meeting, which is the Citizens Redistricting Commission, first Commission meeting.

After providing this information, the operator will ask you to provide your name. So please note, you are 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 is your turn to make a public comment, the moderator will introduce you by the name you provided to the operator. Providing a name helps ATT, which is hosting this public comment process, to ensure that everyone holding for public comment has a chance to
submit their comments.

So please be assured that the Commission is not maintaining any list of callers by name and is only asking for some names so that the call moderator can manage multiple calls simultaneously and can let you know when it's your turn to speak.

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 is time for you speak. You will be able to listen to live audio of the meeting. Please mute your computer livestream audio, because the online video and audio will be approximately 60 seconds behind the live audio you are hearing on the telephone.

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 which will arise. 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 will need to press 1-0, that's 1-0, so
that you can be placed in the queue to make your 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, the Commissioners will move on to the next caller and you may hang up your call. 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 repeat this process.

If you are disconnected for any reason, please call back and explain the issue to the operator and then repeat this process and rejoin the public comment queue by pressing 1-0.

MS. JOHNSTON: And to note for the record, Commissioners Le Mons and Toledo have arrived.
MR. VILLANUEVA: Thank you. 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. That is the time to call in.

The process for making a comment will be the same each time, beginning by dialing 877-266-8163 and following the steps that I've outlined for you. These steps are also located on the homepage of the website where you can click the link and identify those steps. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. And counsel, Commissioner Le Mons was already online. And I think there was someone else that joined with Commissioner Toledo. But we're here. Thank you.

MS. JOHNSTON: Right. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Ryan, we'd like to check to see if we have some public comment waiting, please.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Okay. And as a reminder, please press 1 then 0 if you wish to make a comment, press 1-0.

And we do have somebody that's queued up. Please spell your name for the record. I'm opening the line of Peter Cannon. Please go ahead.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. And your name --

MR. CANNON: Hi. My name is Peter Cannon, P-E-T-E-R
C-A-N-N-O-N. I previously called in about your job search. I think your training to date has been great. However, I believe that one thing has been missing. We have not heard from the old Commissioners other than the one -- other than one on a very technical topic.

Even the applicant review panel took the time to hear from three past Commissioners. You all now know about the day in the life of a Commissioner. You have had seven of them -- of those yourself.

I -- my specific suggestion now is to invite former Commissioners to present in groups by their subcommittees. Based on their old agendas, it appears they have five main areas: technical, public information, finance and administration, legal, and outreach.

This could be helpful as you pivot from education to implementation. Some examples; as you consider potential landmines -- landmines to avoid over them drafting your line drawing RFP, wouldn't it be great to hear from the old technical subcommittee that drafted the last one? As you consider how to maximize your funding, knowing how the finance administration subcommittee secured budget augmentations would be helpful, I believe.

And if you are trying to figure out how to spend 2.1 million in new funding for outreach, what would the very jealous, former, outreach Commissioners done -- have done
with these -- with those dollars if they had them?

And I thank you for your time and consideration.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you so much, Mr. Cannon. We appreciate the comments and the wise advice. Thank you.

Is there a next caller?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: As a reminder, if you do wish to make a comment, please press 1, then 0. And we have no further in queue at this time.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Thank you. We will definitely hold that for consideration.

So we'll move today into our agenda -- continued agenda item, item number 16. We still -- and I believe Commissioners, did you all get the job -- the -- the postings that went out for the videographer, language interpreter, etcetera?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Madam Chair --

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah. There you go.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Fornaciari?

MR. FORNACIARI: Yeah. Chair Turner, thank you.

Before we get going on that, I just -- you know, I checked the -- the live feed and, you know, you'll come to find -- and I'm not one who's a great speller, but I think queue, should be q-u-e-u-e, not c-u-e. So if someone could fix that on the livestream, I think that
would be great.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Agenda 16 continued?
Okay.

So we had a report on -- let's see. This was the finance committee, I'm sorry. So we'll be in the hands of the finance subcommittee at this time for the videographer's solicitation.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So am I starting role, are you starting? Let's see, who's starting?
Okay, I'll just start. So for the videographer, this is the one -- we did receive three bids for that one. And we had -- two of the lower bids were within 150 dollars of each other, which is interesting. One of them came in a dollar below the 250,000-dollar limit, which was interesting. But, you know, I'm used to that sometimes.

So basically, with this type of bid that went out, they come back with costing information. So that's really all we're going by. We don't have any, like, experience information or anything like that. They had to have met the criteria. And I'm hoping they did meet the criteria and how that will be vetted out.

There are two -- like I said, it's only 150 dollars difference. The total came in to about 190,000, 191,000. And like I said, they were within 150 dollars of each other. The only difference I see is one of them has an
office in Auburn, California. So their travel to Sacramento costs were much lower, obviously. The other vendor had offices in San Jose and San Diego. So their costs for traveling to Sacramento were obviously higher. They have a further way to go, and since there seems to be a majority of our meetings, potentially, could be in Sacramento, but -- so that's probably where the major cost difference could be moving forward.

So I really, at this point -- and I believe Commissioner Fornaciari, we were kind of on the same page where either one would probably be okay. I guess I was just leaning a little bit more towards the Auburn one, because in the long run that might come out to be less expensive. Because it's Sacramento, closer to Sacramento. So it was a 1,000-dollar travel cost to Sacramento versus the 1,200 dollar for meeting costs, so -- but other than that, that's what I have.

MR. VILLANUEVA: I have a comment.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes. Please, go ahead.

MR. VILLANUEVA: I had expressed this to the subcommittee. When that scope of work came out, it was based on one kind of plan and vision. And I had mentioned to them to kind of step back and look at it, because -- and especially after the discussion about the line drawer -- the scope and vision that developed that
work, that statement work, is different.

And so my concern is on two different levels. One is the way that the vision and the scope will work captures public engagement and what will be required of the videographer to do that with you.

And the other part -- and I hadn't -- I hadn't realized it as much as I have in this meeting, and that is the cost for ATT to run your public comment, and as much public comment as you do, is really, really expensive. And so could we look at a scope of work with your videographer that has them looking and/or partnering with how you engage public comment?

And not just by telephone, but in other different ways. So again, I -- and especially last night I'm thinking, I think the visions are different. And what caught my attention, again, is your discussion about the line drawer. The line drawer's a little -- is a little bit more -- because you're -- you're hiring a technician to do technical things at your request and under your direction, is a little bit more linear than the videography, where you're asking technicians to also problem solve with you on some of these issues that you were grappling; just in terms of the public engagement part.

So I guess what I'm suggesting is maybe as you're
stepping back for one to step back for the other.
Because that component, the videography, your public
comment, are going to be critical for all of your
operations moving forward. And I think the visioning and
the ideas that you want to develop for how you do that
require just as much time for one as the other.

Anyway, I just wanted to share that with you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Raul.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. So --

CHAIR TURNER: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So I was -- I read your
comment last night and I've been thinking about it too.
And in going back and reviewing the RFP, yeah -- I
mean -- I kind of -- I agree with what you're saying.
And I -- we might want to, you know, put this on the back
burner for the time being. I have a couple questions
about that though.

So currently the contracts through the State
Auditor's Office, and so I could envision it would be one
or two meetings, so a few months, if you will, before
we're ready to put out a new RFP or whatever this is
bid --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: -- or whatever it's
called.
Is the current contract that's in place, in place long enough for it to give us the time to kind of rethink how we might want to do the videoconferencing for probably a few months?

MR. VILLANUEVA: So the current contract runs through December 31st. I would have to go and discuss it with them in terms of making sure that there's sufficient funding in the contract. I had already brought that up to them in August. As I'm looking at possibilities, they're amenable to that. They are waiting for your discussion today though. And that's really the long and short of it.

They -- there -- like I said, there is a strong support by the CSA, by the Auditor's Office, to ensure that what you as a Commission need as you start up for your meetings, and the requirements for transparency and public engagement, are there for you.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: So but -- so even if that -- I mean, so when you say that you want to check to see if there is enough budget, you mean enough budget left on the contract? Or enough budget in the -- in the auditor's pot? Because they can always send us a bill, right? You said yesterday they sent bills.

MR. VILLANUEVA: No, it's really in terms of the contract. So --
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.

MR. VILLANUEVA: So with -- so one of the reasons you do the costing, right, on the front end is so you know -- you can budget out for the work.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.

MR. VILLANUEVA: So if the work's going to be extended, it's just due diligence to make sure that there's sufficient funding to accomplish that work. And so it --

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.

MR. VILLANUEVA: -- would behoove me then, as part of the discussion, to bring that to the table with them, and that's something we would look at. And so if that needs to happen then the auditor would have to go through the process then to do that, which is fairly straightforward. But again, it's just part of due diligence.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm going to -- I do remember you talking about that, Raul, about whether or not this contract encompassed everything. I guess what I'm -- was looking at is I was looking at it as a pure videography contract. And can't we do the AT&T piece of it as a separate contract? I think that's -- I was trying to keep them separate --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Uh-huh.
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- versus having a videographer not only deal with -- focus on videography, but then also bring in that AT&T component. And maybe that might be too much for someone? I mean, maybe that's not their expertise, would be the AT&T component of it. So I guess I -- we didn't really have a chance to discuss it as a subcommittee. So I guess we're discussing it now. And I think for me, I was just trying to keep them separate and pure --

MR VILLANUEVA: Right.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- so that we could potentially get the true expertise in each area and try to be more efficient about it.

MR. VILLANUEVA: So here's what got me thinking about it. If you do something by Zoom, can we figure out how to do the public comment by Zoom? Are there other options that we haven't looked at? And because we have to pipe it through the meeting, at some point there has to be some kind of a -- of a partnership between the other entity, if another entity is doing it, and the videography.

When you start looking at the statement of work, we haven't asked for that partnership. That's important because as the perspective contractor is pricing out their work, pricing out their staffing and work plan, if
the scope of work isn't covering those things, then
they're not also allocating resources that are needed to
do that. And that would be an inadequacy in the
statement of work.

Another thing that caught my mind was -- so for
example, Commissioner Sinay and I, we worked for quite a
bit to try and find her a place to where she could be
present for the meeting. I was unable to find any
government building because they're all closed. Okay?

So what happens in November and December when the
Commission wants to go out and engage the public? What
are our opportunities there? And what if at some point
the Commission has to set up its own little stations as
it were? Videography would be a part of that, and we
haven't included that in the scope the work. And so
I'm -- those -- okay -- So anyway --

So you get the point in terms of my concerns with
that scope of work? It -- the way I was looking at it,
when I originally developed it was based on -- what I'm
seeing now is much more of a linear -- how we're doing it
now -- or how you were -- or how the ARC was doing
things. And this is a different ballgame. And again,
your discussion yesterday about the line drawer was so
key to me in terms of making me want to sit back and go,
have we really envisioned what you're going to need out
of what's really a very, very key player for your
meetings? And for your public engagement.

And so anyway -- so that's why I felt -- you know, I
have to bring that up as part of the discussion for your
consideration.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So you don't feel -- excuse
me. And I'm just getting into the little nuts and bolts
of this --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- but on -- let's see,
page 5 starts the videoconferencing and teleconferencing
requirements. You don't feel that encompasses enough of
what we need for the remote side of it? Because it does
talk specifically about --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yes. It does.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- remote and -- yeah.

From telephonic connections from remote attendees and
different information. So you don't feel that it
encompasses enough detail?

MR. VILLANUEVA: So --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Or requirements or
coordination?

MR. VILLANUEVA: So what that is predicated on is
the individual who's calling in, finding their own place,
and that place having its own capabilities for internet
and telecommunications. That's what that is predicated on. And so what happens, like I said, if we want to set something up, because everything's closed. It -- that scope of work is going to accomplish that. And so at that point then we would be faced with either developing some other contract or making do with the current, because the scope of work doesn't fit it.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So is it something, Raul -- I'm just trying to, you know, grasp this. And I apologize for running back and forth on this. Is it something that we could do an addendum to this process, and maybe just communicate with the three that submitted? Or do we have to go back out? Do we have to -- would your recommendation be to just completely do away with what we have, start over again, and go through the process? I'm just trying to understand the -- what your recommendation would be and what would be the most efficient for us.

MR. VILLANUEVA: So the actual vehicle is going to depend on the vision that's designing the scope of work. It could be that a small business contract may not be large enough to carry it through. And we may have to go through a master services agreement or another means. I think it really depends on what the vision is for that and what needs to be included. That's -- so that's as
far as I got on the drive up today. You know, it's like, okay, hit wall, let's hear what the Commission has to say on the subject.

CHAIR TURNER: I'm wondering if -- oh, Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, one more I -- well, first of all I really appreciate, Mr. Villanueva, that you bring this forward, because this is a crucial part. And where -- when we define a scope of work, and then we realize that, you know, we might not have included things, particularly in this time of Covid when things are so up in the air, it's tricky to consider everything.

And another item that I'm thinking we might need the videographer help for, that we have not even addressed yet, is the language interpreter. Because I know one option -- well, obviously, we'll talk about this later, but it isn't just video in person, but there's actually a whole videography aspect of it that would have to be incorporated with the videographer. And I -- that hasn't even been brought up yet. So in terms of is -- I don't know the contract well enough, and if it is there -- there might be things that will come up that we will not anticipate yet.

But I don't know if we need to flush all that out yet. Can we do it, as Commissioner Fernandez said, in
like a type of addendum for future work coming up? I don't know if the -- I didn't read the details of the contract that well. So is it priced such that we could then put a number on the additions? And because I think this is not just -- you know, rather than try to define our scope right now, which I don't think we fully know and understand, but I don't think we need -- but I don't want to be held -- the videographer held to it as the scope is changing.

Do you see where I'm trying to come from? I don't know that the depth of the -- flexibility in the contract.

MR. VILLANUEVA: That's the key thing --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: But if -- I just want to -- I want to piggyback on that a little bit of what Commissioner Andersen said, is I've been involved with state contracts before and actually, like, at the CalPERS level. So they have more flexibility. And it's absolutely true where what you go out and you scope changes as you go through the process, correct? And so as you go along you actually do make changes and amendments to the contract. And you know, you work -- you go back to the vender and you're amending the contract in terms of what your additional scope and then the additional costs.
So I mean, that's my -- I guess I'm just a little concerned we're -- I appreciate, Raul, you bringing up that it's not including something, but I'm sure it's not including some other things too that we're not going to know about until, like, next month or the month after. And I feel at some point we have to just -- and I'm not saying it's right now, I'm just saying it's -- but at some point we have to just, you know, bite the bullet, have the contract, and then normally you do have -- there is a process to make amendments to it. Once -- you know, as you move along and you realize that you've got -- you know, there's like a change order or whatever you want to call it. But anyways. So that's -- and thank you, Commissioner Andersen, for bringing that up. Because, you know, I have had experience in that where you do have the contractor and you are able to change and add on to the scope as needed.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. I see you Commissioner Sinay and Le Mons, right before, and Yee, right before. The point that I wanted to say is that I'm hopeful that we will have opportunity to go back to the three small businesses that have applied and at least ask for question of their capabilities.

I don't know a lot of videographers, but the one that I'm -- I am familiar in working with, a lot of them
by being small business are actually used to going to remote sites and performing some of their services. So this may not be so far outside of their scope. Granted this has a little bit more, you know, degree of difficulty in what we're asking them to do. But if we could start by adding in having additional conversation and letting them tell us if this something that they think they'd be able to accomplish or not, it might inform us whether or not we need to automatically move to a master service agreement.

So I have now Commissioners Sinay, Le Mons, Yee, and Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Commissioner Le Mons had his hand up first. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you, Commissioner Sinay. And thank you, Madam Chair. First I want to thank Raul as well. I really appreciate the thoughtfulness that you brought to this, and the thoughtfulness you've brought to this process in general. I think that you have been an invaluable resource to us. I really wanted --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: -- to appreciate you for that. And also the way you even manage the communication. I think you do it very brilliantly in
terms sharing your point of view. You're being very respectful of, you know, where that intersects with our role, etcetera. I really appreciate it.

I think that what I'm hearing and supporting of what Raul is saying, is I think there's a re-envisioning opportunity. And I think the comparison was to how we were looking at the line drawers. So we know that there is a set of tasks that these particular expertise bring, but because we're -- the fourteen of us, I think, are looking at things in different ways. So the most, I think, appropriate word that comes to my mind is reimagining, and is there an opportunity to reimagine this particular piece and how it's going to work; not just for the meeting facilitation, but some of the other things that we're going to need and want.

So I guess for me it would be a question of -- it sounds like we potentially have contracts in place that may be robust enough financially to take us through December, which gives us a little time, if that's indeed the case, to actually do this re-envisioning. And I think we could do it parallel to the re-envisioning that we're going to be doing with the line drawing.

So provided we don't create a gap in service, because we know we cannot have that --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Uh-huh.
COMMISSIONER LE MONS: -- and we're able to do this re-envisioning opportunity, I would really support -- and not us figuring it out today, but us of course relooking at how we would approach this. So that's -- that's my thought.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay? Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you, the -- Commissioner Le Mons, and Madam Chair. And Raul, I really appreciate that you are slowing us down, because sometimes I feel like you're speeding us up. And this was a bit, hey, slow down and think about it. So as Commissioner Le Mons said, your input is really valuable. I would not have thought of what I'm thinking right now if you hadn't done that.

And in all my little Post-Its -- I am trying to organize all my little Post-Its -- I do -- I did write down different tool -- kind of workshop presentation, whatever, to understand what the world looks like. What are -- what are our opportunities for using different technology and tools for engagement. As much as we would like to say by December we'll be out in the community, really the news is saying, you know, it's going to be in that mid-2021. And so we really need to stop looking at 2010 and how it's been done, and look -- you know, and think differently --
MR. VILLANUEVA: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And so I do feel that one of our agenda items will have to be inviting different people who are looking at line mapping and which rules are there for line mapping for government meetings, as you were saying, not just public comments, but even how we engage and share. Is Zoom the best way?

Public engagement, you had brought it up, but in general, not just public comments, but how we're going to engage the community.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: You know, our dockets -- there's so many different pieces that we need. And some things I think we -- we just want to be -- we want to explore with staff and some things staff is just -- we just need to say, hey, we need better this.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: But it is a whole new world we're in. And if we've been in it for about seven -- eight months, however long we've been in it, it's -- and people are really innovative, and so I would love to hear what is out there. Who's been trying things differently and what's what? We're not the only ones in this things that --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Uh-huh.
COMMISSIONER SINAY: So I would support exactly what Commissioner Le Mons said, is let's reimagine -- let's get the information we need to be able to reimagine. And then let's get the support we need to make that vision a reality.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Yee and then Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you and good morning everyone. On Commissioner Sinay's point she just made, I'm imagining there's like scores of state Commissions having this exact same conversation, because, you know, they all have similar requirements, you know, for public comment and videography and so forth. I guess I'm wondering -- it's probably a rabbit trail -- but I'm wondering if there's, you know, any office in the state government that's kind of looking at this at a more global level. How can we provide services for all these different bodies, Commissions, whatever, boards that do need these services, so --

And also, I'm wondering, you know, since, you know, every meeting we're going to need videography and public comment facilities functionality, is there any -- is there any point in maybe thinking about making this a staff position and staff functionality? You know, I know we don't meet every day, but if we're paying tons and
tons for outside contractors to do this, there could be
some advantage to that maybe? But of course we'd have to
get our own equipment and so on. I don't know.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Is that realistic or even worth
considering?

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you, Chair, everyone
who's already commented. And Raul, I also want to add my
thanks and appreciation to you. I'm glad that you
brought up what you did. I think these are the kind of
things that help us to be a better Commission in terms of
hearing the public comment too. I think it helps us to
think about things that maybe because of our own
perspectives and our own blind spots, we may not have
considered, or even thought to even realize that we
should be considering. So I think that this was -- has
been incredibly helpful.

I would -- two -- two things that I want to just
build on. One is, I think about our time yesterday
around the public comments and the concerns about making
sure that people are going to be able to take part and
the checks that have had to be enacted to make sure that
the lines are open and other things like that. And as I
think about that, it makes me think even more so that
what Raul was bringing up is an important part of our responsibility to the people of California, to ensure that there's -- as best, as efficient, as effective, and as -- and I'm going to say innovative ways in which we could use the tools that are out there to ensure that we can engage everybody in the best possible way.

I -- one of the things that kept going through my mind is, can we allow them to call in on the Zoom too, so that then we can see who's in queue. We can even see who was just curious and listening in. Or at least we can even see their faces, to be honest. So in a true kind of public meeting, we would be able to see them as well as they see us.

And so those are the kind of spots that I'm thinking about that would be good in terms of, as Commissioner Le Mons had said, reimagining what this could be. I feel like we're in a much different place. And most likely when we first drafted this, even though you knew that there was a COVID timeframe --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Uhm-huh.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: -- I don't think anybody thought that we were still going to be in this moment where we are today, still unable to meet in person and to travel. So I do -- I do want to just bring that up. And so -- I'll just stop there. I'll just stop there.
CHAIR TURNER: (Indiscernible). Okay. Fernandez, Andersen, Toledo.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just want to comment to Commissioner Akutagawa, is -- in our -- in my school board meetings we also had Zoom, obviously, but we also had the capability of -- we had -- I think it was the -- we separated people out in terms of an attendee versus actual, like, board member, Commissioner. And then if they wanted to do public comment, we had somebody that could actually bring them into -- so that we could see them. So there is that capability. And I would be hopeful that we could do that. And then maybe we're not dealing with the people calling in having telephone issues? But I mean that's a really --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm surprised we didn't have it. But that just triggered my memory that it is possible to do that. So that's a good thing to look further into.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh. Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. This is -- I'm trying to piggyback on a bunch of great ideas that we're all saying. I love Commissioner Le Mons' idea of reimagining the scope. And then Commissioner/Chair Turner, the way you said, well, what -- can we go back to
our three videographers who brought in their ideas? I think that dovetails exactly into what a couple of call-ins yesterday on the line drawing. Why don't we come up with like -- basically, putting off -- giving room for Commissioner Sinay to add her blue notes.

Let's add -- get experts to come in and present this information to us. To confirm yes, these things can happen. There -- I know a bunch of (indiscernible) and there are security issues with how you do this. But we don't need to go through this right now. We have experts who are bidding on it who can tell us what -- how -- the best ways to do these things. And we (indiscernible) with like the line drawing. We'll have some experts come and present to us. So we need to actually have -- almost like the -- you know we were talking about a little workshop. But more of a day of our next meeting, actually have these -- have people come or they can present -- or I -- the only thing that I need from Raul is how do we set something like this up, such that we can get (indiscernible) without having anyone who would want to bid on it to be these experts. How would they not get disqualified by doing that? So there's -- there's the logistics of that.

But basically, I think, we need to kind of back off for a minute and get our experts out there to tell us how
we -- their opinions, essentially.

    MR. VILLANUEVA: Uh-huh.

    COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So we can evaluate -- well, look, video -- I'm sure the videographers are saying, oh, golly, guys, you can do this, and this, and this, and this. And we're fumbling around here because it's not our field.

    MR. VILLANUEVA: Right. Right. Right.

    COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That's where I'm going.

    CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Thank you. I see you, Raul. Can we go Toledo, Sadhwani, Raul, and then Turner?

    COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. Just very quickly. And can you hear me?

    CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

    COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Oh. Perfect. Thank you. So I also welcome the idea of re-envisioning or visioning a little bit more about this and updating the scope. And one thing that -- one element that I think is really critical for us to look at is also the security threats around all of our communications. And I know that this has been an -- this -- that we are, as a Commission, looking into this. But just -- one thing that -- our county government was recently -- had a -- I think it's referred to as a Zoom bombing, or a Zoom attack, or a cyber-attack --
CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Uh-huh.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes. It is.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And it was pretty awful, and it was targeted -- it was a controversial issue though, thing, brought up. And because of that it -- it was a -- it was actually an international attack. And so it stopped the whole process and brought it to a standstill. So I would hate for something like that to happen. For us to really think through security elements of it, given that the topics that we may be encountering might be of a controversy or of passion for some groups.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I -- thank you both (indiscernible). I so appreciate this comment of slowing down, reimagining. I agree with everything folks are saying. And to that end, I'm wondering, we've been on item 16 for a while now, and we've only covered two of the points. Both it seems like we're coming to this resolution of, we need to think about what our plan and process will be. So I'm wondering if at some point -- and maybe that will be different for language interpretation -- well, language interpretation, my stance is we're going to have a long conversation about that too. (Indiscernible) American Sign Language,
because I think we recognize the need for it. We need all of them (indiscernible). I honestly wondered if we want (indiscernible). I honestly wonder if we want --

MS. JOHNSTON: Can you move closer to the mic?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. If we want to move ourselves --

MS. JOHNSTON: You're breaking up.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh. Sorry. I thought I had put stuff --

MS. JOHNSTON: Right.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Is that better?

MS. JOHNSTON: For the moment, but it goes in and out.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. I'll switch to a head phone. I guess I'm kind of a -- wondering if we want to switch to item 23, so we can actually start having a wider conversation about vision, future, and then maybe come back to finalizing -- or having some conclusion about -- or is this something we want to punt to our next meeting to (indiscernible). Something of that nature.

But just to -- I think we keep coming back to this piece of we need to think big picture before we can get to the details of contract.

So just in terms of process do we want to move --

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.
MR. VILLANUEVA: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- forward and then kind of recognize that we need to come back to all these key (indiscernible), whether that's later today or at our next meeting.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh. Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just wanted to say both Commissioner Sadhwani and Commissioner Andersen, it's really hard to hear you today. So I don't know if both of you could please use mics or something, because you're both coming in and out.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Raul?

MR. VILLANUEVA: So rather than going to further discussion, I was going to tell you a little story about the line drawer thing. But instead let me -- let me move -- kind of move things forward. If you're at a point where you've decided that really you need to revision the original intent for that scope of work to find a more appropriate scope of work, then really the next step is to take a vote for -- really -- let me go back. Is someone would need to make a motion to reject that solicitation and to begin process for a new one. You don't have to delineate the process, but you do have to end that solicitation in a formal manner.

The other thing that I would suggest is instead of
moving too much forward, you're MSA contracts with the American Sign Language and the transcriptionists, those may be easier wins in terms of being able to decide -- to vote those in or not.

Also, I'd like to put on the table, yesterday there was a recommendation by a subcommittee, the subcommittee for the Chief of Counsel, to go out and do a search -- an executive search. So there are public entities that can do that. And you can then at -- so then you can have a motion for me to go and obtain the information for a perspective interagency agreement, which would be much faster. If you go with a private company, you're going to go RFP. And so my suggestion is allow me to do the interagency search first, and if you don't like that then you're looking at the RFP.

I know that's about three things on the list, but --

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. Let -- why don't we go one at a time? But I do -- I do agree Raul, we -- because I think the transcription one, like you said, and the American Sign Language that -- we could go through that quickly because that's a multiple services agreement or something like that?

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yes, exactly.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So why don't we -- why
don't we go with the videographer --


COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh. Okay. Okay, so -- so then I would do a motion that we -- we not make a decision on the videographer and go back and re-envision and -- re-look at the scope of the RFP.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So that's my motion for that piece of it. Is that what you're looking for, Raul?

MR. VILLANUEVA: If I may. It has to be a little bit more direct than that. The motion would be that you reject the current solicitation --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

MR. VILLANUEVA: -- and then the second part of --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So what I said plus reject it. Does that cover it?

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Well, I -- I don't know -- I suppose. Marion should respond to that.

MS. JOHNSTON: Is there a second --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Does that cover it, Marion?

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes. Is there a second?
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. I think --

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'll second.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I'll second.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: You need public comment before you take a vote.

CHAIR TURNER: And before we do public comment, is there -- are there others in this grouping that we will be also making a motion on?

MR. VILLANUEVA: Oh. Very good.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh. That's right. So we should probably get all of them. Sorry. My bad. Okay. So that's one of them. That's one of the motions. What's the other motion?

The other motion -- oh. I don't know if we are in agreement of going forward with the Chief Counsel to do a public search contract and to direct Raul to look into that to see if there are interagency agreements?

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I think that was the second piece, right Raul?

CHAIR TURNER: Oh. Is that -- that's not under 16. That's not under 16 I believe.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It is not. It is not.

CHAIR TURNER: So what we're looking for is resolution or a path forward for the language interpreter, transcription contract --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh. Okay.

CHAIR TURNER: -- and American Sign Language.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So for the transcription contract, I'll let -- and also for the American Sign Language, I'll let Raul talk about that, because those are --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Necessary --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- state agreements --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yes.


MR. VILLANUEVA: Okay. So those are both master services agreements, as I described yesterday. And by the way, I wasn't trying to give you full education on all the different types of contracts. There's probably about twenty, thirty, or more, or types of bidding. Anyway. So the master services agreement is done on -- by the state on behalf of providing the opportunity for other entities within the state to obtain those services. So as such, they've already been pre-bid, the contractors have already been evaluated, the costs have already been negotiated, and the contract is in place. And so part of
the process then is identifying which of the vendors, per say, is the one that provides the services in your specific area; which is for the transcription and the American Sign Language, that's the case. I'd have -- we'd have to pick the vendor here in Sacramento.

The contracts that I've developed with them take into consideration live-person as well as by video. Since we don't know when we'll be able to do a live-person again, but they include both. And they're amenable to that. There's a preliminary costing to set the basis of the budgeting for each of the contracts. And the rest of it is boilerplate. You have to -- you basically piggyback on the master services agreement.

Any questions? And you have copies of those. And they've also been posted, by the way.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: So there's no MSA for any of the other services, videography? So --

MR. VILLANUEVA: The videography, you could obtain that through the California Master -- the CMAS, master agreement. I haven't looked into that. But I know there's videography on that.

CHAIR TURNER: So -- Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: My apologies. I -- I'm wondering if we're going too much in the weeds, to a
certain extent, on administrative right now just because
we don't have the executive director. This one I'm --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- fine with. But if we can
kind of remember that we will have an executive director,
hopefully in maybe, say a month. And, you know, and
we're going to have to figure out how we're going to work
with that executive director and other staff, because I
kept reading admin -- you know, that the last Commission
went too much into administrative, and I'm not sure what
they meant by that. So I would like to meet with 2010
and understand what they meant by that.

So just -- just so that we can differentiate what is
administrative, what is -- you know, what is -- the
different pieces that -- if there are things that we feel
that we might want to wait until we have an executive
director, because they're the one that's going to manage
it, and we do have that time, then it might be good for
us to spend our time that -- our limited time we have
today on looking at more the vision, the gen -- the
things we need to understand for our work that will slow
down our timeline if we get too caught up in
administrative.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Well, right now I can't extend the
services for your meeting without the Commission
authorizing that to occur. Because I agree with you. A lot of things should wait for the executive director. But being able to have your meeting -- and so that's really why you're seeing these specific ones, the American Sign Language, the transcription, the videography. And then you'll have the discussion about the foreign language interpreter. Because those are the core basis for your meeting.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.

MR. VILLANUEVA: And without them, your meetings stop and -- because I don't think we do them in the dark.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So we have a motion and a second for the videographer. And Raul, what you're speaking about now is a master service agreement for the transcription contract and for the American Sign Language?

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yes, Chair.

CHAIR TURNER: So those two points. Is there a motion and second for those for further discussion?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm just going to --

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner -- uh-huh?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm just going to respond to Commissioner Sinay. In our subcommittee we were actually talking about -- gosh, I can't wait for the executive director to come on board so that we don't have
to do this. Because we know that right now we're having
to do it because there is no one else. But yes,
definitely looking forward to staff coming on board, and
then it would be them reporting to us and us not having
to review this to the detail --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Uh-huh.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- and get, you know, our
fingers into it; which we shouldn't have to. And in
terms of for transcription and sign language, I guess I
make a motion to move forward with those. I guess it
would be separate -- separate or can I --

MS. JOHNSTON: You can --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- combine them?

MS. JOHNSTON: You can combine them.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So that we go
forward with the MSA agreements with both of those.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Toledo, were you
waiting?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: No. No. Sorry about that.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh. Okay.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I'll second the motion.

MS. JOHNSTON: I'm sorry. Who was that?

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yee.
MR. VILLANUEVA: I have a point of order, please.
Marion, do they have to specify the specific contractor in each one, or can they -- can the motion be general like that, that -- because they've seen the MSA?

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes. They can be -- to -- you're approving the ones that are currently in place.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Very good.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So we have --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: -- a motion and second for the videographer solicitation, and together a motion and a second for American Sign Language and transcription contract. And so under 16, what's left is the language interpretation, solicitation, and there's a discussion of options that we can have there.

MS. JOHNSTON: And I have one comment about the line drawing, Madam Chair.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh. Yes. I'm -- thank you, Marion. Please go on. Go onto this side.

MS. JOHNSTON: On the line drawing, first of all, I wanted to call your attention to section 8253(b) of the government code, which says that the legislature shall develop -- provide the public with access to a computer software for drawing maps. And I was informed yesterday by the assembly representative that that is in process.
There's a beta version of it. It should be ready soon for the Commission to explore. And he would like to have that on the agenda for the next meeting. But that will help with public input on line drawing.

And secondly, I want to correct a misstatement I made yesterday. I misunderstood Karin MacDonald. She did not apply for the first line drawing, but she has not decided yet whether she wanted to apply when you redo it. So I just wanted to correct that mistake on my part.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. On the language interpreter solicitation, is there -- are there any questions, comments? Because subcommittee, I don't think -- did you have that one? I don't think so. Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: No. We didn't -- we didn't have that. I think that Raul was going to talk about it, because he -- well, he mentioned about potentially small business, MSA, or bid. So I wasn't sure. There hadn't been any work done on it yet.

MS. JOHNSTON: I think we need some parameters from the commissioners about how extensive services you wish to have.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Uh-huh.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh. Thank you. Commissioner Sinay and Commissioner Andersen next.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: In general, this -- on this
whole contracts thing, when we're looking at small businesses, does that include nonprofits? And how -- do we have the capacity to do grants or are, you know, or contracts with nonprofits, both on this language -- this language, you know, capacity piece, as well as in the future when we're talking about outreach -- that's a long time away, but just for me to have an understanding of how has the government set up parameters to contract with the nonprofit community?

MR. VILLANUEVA: So as far as the small business option, that's actually a certification you apply. It's very straightforward, very "easy to get" in terms of the requirements. There's not -- and by easy, I mean there's not a lot of bureaucracy; it's been very streamlined. So if you're going to -- when you do a small business solicitation, there's a whole database of businesses that have the small business certification and Disabled Veteran Business Enterprise certification. And you go straight to that database.

In regards to contracting with a nonprofit entity, I would have to look into that.

MS. JOHNSTON: A nonprofit could qualify as a small business, but we don't know if they have yet.

MR. VILLANUEVA: I don't know enough to -- I would want to learn more to be able to provide you reliable
information. I'm not at that place right now. I mean, that could be -- I just don't know.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can I do a follow-up?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: My concern is, as I said yesterday, is that there is a tradition -- I don't know if tradition's the right way, but there is an expectation a lot of time when government, academics, others go into communities to expect the communities to do the work for free.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And I don't want us continuing that practice. And so I really want us to think, how are we going to make sure that community groups or individuals in the community get funded appropriately.

And I also would say that I wish that the speakers who spoke to us did get paid because to me, that's a cleaner line that we hired you to do this versus they did it and we, you know -- what conflicts of interest statements, things like that, did we ask of them?

So I just want us, not at this -- not right now, and maybe to put it in the agenda, is to really think through how we create the walls, because we really have created a really big wall between us and the community advocacy groups that we make them call in and do public
I mean, if you look at our speakers, they weren't very diverse ethnically. They weren't very diverse professionally. They weren't almost very diverse gender-wise. So I really want us to think about equity -- access to equity, our own access to diverse information and diverse speakers. And so when I'm saying hey, we need to think through how we're going to pay the community for the work they're doing, I'm also saying hey, we need to pay academics for the work they're doing and we need to pay, you know, whatever. I just want us to really think through how we do this ethically, equitable, and sustainable for the community.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Akutagawa and then Commissioner Kennedy, please?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. And I just want to support what Commissioner Sinay said also as well, too. I think -- this wasn't my original comment, but I do want to just build upon what she said. I think that there's going to be some value that we would get from other sources other than just academics. And I say because for example, our public commenter, Sofia Garcia, from the Dolores Huerta Foundation yesterday, she brought up some really important points that again, I think this
is what I referred to earlier, that they help us to think
through things that perhaps we may not have even realized
to ask.

So I do want to just say that having some other
opportunities to utilize someone other than just a
company or an academic would be helpful, in terms of
being able to assess, you know, where are we going to get
the best kind of services that will help us to look at
all the different angles.

I do want to say, though, in terms of the small
business certification, I am aware -- so I run a
nonprofit. We have tried to get small business
certification, but because we're a nonprofit, we do not
fit cleanly for that kind of certification.

So nonprofits, you're -- at least in my experience,
I don't know if you're going to find those that have that
kind of certification. We fit in this other weird
category because we're a nonprofit, so I think it's going
to be a question of whether or not as a nonprofit
organization, would one of the many various organizations
that provide language interpretation services; would they
be qualified as a potential bidder for a contract to
provide interpretation services?

And I do agree that many times, those that have
their specialized language capabilities are oftentimes
asked to do it for free. And given how stretched nonprofits are right now, the smart ones, I will say, are saying no if they can't do it, unless they're going to get paid because there's just -- they just don't have the bandwidth or the capabilities of doing everything that they're committed to doing, but are -- and then trying to do other things that they're not getting paid to do, but still may be in alignment with their work and their mission, but are just not getting paid.

I know that there's a lot of hard choices being made right now, so I think as much as we can be mindful of being able to pay people for their services, I think most people would probably very much appreciate it in this current time right now.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa. Totally in agreement.

Commissioner Kennedy, Andersen, and Sadhwani, and -- yeah.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madam Chair. For Raul and for Marian, do we have the possibility, in the case of invited speakers; do we have the possibility of offering an honorarium, you know, even if it's something like, you know --

MR. VILLANUEVA: I don't think so.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- one day of our per diem,
you know. If our per diem is 375 dollars, when we invite someone in to speak, we pay them 375 dollars in the form of an honorarium, without having to go out for bids and stuff.

MS. JOHNSTON: I don't believe so.

MR. VILLANUEVA: If I may also, I don't disagree with -- on one level with a lot of the ideas that are being put out. At a certain point, though, you've got to remember, you're a state Commission, okay? And because you're a state Commission, there are certain restrictions, if you want to look at them that way. The other way to look at them is there's certain responsibilities because you're a state Commission and you're paid with state dollars. That carries certain responsibilities and certain requirements.

So while some of these ideas are really good in the abstract, trying to figure out how you intersect them with you as a state Commission could be challenging. So that's why with the question about can you contract, or how do you contract with nonprofits, I don't know. I would have to look into that. Nonprofits is a notion this big; there's a lot of different types of entities. That's not an easy one, you know. But I have no problem going and investigating that for you.

MS. JOHNSTON: And on the honorarium question, the
honorarium is payment to you for your work. You can't transform that somehow into a payment to someone else. I mean, you personally could make a gift of it, I suppose, but it cannot be a Commission decision.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right. I mean, I was just using that as a yardstick.

CHAIR TURNER: Right.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I mean, I've been -- I've lectured at the Foreign Service Institute and other places and received honoraria of 250 a day or 500 a day, depending on, you know, and some of these are government entities like the Foreign Service Institute; others are not.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Right.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: But you know, generally, an honorarium is not intended to fully compensate for someone's time --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: But it is intended to, you know, express understanding that a person's time is valuable.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: And so when I mentioned our per diem rate, that was just as a yardstick.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Right.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: That would fall in that range of honoraria that I've received when I've gone out and spoken at various places. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh. Thank you. Commissioner Andersen, Sadhwani, Yee, and Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. Can everyone hear me, or am I breaking up?

MS. JOHNSTON: You're better.

CHAIR TURNER: You've been good for right now.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. I'm getting a -- I need to get a microphone.

So basically, we don't have to reinvent the wheel on this, it turns out. The court system has been looking at interpreters and video interpreters for several years now, and this is -- it's a really crucial, important issue. We need interpreters who can -- basically that we supply. And I totally agree with the idea, we don't want to have to have our nonprofits paying for this service. It should be on us, as we -- our American Sign Language interpreters and transcribers. We incur these costs for us.

And the court system actually does have something like this in place. I don't know the -- I don't understand the full details of it, but there is a person who was involved in early pilot programs for that, and
who could possibly come and speak to us about the latest ways that these are all being done, and it's not just the court system, but it's other state organizations also.

And my understanding, having a brief discussion with her, is that there's also the same group, they actually have the areas of the state; if you say I'm going to go to, you know, Butte County.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And they'll say, ah, up in Butte County, these are the common other languages that are spoken. And they have up to six different ones in all different areas. And they're not just, oh, yeah, they're Spanish or it's -- oh, there's Phuong. There's different dialects of Vietnamese. And then they actually get those experts, and they can say, if you're going here, these are the language experts you need, and then I believe there's a group that then can supply those people --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yes, yes, yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- to us. Then it's up to us to make sure that that's correct.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: But -- so it's like, we could then check with our nonprofits --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Certified court reporters.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- or our advocates in the areas to say, are these the languages that you need. If they say yes, they are indeed, then we could actually hire them through this -- through a company who we've hired.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So I'd like to, as part of, like, this next -- bring in a few experts to talk to us about it before we move ahead, I'd like to actually see if we could bring this person in, actually explain to us about this, about what their knowledge is. And I'd like to see if Raul can pursue this a little further because my understanding is a bit shaky. And if he could pursue this to see if that's indeed the right direction.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Right.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Andersen.

And Raul, if you want to respond to Commissioner Andersen, please?

MR. VILLANUEVA: I just wanted to comment quickly that she -- Commissioner Andersen is talking about the certified court reporter's program. The discussion you had with Olivia over at CSA?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- except that that, you
know, so that has gone; there are other programs out there that are doing things like this --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- to become just a court reporter.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Right. So they have a database that -- so it's two things. One is, they have -- so in terms of the database regarding the languages that are spoken in different areas so that they have the right court interpreters to service the courts in those areas, that is part of that.

I did identify a small business that they specialize in providing interpretation services by certified court interpreters, and I'm looking into that. Anyway. So yeah, it's a higher level of interpretation sometimes, and you have to be careful when you're working with interpreters, because sometimes they'll work with an informal version of the language. So an example with Spanish, I can speak Spanish, and so I understand when it's a little bit less formal and -- anyway. And so you have to be careful with your -- the level of interpreter skill with the vendor, is what I'm going towards.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani, Lee, and Le Mons. Can't hear you.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Can you hear me now?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. Well, the speaker thing doesn't work.

So first, I just wanted to say I really appreciate this conversation. You know, I so appreciate Commissioner Sinay's comments about ensuring that we are hearing that there's (indiscernible); I really appreciate that. Thank you.

To that end, as I mentioned before, I feel like this live interpreter piece warrants a larger conversation about our process at raising an issue, how we move forward, et cetera, with this entire process.

If we are, as a state Commission, we need to hire a small business language interpretation service, I'm fine with that, and I think that we can also think broadly about how we engage community-based organizations just as we have talked about. And in addition to hiring one chief counsel, we might have additional legal consultants. I think we can think broadly and outside of the box about having community consultant -- community outreach consultants as well, that we can contract with, because I do agree that we cannot expect that community organizations or members are going to be acting for free on our behalf or, you know -- in order to support us in
some way.

So I think (indiscernible), there might be ways for us to think about that broader image and ensuring compensation for that. And I, you know, I agree that the people that we've talked (indiscernible), should be compensated as well at some level (indiscernible) or something.

But again, I would just reiterate that I think this is really for a different conversation and we can wrap up the pieces about transcription, and that's how we would come to that in a broader conversation.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yes.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Sadhwani, I think it's the equipment that we're using. We really are going to have to get to the point of how we can change these computers out and these phones. They're so unreliable and unpredictable as to when it will or won't work.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Or if we could, you know, just a good, you know, microphones, it'd really help.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Good headset, yeah.

CHAIR TURNER: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Can I make a recommendation? Commissioner Sadhwani, you're still going in and out, and I know that you put in your mic and your headsets, so you
may need to call in and participate. You can watch us on
the video but call in when you need to speak. But we can
keep trying.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. Am I coming through
okay?

MR. VILLANUEVA: Dial 877 --

CHAIR TURNER: Sometimes, Commissioner Andersen --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: You're going in and out as
well.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right. Okay.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioners Yee and then Le Mons,
please?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you. So I'm certainly all
for compensating generously, especially to help smaller
nonprofits and so forth, and to increase diversity.

Just a quick footnote, sometimes when presenters
come and so forth, it can be the case that it's within
their, you know, their job description and their day job.
I mean, I've been on that -- on the other side myself.
And so for instance, for Karin MacDonald, she is the
director of the state database, the Statewide Database,
and I don't know, but it may be the case that part of her
job description is outreach, you know, which would
include groups like us, so --

I mean, I'd love to pay her to talk about anything
any day, top dollar, but just to point out that
sometimes -- I mean, pro bono is not just doing a favor;
sometimes it is within the scope of --
MR. VILLANUEVA: Uh-huh.
COMMISSIONER YEE: -- a person's job to provide
information and outreach like that.
CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh. Thank you for pointing that
out.
Commissioner Le Mons?
COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes, thank you for pointing
that out, Commissioner Yee. I was going to say something
similar.
In addition, I think we convoluted a lot of
different points. I wanted to suggest that we give Raul
a very specific instruction to try to identify pathways
to be able to support nonprofit contribution and be
compensated, so that's something that needs to be
investigated and brought back what our options are.
The philosophical position of not expecting
nonprofits to give services for free, support that, no
assumption there that they ought to or should. I don't
think we necessarily had that assumption. I think more
importantly is how do we create a way so that we can
support, appropriately through compensation, if they're
outside of our current contracting systems, in the
context of the discussion that we're having currently. And same being with the various programs that are available to us with regard to language services. I'm now confused as to what exactly we are talking about specifically with regard to language services right now. I think that what we're trying to make a decision on is whether or not to continue with the Master Agreement that's in place. I need to have that clarified, and then if that limits us to any of the things that we've identified as desires in the last few minutes, then it would help me understand whether we move forward with that. If we can augment, then that would help me understand that we don't need to necessarily stop this particular process, but we want to be looking at augmentation as we move forward.

So if somebody could clarify the language, what we're actually trying to decide on the language piece right now.

CHAIR TURNER: Absolutely. With the language interpreter solicitation, because there was no subcommittee dealing with it, it has been kind of a broad conversation, but there are some options as to whether to continue with the Master Service Agreement in place, and then I think it came up because of discussions on the calls, as far as the inadequacies, perhaps in the moment
that we're in, that would allow people to call in from
different languages, have access. And so I think we're
just trying to broaden that out and see if it's still
applicable, or if there are other opportunities that we
need.

Commissioner Andersen and Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'll lean in and hopefully
you can hear me. Do we have a Master Service right now
for any language interpretation -- I didn't think --

CHAIR TURNER: We do not. Okay. Well, good we're
clarifying, Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I don't think there's
anything right now. MR. VILLANUEVA: No.

CHAIR TURNER: All right. Thank you.

And Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. You're absolutely
right. There isn't anything in place right now and I
think it was more of a discussion of if we're going to --
if as a Commission we want something in place and if so,
then provide the direction as to what we want. So there
isn't something right now.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yes, that's correct. So I
would just echo what I think Commissioner Sadhwani said.
This is a much bigger conversation for us to get to the bottom of it now. I think we've given Raul some direction to -- some direction at least to get started, but I think this couples in with, you know, the planning we're going to be doing on how we're going to execute our work and that will -- that planning will help inform, you know, exactly what we need in language interpretation services and how we want to go about getting it.

So I propose at this point that we put this issue aside and we take it up at a later date, and that we go forward with public comment on the motions that are on the table at this point, and then do the votes, and then wrap up action item -- or agenda item 16.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Before we do that, Raul, are you -- do you have clear direction on this particular item?

MR. VILLANUEVA: In regards to real-time interpretation during the meeting as needed, yes.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

MR. VILLANUEVA: I haven't heard -- because there was other discussions on translating the entire meeting; I haven't heard that, so I won't be looking at that right now. But as far as real-time interpretation of a speaker during the meeting, yes.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Great. So Commissioner
Fornaciari, yes, all can move forward with what -- now
that we're all clear of what Raul's going to do at this
time.

Is there a motion?

MS. JOHNSTON: You don't need a motion to instruct
Raul. He will come back with proposal for you next time.

MR. VILLANUEVA: You just got to tell me.

CHAIR TURNER: All right. Okay. And I think
Commissioner Fornaciari did indicate. Commissioner
Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just
to clarify, we are including interpretation when someone
calls in with public comment in a language other than
English?

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yes. So an email came to me and
asked about that, and I responded that like right now,
the Department of Consumer Affairs offers that service,
so anytime you walk into a Board office, you just pick up
the phone, indicate what language you need to be able to
work with, dial in the number, and there's the
interpreter right there. That may be a state contract,
in which case it would be easier for us to access
something like that.

So that was one of the directions that I was looking
at; I was offered some other options to look at.
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. And so do we need a motion to table this, or are we just going to table it?

MS. JOHNSTON: You just instruct Raul to come back at your next meeting.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So Raul, could you please come back with the detail for our next meeting for the language interpretation solicitation.

And so at this point, we will go to public comment, because we have motions on all of the other pieces. And this public comment line, we're opening the line for public comment on agenda item number 16 only, please.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you. If you wish to express public comment on agenda item 16, you may press 1 and then 0 on your telephone.

(Pause)

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: While we're waiting, can you hear me better now? Yes. Okay, good. Thank you. I changed around mics.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Very good.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'm going to grab my son's gaming headset soon.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Oh. That's good.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: You may be disappointed when they won't fit in that socket, in the jack. Because
these computers are older, you have to find the right jack.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, he'll get an adaptor for me.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I think there's something --

CHAIR TURNER: How are we doing, Ryan?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: There are no lines in queue.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Marian, can we go to vote, please?

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes. The first motion is to reject the videographer proposals and to have a discussion at the next meeting, re-envisioning what you would like to see for videography.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: 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 passes. Madam Chair?

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

MS. JOHNSTON: The next motion is to extend -- is that the right word?

MR. VILLANUEVA: No, to -- to --

MS. JOHNSTON: Renew?

MR. VILLANUEVA: To hire.

MS. JOHNSTON: To hire. Okay.
MR. VILLANUEVA: Well, to contract. To go ahead and contract.

MS. JOHNSTON: The next motion is to go ahead and contract through the master services agreement for transcription services and ASL services.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER 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. Someday I'm going to be the tiebreaker. Someday.

MS. JOHNSTON: Now you just make it unanimous. The motion passes.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: You hold the unanimous power.

MR. VILLANUEVA: That was good.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you so much. Commissioners, we'll go to break at this time. And we'll be back at -- let's take until 11:15, we'll be back. Thank you.

(Whereupon, a recess was held.)

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Welcome back from break. And we will continue on our agenda items. And what I'd like to do is to get a follow-up on, I think it was agenda item 14 on the Chief Counsel recruitment. Was there another piece there that needed to come back?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I believe the only thing was potentially entering into a -- and I don't know if this is something we can bring a motion on, is to potentially
contract for recruiting incentive.

   COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Actually, can we -- I do
have a bit more information on that, which I want to talk
to Commissioner Toledo at lunch about. But could we
postpone -- I think there's possibly a better way of
doing this, which might be more efficient.

   CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

   COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So could we hold off
negotiation until post-lunch?

   CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Then I'd like to go to the
follow-up on the report -- the census report -- response.

   COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. Thanks, Madam Chair.

   We -- Commissioner Toledo and I prepared draft letters
for your review, and edits, or approval. We also
accompanied with that a memo, kind of outlining our
thoughts of the strategy there.

   So we included a draft letter to the Secretary of
State and Census Bureau Director, as the first letter.

   Using almost exactly that same language, we also prepared
letters for your review to Senator Harris, our senator
here in California, who is authoring the senate version
of the bill that they are -- as they prepare an
accountable census act, as well as Representative Maloney
from New York.

   The bill in the Senate is currently in the Homeland
Security Committee. So before it would move forward, it has to go through that committee. So we also included a letter to Senator Ron Johnson -- I believe that's his name, correct -- of Wisconsin, who is the head of that committee, who would ultimately have the authority to move it forward.

So we certainly welcome your feedback to that. I don't know if that letter has -- and memo has made it up on the website yet. But certainly, we welcome feedback from the other commissioners in terms of their level of comfortability. And then when we had had this conversation before, we had said we would start with a letter and then discuss the possibility of an amicus brief, or even joining the lawsuits.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: At the advice given from counsel the other day, here in the public -- you know, in our public meeting, I had went ahead and sent emails to the lead counsel of two different lawsuits that are occurring. One being brought by both MALDEF and Asian Americans Advancing Justice, and another one representing the National Urban League and a number of others -- including, I believe, the state of California and the city of Los Angeles.

I actually have not heard back from any of those
emails that were sent. So I don't have much to report
back there. I don't think that it has to prevent us from
at least a conversation around an amicus brief that we
can do independently, on our own. But certainly, I don't
have anything to share about the ideas that were brought
up previously about joining litigation.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes. So I would -- I would
suggest that we maybe take some of these in steps.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Correct.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So if we start with a letter
to the Census Bureau and to the director because that's
ultimately what the full Commission wanted us to draft.
So let's -- and the focus of that letter is really around
the quality of the data, the potential for litigation,
the -- if we get data that's inaccurate and incomplete,
the importance of securing complete and accurate data for
the state of California, so that we can do our job. And
just highlighting the challenges that exist in California
around obtaining complete and accurate data and urging
them to take the time that's necessary to get a complete
count, and to do the quality controls, the follow-ups,
the -- I forget the exact terminology -- it's the --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Post-processing.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Post-processing. Thank you.
That's necessary to get us data that will reduce our risk in terms of litigation.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So -- and so it's a very -- I would say it's a very non-partisan letter in the sense of we're urging for a complete and full count of California's -- California's population so that we can -- so that we can do our job.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And so it's -- and so that's -- that's the -- that's that letter. And we -- so maybe we can begin there and just see if there's any discussion around that.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner Toledo, you want to lead that discussion?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: In terms of the discussion that we focused --

CHAIR TURNER: In terms of -- no, no. I'm sorry. In terms of, Commissioners, if you have any response --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Oh. Okay.

CHAIR TURNER: -- to the letter and just (indiscernible).

Commissioner Fernandez and Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. First of all, I just want to thank you both. I read the letters and I thank
you for the time and effort that you put into that. It really brings home what we're trying to do and what our concerns are.

The only question I had on the one for the Census Bureau is on the second paragraph, the first sentence talks about the work of the -- of our Commission and that we rely on the census data. And it says -- the letter says reapportionment decisions. I thought it was -- it should be more appropriate -- would it be, to say redistricting decisions versus reapportionment? I mean -- but we kind of went through that, like --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: We can make that change. That's a good -- that's a good catch. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. And that was the only -- and then my other -- I'm not an English major but I'm thinking -- I'm thinking this is going to be, you know, something that is formal, will go out there. And you know, we refer to April 13th. And I would -- I would advise, you know, making -- putting the year in there, also. I mean, because, you know, ten years down the road -- yeah. I'm not an English major, but I'm just thinking -- and I realize that's how the letter was that I believe the U.S. Senate sent. They just put the 13th; they didn't put the year. I think I'm just more of like on the legal side. You always try to put the --
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: We'll definitely put the year in.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- year. So that was the only thing. But other than that, thank you so much. I mean, I really -- it was well read. So thank you.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Thank you as well to the both of you on your working effort on this. I support the letters 2000 percent. And non-party affiliate is how I would be characterized. And there was a question in there.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. That was raised, actually, Marian had raised that for us, and I thought that was very astute. Technically speaking, our, you know, non-party affiliated friends on the Commission, colleagues, I think are identified as not being a member of one of the two major parties, technically. Right? So if anyone -- I think this is an opportunity -- if you all want to be identified -- however you want to be identified, please let me know. Let us know.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Do we have an option or is there --

MS. JOHNSTON: There's no standard option. You can come up with one you like.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Oh, okay. The non-party affiliate.

MS. JOHNSTON: Well, but some -- you may be a party affiliate of a different party.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: No, I'm not.

MS. JOHNSTON: Okay. If none of you are --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I'm clear on what I'm saying.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'm not either so --

MS. JOHNSTON: Is that true -- is that true of all the non-affiliated?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: If that's true, then non-party is fine.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No libertarians or green party?

MS. JOHNSTON: Could be.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Akutagawa and Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I just want to say that I think the official term on the voter registration is decline to state.

MS. JOHNSTON: Well, not necessarily because you could state another -- a minority party.

MS. JOHNSTON: Oh, that's -- okay.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Vazquez, go ahead.
COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah. Along this line, I guess it's sort of up to the Commission and possibly the authors or maybe we need something more specific. But a couple of the -- a couple of times it's mentioned we're a bipartisan Commission -- and I'm just -- I'm curious if we need to change that to multi-partisan? Multi-partisan?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Would that be non-partisan?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yeah. I thought about that, too. And I -- in terms of the bipartisan. But there really are two parties, and the rest of us are non-party affiliates, like, kind of -- and so I went back and forth on that. I did try nonpartisan as well and that didn't seem -- so we -- we're open to whatever the Commission wants to use.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Personally, I would recommend not non-partisan because I do think that we've been put together in many ways based on our party or non-party affiliations.

So to me, that's -- that doesn't say non-partisan. It just means we have -- parties have come together based on some previous agreements. I don't -- to me nonpartisan doesn't fit, and I'm sort of agnostic as to what the other term is, whether it's bipartisan or multi-
partisan.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Bipartisan plus, maybe.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Well, generally in advocacy letters, what I've seen is bipartisan because we really are a two-party system with -- two major parties, right? And the two major parties come together, and even though there are others involved but we can -- that doesn't mean that that's correct or the best terminology, but that's what I've seen in previously, right. And colloquially it's --

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yeah.

CHAIR TURNER: I see Commissioner Le Mons, there was a hand before you. Commissioner Andersen and then Commissioner Le Mons. And then Commissioner Kennedy. I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I think Commissioner Kennedy was first, so if you want to go ahead.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: You can go ahead. I'll hold for a second.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Can people hear me?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. A couple of things. Oh, on the bipartisan, remember in California we're used to multi-party and stuff, but these letters are actually going to the -- on the federal level, and they won't know
what we're talking about. Bipartisan to them means, oh, okay, you know, about half and half. So I think, and I agree with Commissioner Vazquez, you don't want to say nonpartisan because then that has a different meaning. We'll just have to stick with bipartisan since it's going to the feds, or to the federal level.

I actually have one great letter and an idea and the -- our -- the ideas I've come across were very good. And thank you very much for all your work. I do have some specific edits and two items which -- we're not leading with our strong suit in terms of, you know, the -- one is to imply, you know -- if the inacc -- if the data is inaccurate, by doing that -- by doing their action, they are causing legal ramifications for -- not just for us but also, essentially, anyone else who starts using the data. Like cities -- and basically, you know, cities, the counties, all the different other people who below them start -- have to use -- for redistricting purposes of all types, have to use this data. So that's an item we -- I'm not sure where to put that one in.

But just starting out, the first sentence, it says, "tasked with re-establishing the boundaries of our districts". That strike me as that's not the right word. I mean, we're not re-establish -- they are established. Should that just be re-drawing or re-districting at that
point? That's a question for the subcommittee. Then we already got them to change in the first -- second paragraph, second line. It's not reapportionment, it would be re-districting.

Then, after we're talking -- of the next couple of lines down, when -- and this is another idea, when you're saying, we are concerned with the early end to data collection will impact the quality of the census data, which the -- which we will utilize to draw the new legislative districts.

And to say something like, as you may not be familiar, California law requires all districting to use all of the people, regardless of their age or citizenship, and they must be counted. Emphasizing all people, in this case, because that is extremely important to us and everyone in California. And those are issues that are being parsed at this level, at this point. And that's not true in other states, where it is true for us. I think that's another strong argument on our case.

Then, let's see, a couple of lines down. And I can give these -- like, there's a comma missing. The third paragraph we say, "yet it has been further complicated by COVID-19 pandemic, which has limited the outreach communication efforts in hard-to-reach communities, including people of color, low-income, immigrant
families, Native Americans, and the homeless", we should definitely add in.

And then when you say, "particularly hard hit", including the uncounted and rural counties, then delete including, just say rural counties, tribal lands, as well as counties that have significant demographic change over the last ten years. I would delete "such as San Bernardino and Riverside", because that's too specific. It's too -- you know, there are many other -- there are changes up and down and it's too limiting.

Then the last sentence on the first page, "we strongly believe this is the best option of upholding the confidence and vitality of the entire process". Because you talked about portions of it, the apportionment, and if you say "entire process", that gets our -- the meaning across.

So those are my very specific comments. But great letter, great ideas. Really appreciate the work. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And thank you. That's great feedback and we'll incorporate it into our letter.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And I can -- I can send you like a, you know, like a little type-up of the couple of wordings if that's easier.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: That would be great if you
would. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes, that would be great.

I'm taking notes but the -- especially on the specific --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Me too.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- very specific ones,

that'd be great.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I can't do it that quickly,

so --

CHAIR TURNER: I see you, Commissioner Ahmad. There

was someone before you. Le Mons. Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah. It was me, but I don't

need to say anything else on this.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. I see Commissioners Kennedy,

Vazquez, and Ahmad. I was looking down for a minute, so

I'm not sure what order.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you, Madam

Chair. At the end of the second paragraph, starting,

"that means taking the time", that's not a complete

sentence. I can't figure out exactly how you want to

modify it, but it's not a complete sentence.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Just a quick -- I do have a

proper wording on that one. I missed it. Thank you. I

can send that to you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Okay. Yeah. In the last

paragraph on the first page, I, you know, I think you'd
want to be as air tight as possible. The original
deadline was not October 31st. They announced a deadline
of October 31st at some point, but, you know, the
original, original was something earlier than that.

So I'm not sure that the word, "original", helps us
there. And that's also -- that's both in the second line
and the third line. The fourth line, I think the wording
for the enumeration period is superfluous. This will
provide the time needed for self-response and non-
response follow-up, would seem to be sufficient on that
one.

I particularly appreciated your work in figuring out
who else to send letters to, because I do think that's
important. On some of these other letters, Maloney
letter -- well, I'll leave that one for now. The Harris
letter, I mean, this is just where we need to deviate a
little bit more from what is otherwise boiler plate. I
mean, if Senator Harris has introduced a bill, I think
asking her to push for passage of her bill, it comes
across a little odd. And maybe we just need to, you
know, express our support for her bill, again, rather
than asking her to support her bill.

And on the Johnson letter, at the very end, I would
instead of push for passage, I would say, expedite the
passage. If he is the chairman of the Commission, and we
expect that he may not be all that interested in moving
it, I think asking him to expedite the passage of it
would be a stronger wording.

But I think those are the main items that I would
add. But again, you know, I think it's very important,
and thank you for looking for where else we can send the
letters to.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. And maybe if we
can just get consensus. Because I just want to make sure
we have consensus on the first letter because that would
be the basis for everything else, including potentially
any other type of advocacy we may want to do.

And particularly, the arguments that are being made.
Right? The arguments around the data, the arguments
around counting everybody, and the need for specific data
around everybody, and the potential risk if we don't get
that data. Because the --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: My only --

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Before -- excuse me.

Commissioner Vazquez, please.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. My question was
probably for counsel. Do we need a motion to support
either of these pieces of legislation before we
officially send them? I get they're in draft form right
now and it's a concept, but curious if we need a motion.
MS. JOHNSTON: You should have a motion to approve the letter being sent. I don't think -- you don't need to make it separate from supporting the legislation.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Got it.

CHAIR TURNER: What's your --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Would that -- Oh, sorry. I didn't know if it was still my time.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes, please. Go ahead. You just paused.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes, sorry. So the other -- I think maybe Commissioner Andersen said this as well, but I do think in the second paragraph in the first letter to the administration officials, in one, two, three -- the third sentence -- "cause them to rely on potentially inaccurate and incomplete data to guide their redistricting processes, which may result in avoidable legal challenges". I do think that language could be stronger, you know, almost certainly. Or -- I don't know. Just that feels like the big risk that we are taking by using poor data. That feels like the argument that everything -- around which everything else is structured. So to the extent we can make that language strong, while still accurate is --

CHAIR TURNER: Who --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: We're comfortable with making
it stronger, although the -- one of the questions we had -- or at least I had, was we don't know how accurate the data is going to be, right? That was -- and how -- of the quality of the data that's going to come out of this process. So is it that it will be inaccurate if they -- so we don't know how inaccurate or accurate or complete this data is. And that's why we used the -- I think grammatically and in terms of context, a little bit, the "may" rather than a stronger form. But we're happy to do a stronger version of that.

Even the severity of if we do get inaccurate data, it would have -- or incomplete data, it would have negative consequences on our work.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. As a professional advocate, I would recommend strengthening that language.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioners Taylor, Ahmad, Andersen.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes. Just maybe as it applies to the wording, there was a publicly announced date of October 31st that was relied upon, correct?

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: All right.

MS. JOHNSTON: That was announced May 18th.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes, that's correct.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you.
CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Madam Chair. I have three points/questions. In regards to edits to a letter, and this may be a question for counsel, would we just share some of those small edits with Raul and then he would share it with the subcommittee?

MS. JOHNSTON: If you want to authorize the subcommittee to make the changes as they wish based on your comments.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay. Okay. And then the other two questions I had, and I guess this is for the group. Do we have a letterhead? And would we be including signatures of the Commissioners on the letter as well?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: This was a question that I had as well. I don't know that we have letterhead yet. I don't know -- it's -- just in terms of like even logo and such, I know when we were under the State Auditor's office we were still using that Shape California kind of logo, and now we've switched our website to the We Draw the Line. So I don't know the answer to that.

And in terms of signatures, I think whatever is the preference of the Commission. I don't feel strongly one way or another. But we would just need some way of capturing everyone's electronic signature in order to put
on there. I don't know how you all feel about that, but
either way.

MR. VILLANUEVA: As far as the letterhead, I do have
a copy of the old letterhead with -- old meaning it's the
current --

MS. JOHNSTON: It's from ten years ago but it's the
one we've been using.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yes. Yeah, the current logo.
That's the word I wanted. It's the current logo and
everything from 2010. May I suggest, it's recognized,
use it. Once you have public communications person, you
can get a graphic artist and develop your own.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you, Chair. Actually
on that, the letterhead that is -- quick question just to
the letterhead. Is that the one that our current agenda
is on?

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Well, that has the --
that is not the current address, so I would not recommend
using that.

MS. JOHNSTON: 721 Capital Mall?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Is that our current address?

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes.
MR. VILLANUEVA: It's the newest of the new.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That is the new address?

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: That's where we are.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. All right. Well, I'm neither here nor there on that one. The letter, and specifically content, there were a couple things that I did miss in terms of our emphasizing in our -- in our argument. And the one point that Commissioner Vazquez brought up on that sentence in -- let's see -- five lines down, second paragraph going down, which makes a premature end of the census counting will force the CRC and similar entities across the country to rely on -- it says potentially inac -- incomplete data. So I think that's fine. It says to guide the redistricting process which may result in -- then you should say unavoidable legal challenges, because since you're going potentially -- and then to say unavoidable, I think that's consistent in terms of making the stronger emphasis.

Then item though that I want to add, and I don't quite know where, is we really need time on the post-enumeration evaluation of the data, remember Karin MacDonald was talking about. And I don't remember her exact wording for that, but that is crucial.
And she was saying that they are being pulled from that to work on the reapportionment -- the people in the Census Bureau. And we should emphasize how our -- the quality of the data depends on extending to the date as everyone planned and using the staff according to the proper -- you know, don't pull the staff because we need that post-quality -- post-enumeration review time. And I think we can look back to see what her wordings were of what that -- the official term. But that's another argument that we should put in that would strengthen our argument, I think.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I believe that the term was post-processing.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: It is.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. And I thought that we had that in there, but I --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It was a bit more than that. She -- she said there was -- she had another term for it, which was -- it was part of the post-processing review but had a -- actually there was a little term I thought she used. I can go back --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: We can go back and look at -- look at that. I thought we took her exact language, but there might be another term that we missed.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. And then we do -- I
agree we do want to use her language, because that's consistent with how the census people will speak, you know, that's their, you know, census speak. Which comes down to the last paragraph on the first page. We say this will provide the needed time for the enumeration period of self-response and nonresponse follow-up. I understand Commissioner Kennedy said, you know, do we need that. But I would put that in because I believe that is census language again.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: We took it from the speaker as well.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So -- the exact. We just hope that -- because we're not census experts by any -- or at least I'm not. And so we just kind of took the language that she was using.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, that's -- that's what I thought, and that's why I think we should go ahead and leave it in. So -- but yes. And if I -- I will send my comments -- is it okay to send to Raul and the subcommittee or --

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes. Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you very much everybody.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you. I think Marian has
her hand up.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

MS. JOHNSTON: I have -- just like to caution you against using too strong language in that this will make your results inadequate, because you don't want language to come back and bite you if somebody sues. So I would just make it a little more cautionary.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Which is -- so the "may" -- so that was our thinking around the "may", right? Because we don't know if the data is going to -- the quality of the data. We have a belief that it -- that it may not be as accurate if they cut down the time. But we're not certain. And that was the -- that's one of the speakers said.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. I think that's correct, right? Ultimately, we are expressing our deep concern. We're not threatening lawsuits or anything of that nature, at least not at this stage.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Vice Chair Ahmad, will you take Chair for a moment? I have to drop off for a second.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Do we have any additional comments, questions about item number 9?
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So I'll just -- I'll just put in I really appreciate everybody's feedback on this. It sounds like everybody is feeling comfortable moving forward. I have a list of as many of the edits as I possibly could capture. If there are very specific things -- I know, Commissioner Andersen and Commissioner Kennedy, you had some very specific changes in terms of the wording. If you'd like to send that to us, it sounds like that is allowable. Exactly what was mentioned here in -- in public meeting. We are -- you know, I don't mean to speak for you, Commissioner Toledo, but I think we're -- but we're happy to make those changes and --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- and with your approval, you know, happy to send it or have Raul or Marian, whoever is the most appropriate person, to actually send these letters out and have them posted somewhere on our website as our kind of official stance on this matter.

MS. JOHNSTON: And how do you want to do signatures?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Well, I would ask the question whether the signature of every Commissioner is needed, given the timeliness. Right? This is an issue that is time sensitive, and we probably want to get it out sooner rather than later. And perhaps maybe just the signature of the Chair, if that's allowable. Unless everybody
feels that they'd like to put their name on it, or if we think, from an advocacy standpoint, it would be stronger if we had everybody's name on it. I'm fine with either.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Me too. I'm actually fine with no signatures, but I mean, either way.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Okay. Yeah.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I saw Commissioner Le Mons unmute, and then Fernandez, and then Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Well, I was going to make a motion, but I realized I was premature.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay. Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I would -- I would recommend a signature instead of no signature, and maybe put our names on there, which would be fine. And whoever can get -- I'm just going to say I'm, like, 15 miles away from headquarters, so potentially I could go and sign it, you know, if you do it right away. But from the Chair, if -- if you want the Chair to sign it, that's fine, too. I'm just saying I'm close. I could do it on behalf of the Commission. But I do think a signature is best.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: That was going to be my recommendation, a signature. For me, I think the Chair should sign it, and then list our names.

MS. JOHNSTON: We do have overnight service that we
could send a final draft to the Chair and have her sign it and send it out.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Question on that, counsel. Does it have to be a wet signature?

MS. JOHNSTON: No.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Can it just -- so we don't have to do overnight?

MS. JOHNSTON: That is up to you all.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay. Well, Chair Turner is not here to speak to that, so we'll hold off on that.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Later when we discuss Chair rotation, one of the questions that's going to come is when does a Chair's term end. And the basic debate is does it end at the end of the meeting, so the new Chair begins at the end of this meeting, or -- which would be end of today, probably -- or does the Chair -- new Chair start at the beginning of the next meeting? So it may be relevant to this -- who signs this letter.

MS. JOHNSTON: Well, if you decide to send the letter today and have the Chair sign it, then the Chair that would sign it I think would be Commissioner Turner. But our concern was that once you -- once the Chair switches, we want to be able to deal with the new Chair for the coming meeting.
CHAIR TURNER: I have to --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Commissioner?

CHAIR TURNER: -- I have to multitask, but I am here, and I can either send it -- sign it with overnight, or it can be -- I can do the signature online.

MR. VILLANUEVA: I don't -- I don't think we have overnight right now.

MS. JOHNSTON: I will pay for overnight.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Exactly. It will be you and I paying for it.

MS. JOHNSTON: I'm happy to do that if -- if you would prefer do overnight.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yeah. We --

MS. JOHNSTON: But if you're happy with a computer signature, that's fine with me, too.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, that was -- that was going to be my suggestion, if a computer signature is allowable, I think that would probably be -- work for all of us, and then if we all want to sign it, we can all sign it, you know, via electronically. But again, we'd have to commit to signing it right away to get it off. But I think electronic signature during this day and age would probably be preferable. My opinion.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Commissioner Le Mons?
COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah. I'd like to make a motion that we move forward with the letter produced by the subcommittee with the edits, with the signature of the Chair to be expedited, and send it out as soon as possible.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Second.

MS. JOHNSTON: A wet signature or a computer signature?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: At the Chair's discretion.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I second.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I thought I did.

MS. JOHNSTON: I'm sorry. Who seconded it?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Pardon me?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: It was seconded by Commissioner Fornaciari.

Can we take public comment?

Raul, if you would please do the honors of reading the call-in information.

MR. VILLANUEVA: It would be my pleasure, Vice Chair.

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 in the agenda and the process in general.

In addition, for each agenda item that requires votes, 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 it is time to call in if they wish to make a public comment. 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 either the access code for the meeting, which is 5185236, or the name of the meeting, which is the Citizens Redistricting Commission, first Commission meeting. After providing this information, the operator is going to ask you to provide your name. Please note you are not required to provide your actual name if you do not wish to. You may provide either your own name or a name other than your own.

When it's your turn to make public comment, the moderator will introduce you by the name you provided to the operator. Providing a name helps ATT, 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 to let you know when it's your turn to speak.

After providing a name and speaking with the operator, you will be placed in a listening queue, which is a virtual meeting room where you will wait until it is your turn to speak. You will be able to listen to the live audio of the meeting. Please mute your computer livestream audio because the online video and audio will be approximately 60 seconds behind the live audio you are hearing on your telephone.

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 which 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 action item currently being discussed, you may press 1-0, that's 1-0, and you
will be placed in the queue to make a public comment.

When joining the queue to make your public comment, you should hear an automatic recording informing you that you've 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 the 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 speaker phone, 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, the Commissioners move on the next caller, and you may hang up the call.

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 repeat this process. So if you are disconnected for any reason, please call back and explain the issue to the operator, then you may repeat this process and rejoin the public comment queue by pressing 1-0.

The Commissioners will be taking comment for every action item on the agenda. As you listen to the online
video stream, public comments will be solicited. That is
the time to call in. The process of making comment will
be the same each time. Begin by dialing 877-226-8163 and
following the steps I have just described. These
instructions are also located on the home page of the
website. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Raul.

AT&T operator, we will be taking public comments now
on item number 9. Is there anyone in this queue?

PUBLIC COMMENT MONDERATOR: And as a reminder,
please press 1 then 0 if you wish to ask -- or pardon me,
to make a comment -- 1-0. And we do have one person in
queue. Please spell your name. We're opening the line
of Sophia Garcia. Please go ahead. Your line is open.

MS. GARCIA: Hi. Good morning, everyone. My name
is Sophia Garcia. And that's S-O-P-H-I-A G-A-R-C-I-A.
I'm the GIS analyst for the Delores Huerta Foundation.
And I just want to really applaud the conversation that's
been happening around sending a letter regarding the
census timeline.

As you know, DHS is a CBO in California, and like
ourselves and a lot of other CBOs across the state, have
been doing census work and preparing for canvassing, and
phone banking, and census outreach for over a year now.
And with COVID and with a lot of the restrictions, and
just trying to be careful with our communities. And also we have been doing canvassing and phone banking as well since last year, and we're expected and excited that the -- the census timeline was being extended until the end of October. When we heard that it was being cut short, that really was a big blow to our efforts, but also, we just had a really big concern, not just on reapportionment and what could happen next year in 2021, but also just what our communities would be losing out from.

So we're really excited about this conversation that you are having and applaud the Commission to send a letter. Again, not just for re -- reapportionment, but really just the impact that it could have with a -- with a low -- an incomplete count. As you all know, California has a huge hard-to-count population, not just in LA but specifically in the Central Valley. And a lot of the other CBOs who have been called in -- and calling in throughout this process are -- are really doing a lot of great work to try to get our communities counted.

So thank you again. I'm excited for you all to send that letter.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And I just say thank you and thank you for all the work that you all are doing to ensure an accurate count.
MS. GARCIA: Yeah. We have a -- we have a great team that's going out there right now with all the proper gear and -- and testing. So any extension would be really helpful. Again, not just for our communities, but communities statewide.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you for your comment.

Next person?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Once again, if you do have a comment, please press 1 then 0. And we have no one else in queue.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you.

So we do have a motion on the floor to approve the letter sending, with edits, and have the Chair, at the time, sign off on that letter and expedite the process.

Counsel, can we have a roll-call vote?

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER 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?
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: Once again, unanimous.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Great. Thank you so much, everyone. So that closes off item number 9 on our agenda. And a natural segue into following up back on item number 5, which was --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Do we need to talk about the
other letters, or did we just approve all of them?

MS. JOHNSTON: I think you approved all the letters. That is my understanding of the motion.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Are we good? Okay. Item number 5, the discussion on procedures for selection of Chair and Vice Chair. So I will yield the floor to our subcommittee, Commissioners Yee and Toledo.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, thank you. So you should have gotten an email with a draft of the memorandum that we're going to propose. And I apologize, there were actually two different drafts sent out. The later one is the correct one.

Before we get to that actually, I want to comment, because we were talking about the census. I want to encourage everyone, especially if we don't meet next week, to take advantage of the U.S. Census webinars and video tutorials. Next week there's some especially good webinars coming up at their Census Academy. And you know, training in how to use their main data site, which is data.census.gov. And I've really enjoyed those, so I encourage you to check that out. You can just Google Census Academy and you'll see the website.

Okay. The Chair rotation -- actually, I want to start off, kind of a quick apology for jumping the gun the first day that we met and trying to propose a
rotation that included all of us. That was presumptuous of me, and I apologize for doing that. I think I was just very impressed by the 2010 Commission's rotation. Although later I found out that it probably didn't involve actually absolutely all of them. I think it was at least 10 of the 14, but maybe not all 14. In any case.

So the rotation that we're going to propose, the -- what we're looking at specifically is a formula for deciding on the next Chair. There's an illustrative probable rotation in the memo. If we were to start today using that formula, this is who would come up. But approving the formula means that we can always know who the next Commissioner is even if people have to adjust their availability for the rotation on the fly, you know. So if somebody decides actually they cannot serve the next meeting, that's fine. The formula will tell us who the next person is.

Also, I think Commissioner Sinay was the only one who got back to us to declining to be in the rotation, so she's not in the probable rotation in the memo. But again, it doesn't matter. She can come back in, or others can drop out if need be. As we go along, the formula will tell us who's next.

So with that, I will yield to Commissioner Toledo to
present the proposal.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO:  And I just want to give --
before getting into the details, really just thinking
about some of our thinking around it, and specifically
around -- we've heard, and just by participating in these
meetings, we've seen that the Chair, specifically, has
significant administrative and facilitation requirements.

And -- and as a group we all are committed to
demonstrating appreciation for California's diversity and
geography, and we -- and we sought to distribute the --
in terms of the plan, we sought to distribute that
responsibility of Chair and Vice Chair with the greatest
number of Commissioners to serve that purpose. And --
and in doing that, I think our proposal accomplishes a
couple of the following goals.

We wanted to be in compliance with party affiliation
requirements for the Chair and Vice Chair, so there needs
to be a distribution that accommodates the requirements.
We wanted a fair and unbiased Chair and Vice Chair
rotation, that the assignments are based on alphabetical
order in general. And that models our commitment to
impartiality and nonpartisanship. We also wanted to make
sure that we had an opportunity and that we provided an
opportunity for all Commissioners who want to serve as
Chair, while at the same time spreading the
responsibilities to -- the significant responsibilities of serving as Chair to the greatest number of individuals, while also recognizing that there are times when we're dealing with significant issues that might cross meetings.

So we took that into consideration, too. And -- and just making sure that we model our appreciation for California's diversity of the demographics and the geography by having people from different parts of the state serve as Chair and Vice Chair, and so that the public and the stakeholders can see that. And so that was our thinking around how we came up with this.

And then in terms of the assignments, starting -- our proposal is that starting at the next meeting -- the next regularly scheduled meeting, the process for the assignments of Chair and Vice Chair would be made on a rotation basis where possible. The next Chair would generally be the previous meeting's Vice Chair. So in this case, as you can see in the -- in the proposed or the doc -- Commissioner Ah -- and I'm sorry if I pronounce this wrong, Ahmad, would serve as Chair, and next in line would be Commissioner Fernandez. So Commissioner Fernandez would serve as Vice Chair for the next meeting.

So the -- and you have this in front of you, I hope.
The subsequent Vice Chair would serve as the Commissioner, would be assigned as -- would be the -- the Commissioner that follows next in terms of the criteria below. So in the -- in the document, which is that the Commissioner should be -- should be of a different party affiliation status than the previous Chair and Vice Chair. So we -- we're meeting that requirement. And that's a regulatory requirement, so we put that above the alphabetical order piece, because there may be some times when the alphabetical order would jeopardize or conflict with the requirement of party affiliation.

And then in terms of term, which is, I think, a little bit more a challenging question that we wanted to bring back. The term of the Chair and the Vice Chair would -- would start at the -- at the beginning of the meeting -- the regularly scheduled meeting. And the term of the Chair and the Vice Chair would end -- and we have various possibilities for this, would likely end at the end of the -- or right before the start of the new meeting so that there would be continuity across. So we always would have a Chair and Vice Chair, even when we weren't in session, so that work can get done. Because there will be some administrative questions that might come up, or signatures, committee assignments, et cetera, et cetera that might happen. Maybe not assignments,
but -- but committee work that might need to be up to the Chair. And so that was our thinking. And we're open to feedback and discussion around the proposal.

COMMISSIONER YEE: A quick clarification. I think legally we're only required to have the Chair and Vice Chair be of different parties. We're not required that the next Chair to be a different party of the previous Chair or Vice Chair. But of course that's desirable. I think we would all agree. So that's the way that the rotation is set up.

Also note that the rotation -- the probable rotation in the memo doesn't repeat, because there's a different number of co -- in each cohort -- the three cohorts, and also Commissioners may drop in and out of the rotation. So we will probably not be paired up with the same Commissioner each time we serve.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And we did -- we looked up what the previous Commission had done, some of the benefits, and some of the disadvantages and some of the challenges with -- with rotating so often. But some of these other goals kind of out -- outweigh some of the challenges. So we thought we could reconcile the challenges of the transition, because there would -- there -- the proposal does have quite a few transitions for every single time a Vice Chair becomes a Chair,
there's a transition period and there's a learning curve
and such. But we've tried to minimize -- well, we felt
that that was worth -- that was worth the cost or the
disadvantage of not doing so based on some other factors
that we described before.

COMMISSIONER YEE: For 2010 the documentation states
that the ED made a random rotation based on willing and
able commissioners.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you for your
presentation. Madam Chair Turner, are you back?

CHAIR TURNER: I am back. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Akutagawa? Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Just in terms of the number
of transitions, assuming, let's say, that a meeting could
be one day, could be multiple days like we've had in this
round, are you envisioning -- and I think I'm asking this
question more for clarity -- are you envisioning that one
"meeting", even if it is going to be spread over multiple
days would be the term of that Chair and Vice Chair like
we just did right now or are you envisioning that each
day there would be a new Chair and Vice Chair taking
over?

COMMISSIONER YEE: The whole entire term -- the
whole entire meeting, even if multi-day. Yeah.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Because technically it is one meeting. Even though it's spread over many days, it's technically one meeting. Right? We're adjourning and coming back. So this is -- even though it's a multi-day meeting, it's one meeting. So we're envisioning that. And there may be some that we -- certainly there is a possibility that some of these meetings will be longer or shorter than others. And that's perfectly possible that we might end up with a couple Commissioners serving as a Chair for, you know, a week and half. There might be some that serve for two or three days. Right?

And so -- and there's not really -- at this point we don't -- based on the calendar, it's really difficult to tell what and when that's going to happen. And it seems fair that we're kind of doing it this way in the sense of we don't know which Commissioners would get the longer or shorter days. And perhaps maybe it doesn't matter, maybe it does. And if somebody chooses to or can't be Chair of a long session because of logistical issues or whatnot, there is the Vice Chair that can step up. And so we'd have that as a backup.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Fernandez then Turner.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I had a comment, but maybe I don't have a comment. Because I mean, it is difficult to change every time and I was just wondering is it
something where maybe instead of changing it for each set of meetings, maybe do it by month? But then again, it can run over a month, so I was just trying to -- each time you transition, there's a learning curve and then right when you've got it then it's time to switch again. And so I was trying to think of do we do it by month? Do we do it by meeting sessions? I don't know. I mean, but I appreciate both Commissioners Yee and Toledo. Thank you for putting this together. I'm just thinking out loud. I'm good either way. I was just -- I just know that there's a transition period and by the time you get in the swing of things then it's time to hand it off.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. That was --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: We thought about that as well. And we also thought -- I think it was Commissioner Kennedy, who at one of the meetings brought up, you know, there may be some sessions that are focused on, you know, the Central Valley, where it may be, you know -- or other parts of the state. And there might be a Commissioner that particularly -- where it may make sense that a particular Commissioner serve as Chair just because they're from that area or something like that. So there's lots of factors that could be taken into account. Although, at this point, it would be very difficult to plan for something like that. So this became -- this
just -- this became a party -- this would be a fair and
equitable way of distributing and we can certainly do it
in other -- there are certainly other methodologies,
other ways of doing it. But we thought at this point, it
seemed pretty random to do it this way because we don't
really know what's going to happen over the next two
years.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. No --

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I -- I appreciate it. I'm
just trying to think of other ways, but yeah. I agree
with what you've proposed.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. And before Commissioner
Kennedy, I wanted to comment and say, first of all, I
appreciate the intentionality and the work that you've
put into it. And wanted to state that as having had the
experience that I'm grateful for, I think trying to do
anything different really does prevent -- I was looking
through my notes, which are just very poorly written, and
considering trying to be a Chair and watch hands and
unable to take notes, which makes it very difficult to
know what did we do the previous day when you don't have
them.

And so I think a month is too long to have anyone
out of the ability to participate and really be able to
process and think through what's going on. And for the
rotation days that come up, when it comes up to -- and I
guess I'm asking the Commission as well as I can't
imagine it being any legal issue, but if it happened such
as someone had one day, which I'm imagining we would be
able to just make a motion or just say we'd like for that
same Chair to continue, you know, the next couple of
days. Or maybe we can write it in a way that says at a
minimum of three times or five or four or whatever.

And then that way the rotation would be already set,
anything less than three, four, five days, whatever the
decision would be, would be the same Chair so that people
wouldn't have to do just the one day and move on, that
they would actually get some good experience of three to
five days and then be able to move on in rotation. And I
love it changing at the end of a full meeting and it
seems that most of them, perhaps, will run longer than
that.

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madam Chair. My
original musing, I guess, last week was quarterly, but I
would agree with Commissioner Fernandez. I think a month
is a reasonable length. I've gone back and looked at the
2010 Commission's calendar, and if you look in -- I think
it was May of 2011 -- there was one stretch where they
had six different meetings, six different agendas in six nights. And it seems to me that it's going to get pretty dizzying to have a different Chair every day for five or six days in a row.

I've also been thinking about, you know, issues of accountability and tracking down who was Chair when, you know, at some point down the road. And it seems to me that if we go with something a little bit longer than one meeting, it's going to be easier down the road to figure out who was Chair when. I guess you'd have it in the minutes, but -- you know, it'd be easier to just mentally keep track of who was Chair when if it were by month. I mean, and the current rotation covers 14 periods, which would take us close to the end of next year already with everyone having had chance to Chair. So that's where I am on this. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: May I point out that the proposal, it used --

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: -- the language generally, so the general way, the next Chair will be such and so. So in situations where we do have a quick succession in meetings, we could go with Commissioner Turner's thought of just deciding that the, you know, the current Chair will continue for a couple of meetings right in a row
before moving on to the next Chair.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Just a quick clarifying question. Is this rotation also for closed-session meetings?

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Fornaciari and Andersen?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. Just my two cents here. I mean, I prefer this idea of per meeting. A month, you know -- two things. A month is a long time to be sort of out of the game. And when you're Chair, like Chair Turner said, you're really focusing on running the meeting and not able to engage at the level you would like. And the other thing is, you know, some months are going to be busier than other months. And if we, you know, maybe if we set up a per meeting with a minimum of meeting days or something like that, it might be kind of a compromise.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner, thank you.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. First of all, I do appreciate -- I also like the meeting with the idea that this is sort of a general pattern. And particularly, I agree with Commissioner Kennedy. If it's
a series of quick, successional six different meetings in six different days, I think we should put -- as Commissioner Turner recommended, at that point modify, you know, hey, look, this one Chair should run those -- that set of -- that set of meetings, essentially. And the reason -- I also agree with that because having been the Chair, it does take, as Commissioner Turner is saying, you know, you don't get to take notes. You're taking notes about public comments. It really does take a person out of serious participation, I mean, to be able to document things. And it's also the idea of putting the proper face on the whole Commission. I think it's very important to have all of our faces up there at different times. I think it really makes a difference. I actually had a specific requirement about when the terms end because there is an issue of -- between meetings, what happens. And I kind of have recommended, look, basically when, you know, Commissioner Turner is stepping down, but she basically still has the authority until the next meeting starts up. And the Vice Chair, you know, Ahmad is still the Vice Chair so it's through that period and then becomes the Chair at the next one. And the -- essentially Commissioner Fernandez is not involved until the next meeting starts. And I think it was our counsel said we would really like to have the new
people coming in to work with during the meetings. And then I looked back -- I've been on a couple of boards, and it turns out there was an executive committee, which was essentially the past Chair, which would be, after this meeting, would be Commissioner Turner. And then the incoming Chair, which would be Commissioner Ahmad, and then the incoming Vice Chair would be the executive committee. The authority would then be on the new Chair coming in except for items that were done still on the old meeting. So you have in that executive committee group, the proper authority at all times.

MS. JOHNSTON: Unfortunately Bagley-Keene would not permit that because if it's more than two people, they'd have to meet in a noticed meeting. That's why we keep it two-person committees.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. I understand that, but this is -- and for all -- this is for all administrative purposes. This is not actually discussing -- and I want to talk about --

MS. JOHNSTON: That's still -- that's still business of the -- it's not redistricting business, but it is business of the Commission for purposes of Bagley-Keene.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay well then there's going to be discontinuity. And that's why I -- then that becomes a problem, and I don't see -- okay. I thought
because it's all administrative that that would be okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: You could have the past Chair and the
incoming Chair as the executive committee.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: All right.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioners --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well then --

CHAIR TURNER: Oh. Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And then in which case, I do
like the way it's written in terms of the Vice Chair
terms, the way the proposal is written.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Commissioners Sinay, Yee,
and Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I wanted to say that I really
appreciate the work that came into this. And I want to
appreciate all of you for seeing being a Chair as a role
of facilitation versus a role of leadership. Because a
lot of times people look at it as leadership and forget
that facilitation piece. So I really have appreciated
you all kind of saying, okay, we're going to -- and it
makes me look bad that I stepped down because I didn't
want to take my turn and all that. And I can't -- I have
no reason why I said no right now. So sorry.

I did want to put it out there that we may want to
do it -- the rotation -- that we may look at when we're
doing the community meetings and community input meetings
a little different in that -- I know that when the last
commitee, the 2010, they look at -- they became teams,
they created a regional map, and then they became teams
around the regional map. And I think they facilitated
the meetings for each of, you know, when they did the
regions. So if you were the LA team, the two people that
were the LA team then facilitated that meeting. So I
just want to put it out there, and it does say generally,
so that allows for that flexibility if when we envision
this, we envision something differently.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I was going to make a motion.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: But I'll wait for

conversation.

CHAIR TURNER: Good. Thank you because I skipped
Commissioner Yee, please.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. So I just want to note that
the current proposal is for the Chair to continue after
the end of his or her meeting until the beginning of the
next meeting. So I mean, if I were Commissioner Turner,
I'd probably want to be able to wrap up this afternoon,
but if we approve it as written, then she would continue
on until the next meeting. I believe counsel's
preference, just in terms of work flow, was to have the
new Chair begin at the end of the current meeting to that
the new Chair can start preparing with staff for the next
meeting. Counsel, I wonder if you could say just a
little bit more about what kind of preparation
specifically you're thinking of. The agenda gets sent by
the whole Commission, does it not, before the end of the
meeting?

MS. JOHNSTON: The topics --

COMMISSIONER YEE: Or how does that work?

MS. JOHNSTON: The topics get sent. Although it can
be added to, as well, as long as the 14-days' notice is
given. And it's up to the Commission whether you decide
to give that authority to the Chair or whether you're
always going to have it by, perhaps, a vote of the whole
Commission. That's really up to you. Our preference for
having -- there are a lot of plans that go into planning
for a meeting. Perhaps Ramone can add -- Raul can add to
this too. When you're going to have speakers appear, how
long you're going to allow for certain people, scheduling
things. There's just a lot of technical -- that seems
like it would be impossible for having the incoming Chair
be involved with.

Raul?

MR. VILLANUEVA: I would confer with Marian.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioners Fernandez,
Vazquez, and Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I hear what Marian is saying, but I also think -- like, I'm just going to use an example of right now, it's Chair Turner, and she would still be involved if we stuck with this plan. And I don't see the issue of working with both Chair Turner and Vice Chair Ahmad during that period because then Vice Chair Ahmad will become the Chair. So I don't see it as being inappropriate in terms of working with the agenda and whatever else needs to be decided for the next meeting because you're going to have the current Vice Chair and the incoming Vice Chair.

MS. JOHNSTON: I said that would be possible. You'd be leaving out the incoming Vice Chair, but as long as it's not more than two.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: That was going to be my comment.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: That was going to be mine as well. I just have a question, I guess, for Marian. So there's sort of -- it sounds like two roles. If the Chair doesn't fully transition at the close of the current meeting and goes into effect at the beginning of the next meeting. Then in this in between, for example,
Chair Turner would continue to be the signatory, et cetera, and the Vice Chair would take on more of the preparation role getting ready -- administrative preparation and getting ready for the upcoming meeting and step fully into the position at that meeting.

MS. JOHNSTON: That would work.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: So that's the only -- is that how we're -- is that -- could it work that way and is everyone okay with it working that way, so we understand some clear delineation?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah? Okay. Then I support that.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And I support that as well. I think the one issue that -- maybe it's not an issue -- but it's in terms of authority. Who has the authority, right, to do the signatories, to be the sign off on -- if there's disagreements on the scheduling of the agenda and that sort of thing for the next meeting, the speaker time, et cetera, would it -- in this -- in the iteration that you have here, it would be the Chair -- the Chair that would be the -- have the authority and the Vice Chair would be providing feedback until the meeting date.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Just because there needs to be
one person that -- or maybe not. Maybe it's the two of them together that have to come to consensus and that would be fine as well. But the version that you have in your packet, the proposal that we've made -- and we can certainly make a change to this that it has to -- that they both have authority, which -- or the committee, that committee, that executive committee that was talked about, might have the authority to work with staff on creating the next agenda and determining all of the things that need to happen, which might be a little bit confusing, but it's workable. Because it goes back to authority. Who has the authority in between meetings?

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh. So as I understood, Commissioner Le Mons and some of the others, the authority would remain with the Chair at the conclusion of the meeting. The agenda setting would be with the Vice Chair until the start of the meeting and then the Vice Chair would assume Chair and we would continue in that manner.

Is there a motion for the discussion?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Oh.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Commissioner Vazquez.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Vazquez first or -- help.
CHAIR TURNER: Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I was going to ask counsel to clarify. So in this scheme, you would be working -- the old Chair would remain in authority, but you would be working mostly with the Vice Chair, who will be the next Chair, to set the agenda and so forth.

MS. JOHNSTON: That's what I would envision.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Right. And legally that's fine because, you know, yeah. Because they're not chairing a meeting or anything, right?

MS. JOHNSTON: Legally, it works either way.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah.

MS. JOHNSTON: It's just how smoothly it works.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay. Very good.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I was going to make a motion again. I'm getting ahead of myself. I'm trying to -- I'm embodying Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I'm going to second it because I'm going to embody Commissioner Le Mons too.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you. I'll make this really quick so I can also embody Commissioner Le Mons. I just want -- I agree with the proposal that's on the
table right now. It makes sense to me. I would just
want to make sure that everyone knows that in the role of
the Vice Chair then, at the start of the next meeting,
you would be coming in equivalent to the rest of the
Commissioners in terms of information and planning that
went into the agenda, knowing that at any moment, at that
start of the meeting, you might have to jump into the
Chair role. So I'm sure everyone is okay with that and
flexible with that, but just something to keep in a part
of your mind moving forward. But I'm in agreement
with -- I'm in agreement with the proposal.

CHAIR TURNER: Counsel -- oh. Commissioner

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: This is just maybe a little
ticky-tacky, but since I know that there are
Commissioners that are ready to make a motion, I just
want to also note that there are some, perhaps some --
some grammar and other edits that need to be made to the
memo if we're supposed to accept it as-is. Specifically,
on page 2 there is a missing word under -- or above where
it says, "probable initial Chair and Vice Chair
sequence", in the paragraph above that, the sentence that
starts with, "the term of the", and then I think "Chair"
is missing, "and Vice Chair will begin at the start of
the regularly scheduled meeting", et cetera.
CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Counsel, is there a formal something that needs to be said and done before Chair takes over? Because the way I was envisioning it is that at the end of this meeting, yes, holding the authority for any signatory and what have you, but at the beginning of the meeting, it actually starts with the Vice Chair chairing the meeting as Chair.

MS. JOHNSTON: That's how I understand your motion.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Okay. Great. Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Clarifying question. Were folks in agreement about the length of the term being a full meeting or three days, whichever is longer? That was a suggestion made by our Chair.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Honestly, at this point, because we're in a year ending in 0, we have -- and correct me if I'm wrong, counsel -- we have to give a notice 14 days in advance?

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: And a year ending in 1, it would be three days?

MS. JOHNSTON: No.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: So I would --

MS. JOHNSTON: Only one month in that year is three
COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Only one month in year ending with 1 is three days?

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes. It was anticipated in the month before your map drawing when you were most busy --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: -- you would be -- you would have three days.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay. So the remaining of 2021 will also still be 14 days?

MS. JOHNSTON: Except for one -- except for the month of August.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Except for the month of August.

All set. Okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: Which -- can also be worked around. When -- last time, because of the -- when they added Congress to the Commission's duties, originally it had been in September, because they added Congress, you had to do your work earlier because of the primaries. But they didn't make the change of the month. So even though the maps had to be done by August 15th, September was the month that you had to give three-days' notice. The workaround was we noticed a meeting for every day.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Got it. Got it. So to have that back-to-back meeting you -- did they notice meetings
in an overlapping manner or just kept one long meeting --

MS. JOHNSTON: Every single day because then you
could cancel that day. You wouldn't be cancelling the
whole meeting.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Got it. Got it. Okay. That's
helpful to know.

MS. JOHNSTON: It's cumbersome, but it was a
workaround.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Got it. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: So hearing no other pushback,
I'd like to make a motion to approve the committee's
proposal for Chair rotation with the amendment of a term
being one meeting or three days, whichever is longer.
Did I do that right?

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. I second that.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I recommend we not include the
three-day provision because -- and keep our maximum
flexibility, you know, because we just don't know what
it's going to look like going forward and -- you know,
including how each of us will feel when our term comes up
and what's going on in our life when our term comes up.
Right? So you know, with just the understanding, you
know, two, three, four, one, two, three, four, five,
seven days, you know, I mean, just how it looks when the
time comes, to keep our maximum flexibility around that
and not set a minimum or maximum threshold.

CHAIR TURNER: I still -- and I know we have a
motion and a second, but I don't see that as any
different than if your term came up and it was time for
you to do the full meeting, you still would need to --
you could decline or do something different. I just
think the setting the three keeps us from having to have
the discussion every time it's a single meeting as to
whether or not we want to take action or not. It would
be understood upfront that the person would be Chair a
minimum of three times. It just feels as though --

COMMISSIONER YEE: Three days. Yeah. True. True.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I think I might have gotten a
little confused based on what counsel just said a few
moments ago. So anticipating these multiple single-day
meetings, what are the odds of having those types of
meetings between now and before August of next year with
our 14-days' notice?

MS. JOHNSTON: It would not happen before August.

It might happen in -- if the time of the census is
extended again so that you had until December 15th to do
your maps, then it might come up towards the end of the
year.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: So we have a -- maybe we could approve the proposal as-is and see how things flow. And we can always amend it moving forward. Because we may be trying to solve for a problem that's not necessarily a problem yet.

MS. JOHNSTON: The only qualification on that is that is if you were going to amend it, you'd have to have it on the agenda as an action item. That could be done.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: That could be done?

MS. JOHNSTON: You could always put it on the agenda, whether or not you want to modify the rotation schedule.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Well, that might be a thought, Commissioners, for if we build in the three-day -- or three to five day, I think was actually the recommendation. And with the out, like Commissioner Yee is talking about, it would kind of cover all the bases. So we're saying this, but we may not do it. That's kind of what happens, right? It's like okay, we'll agree to this, and we'll have this out. So is an agreement necessary? Maybe the proposal without the days and if we find this a problem, we can address the problem when it is a problem.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Oh. We have a lot of -- we have a
lot of motions that's been seconded on the floor.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Or we could just move forward with it as it is since it's been seconded. I'm good.

MS. JOHNSTON: Do you want to call the question?

CHAIR TURNER: I --

MS. JOHNSTON: Calling the question will stop -- stop public discussion and you still have public comment.

CHAIR TURNER: Right. Okay. So Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Can we clarify that the motion also includes Commissioner Akutagawa's correction to the paragraph to read Chair and Vice Chair?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Okay. So we'll stop discussion at this point and go to public comment.

Ryan, do we have a public comment in the queue?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And once -- and once again, if you do have a comment, please press 1, then 0, 1-0. And allowing a few moments here. So far we have no one queueing up.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Ryan.

Counsel, what time is our lunch scheduled?

MS. JOHNSTON: Five minutes from now.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And we have no one in queue at this time.
CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Thank you. Then we will call to vote, please.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Before we call the vote, can we just hear the motion one time?

MS. JOHNSTON: As I read it, is to accept the notation proposed by the subcommittee with it being on the agenda at every meeting as to whether or not you want to change that procedure.

CHAIR TURNER: No. The motion --

MS. JOHNSTON: No?

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Vazquez, do you want to make your motion again?

MS. JOHNSTON: Oh. It was your second -- I apologize. I didn't write that down. It would be to either for one meeting or for three days, whichever is longer, subject to change at every meeting.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I didn't have that one. I mean, so --

MS. JOHNSTON: I thought that --

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: It's okay, but that was not my motion. That was --

MS. JOHNSTON: Can you clarify, please?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: That was -- yes. It was just without the subject to change. So that was -- yeah. That was not part of my motion.
MS. JOHNSTON: Okay. If --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Can you remake your motion again? Just say it out what it was because I'm just not remembering it and I didn't write it down.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. To accept the rotation as proposed with the amendments of -- the term duration being one full meeting or three days, whichever is longer.

CHAIR TURNER: And with the corrected -- adding in the word "Chair".

MS. JOHNSTON: All right. Is everyone clear on the motion?

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Akutagawa?

And I'm sorry. This is a special vote. Since you're electing Chairs, it needs to be three from each subgroup, but -- 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: You had me going there.

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: It passes with the required votes.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Actually I think I better say my yes verbally because I think I got --

MS. JOHNSTON: I thought I heard -- I thought I heard you --

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I didn't have a chance to say yes and since this is also recorded and public, I should -- I don't want somebody to come back and say that
I didn't say yes so --

MS. JOHNSTON: I have you recorded as a yes.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you, everyone.

CHAIR TURNER: Good job, subcommittee. Thank you so much. At this time, we will go to lunch. We'll recess for lunch, and we'll come back -- let's just come back, please, at 1:45, 1:45.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Thank you and welcome back to our Commission meeting for Friday, September 4th, after lunch.

We will begin with public comment, Ryan. So if you would, please. I think the instructions have been read twice today. Let's just go and see if we have someone online.

Actually, Raul, if you would read them, that'll give time for the community to join online for public comment.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Very good, Chair. Let me bring that up.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

MR. VILLANUEVA: You're welcome.

CHAIR TURNER: And Commissioners -- let's see -- Fornaciari and -- I can't remember -- Toledo and Andersen, are you ready on your subcommittee report?
Should I come back after lunch for the chief counsel?
Will you be ready right after public comment?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'm not sure. I sent a quick email to you so you should probably get that.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'll check on it. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Thank you.

We're ready, Raul.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Very good, Chair.

To the public, instructions for making public comments by phone. So in order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment during their meeting by phone.

Each time that the Commissioners bring up an action item, you will be informed that it is time to call in if you wish to make a public comment. The Commissioners will then allow at least two minutes for those who wish to comment to join the public comment queue.

So you can make a public comment by dialing 877-226-8163. After dialing the number you will speak to an operator. Then you will be asked to provide either the access code for the meeting, which is 5185236, or the name of the meeting, which is the Citizens Redistricting Commission, first Commission meeting.

After providing this information, the operator will
ask you to provide a name. So please note, you are 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 is 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 ATT, which is hosting this public comment process -- excuse me -- providing a name helps ATT, which is hosting this public comment process, to ensure that everyone holding for public comment has a chance to submit their comments.

So please be assured that the Commission is not maintaining any list of callers by name and is only asking for some names so that the call moderator can manage multiple calls simultaneously and can let you know when it's your turn to speak.

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 is your turn to speak. You will be able to listen to live audio of the meeting, but please remember to mute your computer or livestream audio, because the online video and audio will be approximately 60 seconds behind the live audio that you are hearing on the telephone.

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 which 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 that's being discussed, you will need to 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 the 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 the operator and then state your comment clearly and concisely. After you finish making your comment, the Commissioners will move on to the next
caller and you may hang up the phone. 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 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. This is the
time to call in.

The process for making a comment will be the same
each time, begin by dialing 877-266-8163 and follow the
steps that I've just lineated. They're also available on
the website homepage. Thank you very much.

CHAIR TURNER: Bravo, Raul. Thank you.

MR. VILLANUEVA: You're welcome.

CHAIR TURNER: Ryan -- Ryan, AT&T operator, we are
ready, sir, for public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Okay. And as a reminder,
please press 1, then 0 if you wish to make a comment, 1-
0. And we have no one in queue for a comment.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. We'll wait, Ryan, still, just
for another minute. Just another minute. Okay. Did
anyone join us?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We have no one in queue.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Thank you, sir.

Commissioner Andersen, you were saying?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. We had a quick

subcommittee meeting and we do want to continue about,
specifically, the last proposal on was should we -- I
believe it was -- I don't know if we -- sorry. Let me
stop again. I'm not sure if we made a proposal or if we
just gave direction, but I believe the direction that we
said was, do we ask Raul to go with a recruiter on
getting a slightly modified posting out to a new group,
to a -- meet with a recruiter and to new posting.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: But we'd still like to
especially do that, but we'd like to help Raul with this
recruiting process because there might be a more
efficient way of doing that. Still the same idea, it's
just rather than saying, Raul, please do this for us,
they're going to give him a little more direction on how
the recruiting -- on using a recruiter.

MR. VILLANUEVA: And Chair, that's what I had
asked -- or had proposed.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

MR. VILLANUEVA: If I could look for an interagency
agreement with a public sector company rather than initially go out to a private company. Private company will have to be done through an RFP, so you're talking four to six weeks just to get that up and going. And the interagency, we can probably look at maybe a week and a half.

CHAIR TURNER: Commiss --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: There's a step we could use before we have to jump into that process. That's what we wanted to talk about in terms of this.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: In terms of proposal for next steps, I think what we're moving towards is potentially advertise for the finished -- finalizing the bulletin and the job descriptions, updating -- making the minor updates, and then helping with advertising of that -- so -- or giving direction -- I guess that would be the -- to advertise the position as widely as possible, but possibly in a couple of legal newsletters, some of the online postings, and -- while we get the recruiter on board so that we can get the biggest dissemination possible. So with addition to --

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: In addition to having the interagency agreement or exploring that possibility, just getting it out there and getting it disseminated and --
through the legal processes, as well as taking some of
the input from the Commissioners, reaching out to
speakers and experts in the area that -- in our --
speakers that have approached us and other experts in the
legal community to see if they can just help us
disseminate this posting a little bit further. So just
asking them for help in disseminating the job description
to see if we can get a wider pool of qualified
applicants.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, subcommittee. We have
Commissioner Le Mons and Commissioner Kennedy.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: No comment.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madam Chair. Just
so that colleagues are aware, I'd suggested our number of
additional recruitment channels to Raul and some of these
may be, I think, pretty good options for getting the
message out widely. One is Election Line Weekly, which
is supported by the Democracy Fund. It's a weekly that
goes out to people interested in election-related topics.
I've been getting it for over a decade, and they have a
very active jobs board there. And also Professor Rick
Hassen at U.C. Irvine runs a very active election hall
blog. So those two I think could be potentially very
good channels for chief counsel. And I also suggested
governmentjobs.com, the California Association of Clerks and Election Officials, and the California State Association of Counties.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Thank you. Thank you. And Raul has all of those?

MR. VILLANUEVA: I have the emails.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

MR. VILLANUEVA: My main concern being that if you're -- those were out -- it's just a matter of how much is it and how do we purchase it. When you start talking about getting an external recruiter, now then that's where -- if I don't have the ability to go ahead and start doing that and starting negotiations and actually seeing what the process is going to be for interagency, the alternative is to wait further and start developing and RFP -- excuse me -- but if I don't receive some kind of direction right now, I have to wait until your next meeting to get the direction.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right. And --

MR. VILLANUEVA: So there's at least a two-week delay there before --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Right. Of the ones that I'd suggested, I think governmentjobs.com may be the only one that charges. The others I think would be free of charge and, you know, I've offered those as a possible way of
avoiding having to spend money on this and still getting
the word out widely among an interested target audience.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Let me just ask and
this is partially a conversation for later, but also for
now. Once this posting is live, can we as Commissioners
be sending it out? Right? Like can we tweet about it?
Could we -- you know, could we have a press release about
it? Could we be advertising it ourselves in any way or
capacity? And it sounds like, Commissioner Kennedy, that
you know of these places and perhaps -- I don't know --
but perhaps you have some relationships with them. Is
that something as Commissioners that we can go and do?
Because it's a public notice. Or is that in any
violation of Bagley-Keene?

MS. JOHNSTON: You can distribute it as much as you
wish.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Great. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I feel like we are maybe
bundling to two things. I think Raul's initial point
earlier today was that there could be a shorter path
to -- having a search firm that's already part of the
state system -- do that function that we were looking to
potentially secure a private firm for. And that would be something that, if we were going with a private firm, would require an RFP and a much longer, up to six-week process. So I think his recommendation was to at least explore the state process first. And if were able to get what we needed from that, great, we have it done. And if we weren't, either for whatever reason he found, that there wasn't something available or if that became a roadblock, then the second approach might be -- would be our next step. So I think that we need to give him some direction to move forward with that. And that's sort of separate and apart from the --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Web-based.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Pardon me?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Oh. I was agreeing. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Oh. Okay. Yeah. And I think that's separate and apart from what Commissioner Andersen opened with, which is regard to the subcommittee wanting to continue to be involved with working with Raul in these other wider distribution -- giving him some direction on some of the things that Commissioner Kennedy -- and maybe other avenues and channels for getting this out as well. So it seems like that we can do both of those. That we need to be giving the
direction very specifically for pursuing the state path.

CHAIR TURNER: The interagency.

Raul?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes. The interagency.

MR. VILLANUEVA: The company that I'm thinking of is Cooperative Personnel Services. They're a joint powers act agency. They're not, per say, part of the state, but because they are a public entity and a joint powers act agency, we're able to do an interagency agreement with them. They do a lot of different services to public sector organizations. They've been around since I think the early '80s.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.

MR. VILLANUEVA: So that would be one of my first avenues, is to go and inquire with them how much for what. Also too, just for every subcommittee, just so you know, my intent, Marian's intent, because we're both working together is to work directly with the subcommittee --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right.

MR. VILLANUEVA: -- in terms of the different -- the different things that the subcommittee's trying to accomplish in whatever capacity. So I don't mean to imply that we won't, but I just need the direction. If you want to do an external entity, that work needs to be
started soon, please.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I think -- can I -- the subcommittee would like us to allow Raul to go ahead, to have our permission to look into this and proceed with this. That our -- the subcommittee's working with him because there -- in terms of -- there may be something that we can do as far as this where, you know, it's a little bit like what we need, there are two portions. The how we disseminate and also a recruiter, but if the one doesn't work, we need the recruiter. So we just haven't had a chance to talk directly to Raul about this. That's why it sounds a little disjointed. But it's the same -- same idea.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And I do think it's -- it's two things, right? So the first thing is giving Raul -- so we -- the recommendation would be to give Raul the authority to go out and try to inquire and get the appropriate conversation and any documentation in this area to enter into an agreement for recruitment services. And separately from that, it would be to move forward with -- and I believe we had this authority with the last motion that was passed -- to update the job description and to begin disseminating it widely. And the two things are separate but connected because they're both connected to recruitment. So we'd be doing our own, right? We'd
be disseminating the job description and also inquiring on getting additional support to help us do a targeted recruitment as well to ensure that we have the most widespread dissemination. And also a large enough pool to make a good decision.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. And qualified too. So we're -- we have multiple avenues to get good, qualified candidates.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And given the competition, right? We're not the only ones doing redistricting.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: There are many entities doing redistricting across many local municipalities, state, national. So we want to be able to secure the best that we can and that's going to require a large dissemination plan.

CHAIR TURNER: And I do --

MR. VILLANUEVA: So I do have a question.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Excuse me. Please.

CHAIR TURNER: That's okay.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Sorry.

CHAIR TURNER: No problem.

MR. VILLANUEVA: So is the preference for somebody who understands California, is in California? Or
somebody from other parts of the country who may not be familiar with California? I phrase it that way because --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So I think some of the preference would be someone who has federal VRA, federal election, electoral, constitutional expertise. The California piece, I think it's important to understand because there are so many constitutional issues that are California-specific. And some of that can be brought in separately, but it'd be --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Well, also --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- important for them to at least understand California rule --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Right.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- would be able to pick them up very quickly and --

MR. VILLANUEVA: This is also your chief counsel.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Right? And so having someone who isn't familiar with California --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh. No.

MR. VILLANUEVA: -- even though the VRA is -- as your chief counsel, I think that --
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I think the preference is rightly having both. If we can get both of the California and the federal VRA and the federal electoral expertise, that would be the preference. And that's in the job description right now. It's actually a requirement in the job description for both.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioners -- I saw Akutagawa and Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: First off, can I just say just as a kind of a point of process, Commissioner Andersen, I am having still a hard time -- you go in and out still. So I just want to -- I don't know about the others, but I'm still having a hard time hearing. On this last point, one of the thoughts that I had -- and I'm glad that this is coming up because this is going to help clarify things. One of the thoughts that I had is in distributing or sharing the chief counsel job description, I was going to go out to some National Bar Association contacts that I have. With the caveat to folks saying that there must be experience in California, I know that there are, at times, people who are from California, who have spent significant time in California, but may be working, for example, somewhere else and may be interested in coming back to California because this is perhaps something of interest. Or they
may be at a point in their career where they feel like this is something that -- it's an opportunity for them to also give back. And so I wanted to just propose that as maybe a potential way to broaden our pool. I do agree that I think you'd need to have somebody who understands California -- the California VRA, but also the federal VRA, but -- and also frankly, I think we also need somebody who had spent some significant time in California because I think there are sometimes nuances that people from outside of California don't always understand. And I guess maybe everybody from every state may say the same thing, but I feel that very strongly about California. I think sometimes people don't really understand it well.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I think if you could --

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioners --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I'm sorry. I might just jump in. That was always the intent, is not only California Voting Rights Act, Federal Voting Rights Act information, but also familiarity with California legislature. And what is going on in our state now because again, this is our chief counsel for all matters that we're going to be going through. So while an outside expert might be really good in particular fields, we need the general California experience, which, I mean,
it's not to say someone who's from California and has been in California, but happens to be out of state right now, might not qualify. But in terms of national pools, I would certainly go California first.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, just my two cents. We are a Commission of the State of California. We obviously need someone that has California experience. And personally, I think that they would also need to be bar certified in California.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Well, if they're going to practice here.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: That is a requirement of the -- sorry.

CHAIR TURNER: Raul?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: -- to be able to help with the litigation through, it is a requirement.

MR. VILLANUEVA: I would also add, as your chief counsel, it's really critical not to just know California, but to know California government --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right.

MR. VILLANUEVA: -- and the entities here in Sacramento because they will be your forward-facing
counsel for all the entities that you would be
interfacing with here as a Commission as part of
Sacramento state government.

If I may, I would put that as number one, general
California law, number two, and the VRA, three because
it's easier to get that as an expertise -- a state
person -- anyway. My point was made.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: You know, so far Marian's been
functioning also as our -- somewhat as our
parliamentarian. And I'm wondering if the chief counsel
would actually, in fact, take that role as well in all
our meetings. You know, a little bit separate function.

But of course I wish Marian would just apply for the job,
but --

MS. JOHNSTON: I'm retired.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Is that the case? Oh. Okay.

MR. VILLANUEVA: We tried. We tried.

MS. JOHNSTON: Well, I did -- at least last time I
tried to attend all the meetings. I have represented a
number of state Commissions, Commission and statute of
Fair Employment Practice Commission, Native American
Heritage Commission, so -- as well as the Citizens
Compensation Commission. So I know Robert's Rules, and
Bagley-Keene, and Brown Act, and all that good stuff.

COMMISSIONER YEE: So I'm just wondering if, you know, that's necessarily going to be the case for the chief counsel going forward, or do we have other options when that time comes.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It's my understanding that a lot of the (indiscernible), but the executive director would also facilitate as the parliamentarian (indiscernible) items (indiscernible). But is that not correct or (indiscernible) in terms of the standard format for (indiscernible) last year and what is anticipated for (indiscernible) executive director (indiscernible).

MS. JOHNSTON: I would assume that's something that the executive director would work out with staff and assign responsibilities as people are best qualified.

CHAIR TURNER: So where we are in the point now, subcommittee and Raul, there was last meeting, I think, a motion had passed to go one direction, and we're actually adding to that, fleshing it out a little bit more by -- is there any different motion that needs to be made or this is just a point of clarification? What is our action item coming out of this after this motion --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Could it be just as simple as a
request, or --

MS. JOHNSTON: Do you want -- well, you want to sign
the contract, though.

MR. VILLANUEVA: No.

MS. JOHNSTON: To go to -- for the interagency
contract, you want authority to do that.

MR. VILLANUEVA: So what Marian is bringing up is --
is an important point in that, should -- so here's how
I'm envisioning it. If you say yes, go ahead, pursue the
interagency, I'm working with the subcommittee and with
the Chair. It gets to a point to where the subcommittee
is going, well, we're going to make a recommendation to
the Chair to go with this interagency, go ahead and start
putting it together.

And so with the Chair, would -- as far as I
understood your motion -- your Chair would be empowered
then to authorize and sign it if it was ready. But I
think wouldn't they be required to have a vote?

MS. JOHNSTON: They could vote now on -- wait, the
terms of an interagency contract are pretty standard.

There's no leeway, really.

MR. VILLANUEVA: No, there isn't.

MS. JOHNSTON: So I think if you would vote --
asuming if we put in place before your next meeting to
authorize the Chair to approve it, would be what I would
suggest.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So there still needs to be a motion, then, for that?

MS. JOHNSTON: Right.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yeah.

MS. JOHNSTON: Because the contract. A easy contract, but a contract.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Raul, do we have a cost estimate on what the interagency agreement half might cost?

MR. VILLANUEVA: As you know, Commissioner Kennedy, those types of external services come with a menu. And so that's where I would be working with the subcommittee and the Chair in terms of here's the menu, here's the cost differences. And depending on what they would pick, that would determine the cost because it could run 5,000 to 25,000, would be my guess, easy, just depending on what you want.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: So maybe we should come to some conclusion about how much money we want to spend to recruit general counsel and then move forward with making a motion to authorize Raul to move in the interagency
agreement down that path with Chair having authority to sign off on it. I think if we could get a cap. I don't know. Do we want to spend 25, 50,000 dollars on recruitment? So maybe that's the discussion. And then we can have sort of a range that we authorize in terms of cost so we can move it forward. So we're not waiting two weeks to just be able to say, okay, put out the general counsel recruitment.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Or however many weeks it'll take.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yeah. (Indiscernible) go over this with Raul, but basically recruiters can cost up to 25 percent of the first year's salary. And if there's another possible way of doing around this because it might be as much as ten percent. But so general counsel's annual salary -- it's only a two-year position, but it's an incredibly important two-year position. And what was the annual salary on that, Raul?

MR. VILLANUEVA: I think --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Range?

MR. VILLANUEVA: Hold on one moment, and I'll bring that up.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: The range didn't go -- I believe it wasn't until -- it was less than 200,000 dollars, if I'm --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yeah. I think it topped at 16K --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Per month?

MR. VILLANUEVA: -- approximately, per month.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, it's (indiscernible) --

MR. VILLANUEVA: It's after lunch, so I'll have to get my calculator to do the 12 times 16.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: It's 192.

MR. VILLANUEVA: 192?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: So basically, you know, if it's 25 percent, well, that could be up to almost 50,000 dollars. If it's 10 percent, it would be more like 20, 25 (indiscernible) --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yeah. But that --

MS. JOHNSTON: But that's using a private agency.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: But it's usually about 15, 20.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yeah.

MS. JOHNSTON: But that's using a private agency.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Raul, is it?

MR. VILLANUEVA: And a lot of the cost is how you're
going to advertise extensively and where.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: And that could probably
cost, you know, about say, okay, 4,000 dollars, 5,000
dollars, just depending on costing.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yeah. Another big cost is the
extent to which they have to develop the solicitation and
advertisement. So if we come in with something and they
just tweak, it will cost less than saying, do it for us
from scratch.

So there's some negotiation points in terms of the
menu.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right.

MR. VILLANUEVA: And that's why the discussion is
important. But I can -- I was going to say --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: It seems to me that about 10
percent would be reasonable for the -- up to 10 percent
of the salary, which is about -- it's a little bit --
about 20,000 dollars, about 20,000 dollars. It's a
little less than that. But maybe 20,000 dollars as being
the cap, given that there has already been a lot of work
done on the advertisement. We would tweak it, we would
figure out where to place it, and help with speaking with
candidates, and trying to get interest and illicit more
interest.

And certainly we'll try our best to keep it as low
as possible and to negotiate the best rate as possible because it is taxpayers' dollars. But we place the threshold at about 10 percent of salary, which is not -- which is a lot less than it would cost in the private sector for a position of this caliber.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I would say probably do like in total, as there is the advertising costs as well as, say, recruiting costs, so in terms of outlay, it might be up to 25, but would be -- around 20 would be recruiting, for the actual quote, recruiting portion. That quotes into ballpark numbers.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Can we split the difference and say 15 percent of the salary will give you range to be able to move? That gives you about 30K, and --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: That's good.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: -- you know, use your discretion, of course, just so that your hands aren't tied, and you can move. How does other people feel about -- other Commissioners feel about 15 percent as the higher end?

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: We need to pay the amount, even if other recruitment efforts -- if other recruitment efforts come to fruition, we only pay certain costs, not
the full cost, because they didn't find us the person, right?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Correct. That's where the miscount comes from, instead of 25. Because you say, yeah, right, you know, you found it through us, so -- and they usually negotiate.

CHAIR TURNER: And I -- to answer your question, Commissioner Le Mons, what you stated makes sense to me so that they're not having to come back close, but not quite enough money. And I do believe the subcommittee and Raul will use their best discretion and try to save those dollars.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And it would still be -- and it would still go through the Chair, so the Chair would have final say on this.

MS. JOHNSTON: Right.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Right.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: And with that, I'd like to make a motion that we move forward with the recommendation of the general counsel subcommittee to empower Raul to move forward with pursuing the interagency agreement with a budget of 15 percent of general counsel salary on the high end to support the recruitment and outreach efforts. And giving the
authority to the Chair to sign off on any contracts supporting those terms.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I second that. Commissioner Yee.

CHAIR TURNER: We'll go to public comment now, please, Ryan, on this particular topic in motion.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Okay.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you do wish to make a comment, please press 1, then 0 at this time, 1-0.

CHAIR TURNER: And Ryan, do we --

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And currently we have no one in queue.

CHAIR TURNER: We'll wait a couple of minutes to see if someone wants to dial in.

While we're waiting, was that all of the subcommittees that were assigned? Does anyone else have a report still of the subcommittees?

MS. JOHNSTON: I don't think so.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I wanted -- it didn't come -- it didn't come up, but Commissioner Kennedy had brought up the election and being able to -- the legal framework about making all election items accessible, language accessible, and I thought about that. I think that we all want to be as accessible as possible.

But my question was -- and this kind of goes to a
lot of the different topics that we've had -- is would we want to restrict ourselves or set a precedent? So if we say we're going to follow the voter -- the laws for -- election laws, could that put us down a path that later might restrict us on something else?

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Let me have you hold that point.

So was there any other subcommittees that was waiting to report out, someone that had an assignment for a subcommittee? Okay.

Ryan, did we have any public comments holding yet?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We do not have anyone in queue at this time.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Thank you.

Would you call the vote, Marian, on the motion?

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER 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?

CHAIR TURNER: She had to step away. She'll be back.

MS. JOHNSTON: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes.

MS. JOHNSTON: Motion passes.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Sinay, I'm going to come back to your point in just a moment, please.

So we also, just to let the full Commission know, that the communications subcommittee did submit the
letter where we will use this particular letter to contact those that have applied before and let them know that they can, if they choose, reapply or they don't need to if they're still interested.

Commissioner Taylor, did you want to say anything on that letter because it was approved?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: No, that's -- we made the changes to suggestions, and we sent that to Raul, and we would like to just contact and encourage those to either amend, reapply, but they're still in the applicant pool.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Right.

CHAIR TURNER: Perfect. Okay. So that's just an FYI.

And then staff, Raul, if you would just help me. I think I'm at the point now where we're able to go to our future meeting dates and agenda. But if you can go through all of the notes to see, or if -- for you -- those of you that have, outside of Commissioner Sinay's comment that she's going to make, did we cover everything else?

MR. VILLANUEVA: Let me check on that, Chair.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

Is that your hand, Commissioner Le Mons, or you're fixing the camera? Okay.

Commissioner Kennedy, let me say this. What's
interesting about watching for hands, I'll say, as my
time gets close to a close, is that for every time you
either fix your hair, adjust your glasses, the
interpreter's hands that's going up, it's like a constant
watching the screen, so your notes -- you're not keeping
good notes. Or looking -- if you look down to look at a
note, you look up and then you've missed whose hand came
up first, and so I just wanted to say that that's part
of --

MS. JOHNSTON: It's not an easy job.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Keep your hands in your lap.

CHAIR TURNER: -- Commissioner, it keeps you
engaged. For sure, you'll stay engaged in checking it
out.

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Just before I make my point,
on that one, you know, if you have a pad or if you have
your Robert's Rules of Order, it's easier to see
something big and yellow in your --

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: -- in the small screen than
this, which sometimes gets hidden behind your name and so
forth.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes. Yes.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Anyway, do we have clarity on
where we are with asking the auditor's office for communications support in the meantime?

MR. VILLANUEVA: Not yet.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: The only alternative to that that I see, as far as short-term -- I mean, Commissioner Sadhwani very correctly was saying, you know, there are already beginning to be things that we might want to issue statements on, is to set up a communications subcommittee and have that communication subcommittee taking on that role in the absence of the support that we should be receiving from the auditor's office.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I'm curious as to how that would really work, because if we're talking about empowering two people to respond as a subcommittee to all of our communication needs, that makes me very nervous. And with the breaks and when we meet, just operationally, I'm not sure how that would work.

So if you have some clarity, Commissioner Kennedy, on how you would imagine the subcommittee functioning, please shine some light on that.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: I would just say, taking direction from the Commission, we need a statement on. And then the subcommittee does what these subcommittees have gone for this meeting, which is just come back with
drafts for consideration of the full Commission.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I think the problem with that, though, is these things we did within the context of a meeting. This will be outside of the meeting. If something cropped up, we wouldn't be able to -- because we couldn't give you any direction or input because once you move past the two people, there's that (indiscernible). So that's really what I'm concerned about. There would be no way to get our input into moving forward on sending responses and things of this nature outside of official meetings that have been agendized (phonetic throughout).

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Yeah. I mean, I'm not saying that this is ideal in any way, shape, or form. But, you know, I've been frustrated from the very beginning that we have no communication support. There were people taking potshots at the Commission before we had selected the final six, and our hands were tied. We could say nothing and do nothing. And we will be in a situation where we --

MS. JOHNSTON: Well, you can only speak as individuals. As long as you make it clear that you're identifying yourself as a commissioner for information purposes only.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Well, is it --
COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Sorry. I'm not -- I'm --

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: My initial frustration was
with the attacks that were coming at us, and we had no
way of responding, and we still have no way of
responding.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Welcome to my world.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Yee and Andersen.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes, I think that -- don't we
have some legal obligation to make publicly available
records of our meetings? I think the language is, as
quickly as practicable. But is that -- what does that
constitute? Maybe counsel can --

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes. You have to make your
meetings -- in fact, the videotape goes up the next day;
isn't it, Christian?

MR. CHRISTIAN: As soon as possible, yeah. One or
two days (indiscernible) --

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: So --

MR. VILLANUEVA: So yeah, all your videos for this
meeting are up. The transcripts, there is a delay
because they actually have to do the transcription. I
get a copy, proof it, then it goes up.

MS. JOHNSTON: But any action you've taken -- for
instance, the letter that the census subcommittee is
sending out, you could send that to newspapers or contacts you have in the press or any way you want to
distribute it. It's a public document.

COMMISSIONER YEE: But there's no communication
needs currently that we're legally obligated to fulfill
that we don't have covered yet?

MS. JOHNSTON: Posting. Just posting. And
notifying people on the mailing list of upcoming
meetings.

COMMISSIONER YEE: But Raul does that currently, and
so that's covered?

MS. JOHNSTON: Through the auditor's office.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yeah. Yeah. Through the auditor's
office.

COMMISSIONER YEE: More power to you, Raul.

MR. VILLANUEVA: No, that's a really good question.
It's important to ask that as far as those requirements,
those are being met.

That's one of the reasons, even though some of the
community agencies were very upset that the auditor had
put out those solicitations, those recruitments, but it
had to be done so that you would at least have some
applicants to look at.

Now, your subcommittee decided that only two of them
met the requirements. And so you're going out for more. But that's, if I may, and I say this respectfully, those are decisions the Commission made. The effort to get you those applicants was done on your behalf, and that's the reason for it.

Same thing with the chief counsel. There's a desire to say, no, that's not what we want. Well, that doesn't mean that those efforts weren't done in good faith or to provide the best means possible for you with an understanding of your needs right now. But the Commission has decided to take a different path, which is your right.

CHAIR TURNER: And Raul, if I respond directly as a Commissioner, speaking as an individual to something that I hear or read in regards to Commission work and respond publicly, should I be sending you a copy CC of that information, Marian CC of that information, or would you like to see it before I respond?

MS. JOHNSTON: It would be good to send us a copy. That would be something that the communications director would undoubtedly request is copies of all public statements that you all make, anything in writing, anything you say to the press.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: So it's a good practice to start
right away.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Two items on that one.

Basically, you know, this did come up when we were the group of eight. And I think what basically we were essentially told, and I think it was what (indiscernible) is, don't just directly respond, run it through counsel first. Because it might be like, woah, it didn't catch it before -- you know, basically it's easy to catch it before you can say something directly than try to rebut it afterwards. Also, I think it would be just in general practice of, when you respond in public, make sure you -- whatever you want to say publicly or send it off, make sure you run it through counsel first. That might help.

CHAIR TURNER: And I think -- I think whereas that is a viable option, and I hear the current counsel says CC, but for those of us that have roles that are quite public, where we are out in the Commission -- I've been out of commission for the last couple of months, but my typical role out in the community could at any moment happen in the middle of a press conference with someone commenting or saying something, what have you. And if I -- and so what I'm comfortable with is making a direct response cautiously. If I think it walks the line as
controversial, or if I feel, you know, if there's time, I'll do that. But there for sure will be times that I won't be able to stop the environment that I'm in and then reach out to counsel or communication and then get back the moments lost.

MS. JOHNSTON: I agreed with that. And as long as you're talking about an action the Commission's taken, you can describe that all you wish. And as long as you're talking about your personal opinion on something you want the Commission to do, that's fine. The only resistance would be in making statements about what the Commission is going to do when you're just an individual.

CHAIR TURNER: Absolutely.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sadhwani?

Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Can I just get additional clarity on that? My understanding was that we could not discuss our personal opinion about what the Commission should do outside of a public meeting.

CHAIR TURNER: Who's speaking? Oh. Sadh -- MS. JOHNSTON: That's not my opinion. I think there would be big First Amendment problems with putting that kind of restriction on you.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That was very helpful. And
while we're on this conversation, can I also just put out there, and I can also speak to you individually, I had spoken about this with the previous counsel. One of the challenges for me is that I actually study elections in California. I write about them. I write articles about them. And I have, at the advice of counsel, have held back in doing that so that it does not appear in any kind of conflict of interest or that I'm writing about any candidate or any -- or that I would have -- I don't write from the perspective of having a preference of a candidate. I conduct ecological inference, right, which is the method of the VRA. But, you know, I do want to put that out there because I think for myself, from kind of a professional standpoint, that is a constriction that I'm putting on myself, and I put it out there for you all.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay. And then Fornaciari and Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Pardon me. Could you just come back to me because I was -- actually had a point about the -- the auditor and the communications, please?

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think Commissioner Sadhwani, on what you were saying, being on the Commission shouldn't be a -- a detriment to your career or -- not a
detriment but a cautionary -- a caution sign or a slowdown, especially as women. We have enough things that kind of derail us at times. And -- and that also I would -- because I'm kind of in the same boat as you are in -- in a different field. I mean the philanthropic field is very into the civic engagement. And I've done civic engagement my whole career.

So I would say that we need to be -- we need to be careful, but you were selected because you have that experience. And we need to con -- always remember we were all selected because of our -- our full experience. And yes, we need to be more careful, but, you know, I mean, you posted an -- you wrote an article that I didn't even realize it was you. And I had reposted it before I was on the Commission. And then later I was like, oh, that's who Sara Sadhwani is. You know? You know, and it was like -- it was like, oh, do I de -- do I un-post it because I'm still an applicant? Or do I -- you know, and I -- and then I had, like, followed you on LinkedIn. And I was like, wait, I've got to unfollow her because now she thinks I -- you know?

It all gets so darn complicated. But we are running in circles that are -- are very -- it was fun to go on each of your LinkedIn profiles and note who we do know, and who we don't know, and how we are connected, and not
connected. So I would say we need to move forward on our careers because that's why we were elected -- we were selected. But also be careful that we -- we don't disparage our -- as -- as a group.

And this is where my question came in is when I sat on -- when you sit on a school board, and you make a decision, it's very similar as being on a non-profit board. You -- you all make the decision. And even if you were a no, you support the decision that was made as a group. While when you sit on a city council or Board of Governors or whatever, if you make the decision and you are a descending vote, you can disparage the vote as much as you want. And I'm not sure which one of the two we're here.

I know that so far Commissioner Yee hasn't been able to throw us off -- off kilter. But there -- but I think that there will be times when we don't all vote the same way. And so I have this as part of the agenda items, but just something to think about is do -- that's another piece of speaking our own mind.

MS. JOHNSTON: Well, and the -- the way the statute is written, it's extremely broad. And I would keep that in mind as -- as a perspective. But it has to be interpreted reasonably and in line with constitutional requirements. To say you can't say anything about
redistricting, you certainly can't talk about what you plan to do as a Commissioner, how you're going to vote a certain way outside of a public meeting. But to talk about the process or past decisions the Commission's made, it's got to be a reasonable interpretation, in my opinion.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. We'll -- we'll go -- okay. We'll go to Akutagawa and Toledo and then Raul. I really would like to hear if we have everything so that we can move to -- oh. I'm sorry. We -- well, we weren't finished. Fornaciari, Le Mons, Andersen, Akutagawa, Toledo.

Go ahead, Commissioner Fornaciari.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I just -- I would -- I would say that I think the advice we were given as the first eight was kind of hyper paranoid; don't say anything because your only job is to pick the next six.

I think at this point, you know, in some ways we would be doing the Commission a disservice by not engaging, right? And in just -- you know, to follow one of Marian's points, you know, we have -- we can't talk about the details of what we're going to do or what our plans are before we talked about it in a public meeting. But not connecting with your network and sharing, hey,
I'm on this Commission; this is what the Commission does; oh, by the way, if you want to provide input, don't call me, come to a public meeting, you know, kind of thing. And I think it's incumbent upon us to -- to use the social network tools that we use to -- to get the word out there and engage our own personal networks to get more engagement in the process.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I would just say that I think we should be mindful. Perception is very important. I think also how what you say gets used is also important. So unless you have media training, being more thoughtful. And maybe we should invest in some media training so that you know how to navigate the press because it isn't just as simple as do I say something or don't say something when you're dealing with the press in particular. Which is why I was particularly concerned about that being turned over to a subcommittee of two people because it -- it's a little bit more complicated than that.

And I'm not talking about Commissioner Sadhwani's talking about in that context, but in a more official capacity, where you are a Commissioner, and you are representing the Commission and you're being scrutinized. So I just say keep that in mind.
CHAIR TURNER: Good advice.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, on these points I totally agree. I actually was going back to the communications with the State auditor. I thought we actually had requested Raul to please look into that. And I thought that was the status of -- not just we will drop that, but can we please ask the State Commissioner, you know, are -- or you know, can you get us a temporary?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I thought that's the way that --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yes.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: -- was --

CHAIR TURNER: He -- he -- it was. And hasn't -- he doesn't have a response yet.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh. I'm sorry. I misunderstood. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. And thank you, everyone, for having this conversation. This was one of the first things that I was really most concerned about when -- when the appointment was confirmed.

As Commissioner Sadhwani had also said, too, I think -- and I think Commissioner Sinay had also said --
I think a lot of have these community ties in which these kind of conversations are going to be par for the course. And I was concerned about whether or not I can even be in a room where a conversation would be going on where I may have to say, I cannot hear this; you need to speak -- you need to come to a public meeting and make a public comment so that the rest of the Commission can also hear.

And I did have a conversation with Marian before every -- before our first meeting. And my understanding walking away from that meeting was that I can hear, but I need to say as -- as -- I think it was Commissioner Le Mons that said, you know, please make a public comment about it so that it is clear to everybody that, while I can be in the presence because I -- I mean, I don't want to not hear out what others may be talking about, I do want to also be conscious about being careful about transparency, being able to ensure that anything I say is not going to break rules, specifically legal rules, but also not put the light of our work in any kind of question because I think that's something that is important in terms of how our -- our work is going to be accepted. And given how hyper partisan of an environment we're in, I'm -- I guess I'm really hyper paranoid about that as well too.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I do want to also say something about the media training. I think that that would be a very good training for us to also consider. Having given lots of media interviews, I am -- even though I've done so, I am very nervous sometimes about what I say, how I say it, how it's going to be construed. You don't know how a reporter is going to hear something, how they're going to position something. And also, they may try to -- I won't -- I don't want to say that they're going to trick us per se, but I think we need to be focused on ensuring that if we're going to give a media interview, what is our talking points that we want to make sure that we always refer to so that we don't get off track and then get misquoted. So I do want to strongly encourage that we do think about that for all of us.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I just wanted to agree with Commissioner -- a couple of the Commissioners that have gone before us -- before me.

In terms of the need for public relations training, I think it's beyond media. I think media is important but also how we communicate on social media and other platforms, any type of communication that -- that could
be used to -- or misinterpreted. And just so that we're, you know, conscious about what we can and cannot do, how -- or how we can frame our communications so that they -- so that they will maintain the integrity of the Commission and not -- and not hurt the Commission because ultimately we all want what's best for the citizens of California.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Thank you.

And at this point we're moving into our agenda, item 23. So I'm going to start.

Commissioner Sinay, I think you -- let's see. This is where we're going to talk about the discussion of meeting dates and future agenda items. And you, Commissioner Sinay, actually I want you to go back to your point that we held off.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Actually, when I was looking at my point, I had written it for item number 16. Commissioner Kennedy had brought it up I think either the first or second day about the voting California -- one of the California laws. And I was just thinking, as we -- I had completely agreed with everything he was saying. And then I was thinking, wait, do we want -- do we want to set precedence. So I don't think that it goes here. And we can discuss it if it comes up again in the future.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Perfect. Thank you.
So Commissioners, future agenda items is where we are and then discussion of meeting dates. And I know there's been lots of lists that's been kept. I see Commissioners Sinay, Kennedy, and Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I have been, as you know, keeping a running tally whenever people have -- had said things or things come up. I've tried to organize it in a certain way. And what I can do is, as you all speak, if you want, continue -- continue to, you know, put things in places, and then at the end, report out what I've heard throughout the seven days now that I've kind of gotten them in categories. But I don't want to share the categories yet in case I'm totally off and we come up into a new area.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Well, I certainly appreciate that. Commissioner --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: It's the facilitator in me.

CHAIR TURNER: All right. Commissioners Kennedy, Ahmad, and Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madame Chair. To me, and you know, I recognize that this comes very much out of my background, I feel the need to develop a comprehensive timeline, breaking out all of the different work streams, and at least coming up with general ideas of what all we need to get done by when. I mean, the
point yesterday that, you know, maybe we can -- maybe we have the time to take more time in some of these improvements. Yes, but how much? I mean -- and as Commissioner Akutagawa pointed it out a while back, you know, some of us are -- are -- some of us process visually. And to me, seeing a Gantt chart is really going to help me have a good overall picture of everything that needs to get done, how we slotted it in to make sure that we get everything done.

And, you know, one of the other lessons from my career has been, you know, yes, hope for the best, but plan for the worst. And we really need to be looking at worst-case scenarios. I mentioned the other day that, you know, we may have a breakthrough and be able to hold public input sessions face-to-face and then two weeks later be faced with another outbreak and have to go back to the -- you know, this way of doing things. So I think we really need to sit down -- this is -- this can tie in with some of the visioning work that we were talking about. But if we can spend some time -- I've already started for my own purposes, working on a work plan -- a Gantt chart that will give us a clear picture of what has to be done and when. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: That's good. Okay.

Commissioner Ahmad and then Fornaciari?
COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Madame Chair. My comments actually very closely mirror Commissioner Kennedy's comments. I think it would be a good place to start with just visioning, you know, a couple months down the line perhaps. We don't know what's going to happen after that. And then before jumping into specific items to include, Commissioner Sinay has the broad bucket. So I -- I rest my case.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Fornaciari and then Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I'm a hundred percent in support of getting the other Gantt chart. And you know, it's going to be kind of notional at this point, but we got to at least capture the big items -- these are all the things we need to get done -- so we can have a visual of what it looks like and, you know, ensure that -- anyway. We all know why we need a Gantt chart.

So I want to kind of let you know, last week -- towards the end of the last meeting, it became apparent to me that we need to really take some time to design -- deliberately design an agenda. Not just for this next meeting, but for several meetings out, to -- you know, all the things that we talked about. And I won't go through the -- all the things. You know, team building,
and, you know, some baseline of understanding of where we're all at, and what the goals, and all that good stuff, all things teams need to do.

And so you know, my brainstorm was, hey, we have this person who's a facilitator on our team. I'm going to -- I'm going to nominate her to be in charge of a team to do that. And then I thought well, before I throw her under the bus in a public meeting, I'll check with Marian and see if it's okay if I call her. And Marian said yes, it was okay. So I called her. And then we didn't talk to anyone else about it. We just talked to each other. We both did that. So I wanted to let everyone know I called Commissioner Sinay and talked with her about it.

And so I think this notion of kind of a subcommittee, you know, to work on an agenda has kind of gone away because the -- the Vice Chair is going to work the agenda. You know, I just offer that, you know, Commissioner Sinay is doing a lot of that work too. So the vice Commissioner can engage her in -- or Vice Chair -- I'm sorry -- can engage her. So -- but I wanted to let you all know that we had that conversation, after I checked in with Marian to make sure it was okay.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Yeah. I was going to suggest
that our next meeting -- whatever number of days that ends up being, it sounds like there's some general themes around what those meetings need to look like. Some of it is, of course, presentations and information through workshop fashion or whatever structure that is going to be used to impart that information to us. Some of it's specific to inform personnel. Some of it is other areas that we want to understand as well. So I think that that would be a sub chunk (phonetic). Also team building and planning.

So those are, like, sort of the three areas that I'm thinking we are saying, okay, we've gotten the -- and then staff would have to weigh in on this as well. It sounds like we've gotten the, sort of, emergent business done. You know, this is the first meeting of all 14. We're all here. We've gotten to get each other's vibe a little bit. We've got the emergent business that we really needed to take care of so that our office can limp along until it can start to run. And now, we're getting the foundation that we as the 14 need. So I see this next meeting, series of days, equally a meeting, being about providing us with as much of that that's reasonable within whatever period of time we're choosing to do it.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sadhwani, yes?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: That's a very tentative hand
there. I completely agree with everything everyone has said. I'm so glad the Commissioners Fornaciari and Sinay have discussed. I love the idea of Commissioner Sinay serving as -- in a facilitator role. I do think, when it comes -- especially -- whether it's the trainings or -- but especially that timeline and work plan that Commissioner Kennedy and Ahmad were talking about, which I completely support, someone has to facilitate that process. And certainly, if we have a skilled facilitator amongst us, that makes sense.

I would only just -- just to throw this out there, I hear you, Commissioner Le Mons. There's like three buckets. And I agree with you on that. I know that we need that 14 days. Rather than lumping all three of those buckets together, I also just wonder if we want to agendize them as separate meetings just so that we don't have to -- this becomes very exhausting. I don't know if you all are feeling that way. But this is, I think, our eighth day of meetings. It does require a lot of time and energy. And just sitting here on Zoom all day is draining.

So maybe if we take one bucket one week for two to three days. But then we're all -- we've already, you know, after this meeting we already agendized something else at that next one, right, so that it's already on the
plan. We have two meetings already set. So that we
don't have to be here quite so long. So that our agendas
don't have to be, you know, 23 items that keep us here --

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- on end.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Fornaciari and Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. I like that -- I
like that idea. Although, maybe there'd be a mixture of
some of each of the buckets. But let's manage the size
of the meetings in reasonable size chunks. I like that
idea.

But I -- and I do want to offer, from my
perspective, just my perspective alone, I -- you know,
Commissioner Sinay is a member of this Commission. And
being a facilitator is about as tough or tougher than
being the Commissioner -- or the Chair. So if there are
specific agenda items that we feel we need a facilitator,
you know, I think -- you know, at least I would like to
offer my support for bringing in a facilitator to
facilitate the -- those parts where we need someone to
really be actively facilitating so that Commissioner
Sinay can participate.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I agree with everything
that Commissioner Sadhwani said about how draining these things are. I'm used to being on these Zoom calls, like, from 7 in the morning to 6 at night. And that's what I've been having to do to work around this. But it is exhausting. And so many days in a row.

I know that we have to give the 14-day advance notice. I am just wondering, and this is perhaps directed to both Raul and Marian, if we were to say, for example, we want to -- like you did for the September meetings, if we were to say two weeks from now we want to hold a day of meetings one day -- one week, and then for the next subsequent three weeks, you know, a day -- even if it's two days, is that something that we can do? Because I -- honestly, I don't think I could do another week again multiple times. It's just -- it's -- it is exhausting. And I don't know -- it's been good for this first part, but I -- I mean, just -- every time I think that it's -- I think I feel like, you know, there's only so much we're going to be processing. So that's one.

Secondly, I do have a question in terms of this process around the facilitator. Because we do have to follow the Robert's Rules of Order, that's not necessarily conducive to facilitation in the traditional way that I think about what facilitation might be and our participation. So I do wonder about that also.
CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Akutagawa.

And in the terms of facilitation, I think I was thinking of and appreciative of Commissioner Sinay's role that she kind of naturally fell into based on who she is. She is a facilitator. I don't think I was necessarily thinking of her as a facilitator for the Commission. She's doing what she naturally does which is extremely helpful, particularly to -- I'll say to me, as the role that I've served as Chair. And I'm certain there are probably others that can be a chair and do something, you know, far better as far as keeping up with everything.

But for me, each time she says that she -- and when I saw her notes and she was capturing it, it was almost like a -- okay. Good. Because you're so nervous. Like, oh my God. And then way later, in the middle of the night, you're like, oh, crap. You know? This person said X, Y, Z. And I don't think we came back to that. And now where is it in my notes? And we don't have notes. You know?

So the fact that she had that for me was a -- is a resting place. It gave me some peace in knowing that she had it. So whether that is a facilitator or just someone -- and I know Raul does the same thing as staff. You know, I can always message him and say, you know, what did I skip, what are we missing, kind of thing. Or
at the end of the day, he or Marian will say remember to
go back to such and such. So for me, it was just kind of
a safety measure to have someone. And then just to kind
of formally naming her as such or it can still be
informally. But that's how I was thinking about her role
and appreciating it.

    Commissioner Toledo?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So I have two things. One, I
think having the work plan or having some kind of Gantt
chart with -- with the work would definitely help with
all of the transitions because we -- we've talked about
the having, you know, so many chair and Vice Chair
transitions. And so if they had this type of Gantt chart
they would know -- it would certainly help them guide in
the agenda-setting processing, ensuring that things stick
to the -- the priorities of the Commission, the whole
Commission.

    And then second, just in terms of Committee work.

It would be helpful if we had a Zoom account for the
Commission or some kind of telecommunications line
because it's been challenging to communicate with the
Commission phones. And so if there was a way to get a --
you know, a Zoom account or some kind of
telecommunications -- a videoconferencing account so we
could see each other, that'd be great for the Committees
and outside of the Commission work.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

Commissioner Le Mons?

Raul, I see you. Commissioner Le Mons and then Raul.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Commissioner Toledo brought up a very good point. And are we empowered now to get some real phones? If so -- sorry.

CHAIR TURNER: Raul is like --


CHAIR TURNER: Raul is like pick me, pick me.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Oh. Pick -- please pick Raul.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes, Raul? Because we want to throw these away.

MR. VILLANUEVA: With all due respect to the makers of those telephones, no -- so should I work with the finance committee on that? Because the next step will be to start -- to start getting the available phones and start looking at cost and then be able to present that to the Commissioners on what they want within that range. And so I --

CHAIR TURNER: As soon as possible.

MR. VILLANUEVA: I just need to know which subcommittee do you want me to work with?
CHAIR TURNER: COMMISSIONER SINAY: Finance, right?
MR. VILLANUEVA: Oh.
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. We'll do it.
CHAIR TURNER: Perfect.
MR. VILLANUEVA: Okay. So I'll --
COMMISSIONER SINAY: And can we get computers too?
MR. VILLANUEVA: So I got your back on that issue.
Commissioner Va -- okay. So there was some issues with
some of the laptops. I'm just going to go ahead and
replace Commissioner Sinay's. If anyone else is having
issues with those laptops -- okay. So --
CHAIR TURNER: Are we -- Raul, let me ask you this
to be able to answer that question. Again, the equipment
seems to be -- well, personally, you already know what my
struggle is. I'm a one hundred percent Mac user. So I
hate the computer, period. Everything is an issue. But
do they not have computers with cameras in them that
they're not using this add-on stuff? I don't understand.
It seems like they're very antiquated. And maybe -- I
don't -- so I don't know what part of it is that I'm just
still trying to resist the fact that it's not a Mac and
what part of it is that it is an old computer.
MR. VILLANUEVA: Well, let's take the easy one
first. No, they don't have cameras. That's the way they
ordered them. These are -- they're better than nothing.
If you wanted to go ahead and get other ones, we're looking at about five -- four to six weeks because getting IT through the State is an interminable process with so many layers. And that's the nicest thing I can say. And I'm being kind. But I can pursue that. But it's going to take that long. In the meantime, if you're having issues, please let me know. And like Commissioner Sinay's, I'm not even -- we're just going to replace hers. I have some other ones here. And I'm just going to replace that. And then once we have IT staff, they can play physician for it.

I just got a message. I have to take a call. It's on your behalf. It's a good one. What I would like to add real quick is, as you look at your agenda, I did want to suggest three topics to consider only because of ongoing work. Something -- you should agendize something to keep the contracts going. So when they come in, they can be authorized. The selection, remember that you're going to have those. One of the things that I'll be working with the subcommittee on, is scheduling those interviews. And so that needs to be on the agenda, please.

MS. JOHNSTON: For the executive director.

MR. VILLANUEVA: For the executive director. Thank you. Something that -- that's your decision. But I
would highly suggest for you to consider something that helps you move forward in terms of how you are going to be defining this community engagement thing. And also something that hap -- that will help you move forward in working with a line drawer.

So there was a little workshop that was discussed, interactive line drawing, the tech -- the technical side of line -- all of those -- there's little bullet points. And so anyway, I can work with somebody, give it to them, and we -- so that I can have a speaker for you or a presentation, or an interactive thing for you. Something that will help you start coalescing those ideas.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

MR. VILLANUEVA: That's my suggestion.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Raul.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: We'll see you when you get back. I have Commissioners Sadhwani, Ahmad, Sinay, and Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: It looks like Fernandez needed to go right away. Yeah.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh. Okay. Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I actually wanted to ask Raul a question because we already -- we already said that we're moving forward with the executive director interviews. But then he made it sound like in the
meeting we would schedule the interviews? My assumption was in the next meeting that we're going to be interviewing the candidates, correct?

MS. JOHNSTON: That's my assumption.

CHAIR TURNER: I believe he said --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: He's saying interview.

CHAIR TURNER: and that he has to move forward on the interviews. So --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Good. I just wanted to clarify that our next step would be to actually interview. Great.

MS. JOHNSTON: And you need to let us know who your five people are.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. Right. So we'll -- the subcommittee -- Commissioner Kennedy and I, we can meet with Raul on those. We'll let him know after the meeting. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Just back on that point of computers. And I know -- I think this is one of the topics that we need to discuss when it comes to that tech and the line-drawing workshop. And Raul kind of alluded to that, some sort of interactive line-drawing piece. I know we have kind of thrown out there that we don't want any of the Commissioners doing any of the line
drawing. I -- I would just invite us to have a
collection about that. I would actually be very
interested to be able to actually work with a line drawer
on that. And that would also inform the kinds of
computers that we would need also. So for example,
ArcGIS only runs on Microsoft, right? For the most part.
So I think before we go, you know, down a five-week
process of getting new laptops, which, trust me, I am
there with you on that, I think having a broader
collection around that tech of line drawing, especially
if the State is purchasing specific mapping and line-
drawing software, that it might behoove some of us on
this Commission to also learn it. Even though we're
going to hire a line drawer, right?

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner Ahmad? Okay.
Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Why don't we let Commissioner
Taylor speak before me?

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.
Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you. That was very
gracious.

I think I would mimic Commissioner Sadhwani's
statements. While I might -- we might not be doing the
actual line drawing, I, at the very least, would want to
have the software on my computer so on those times when we get information I could see, at least for a segment, how this would affect the population. So I personally, myself, would want to have a computer resource that's able to carry that function.

MS. JOHNSTON: I don't know how that works. I don't know the logistics of that. How do you -- you'd have to have the state-wide data on your computer also? Or have access to it?

CHAIR TURNER: It's the program, I think, that has -- that can only work with that PC.

MS. JOHNSTON: You'd have the program, but you also have to have the data, don't you?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Statewide Database is publicly available. And I use it on a regular basis.

MS. JOHNSTON: Okay.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioners -- let's see -- Fernan --

MS. JOHNSTON: And as I mentioned before, the legislature is doing line-drawing software to be available to the public. And they're willing to give the Commission training on that.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh. Thank you.

Commissioners Kennedy and Andersen?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madam Chair.
Yeah. I was just going to say that I recall during the 2010 process, when the publicly accessible interface was available, I was online, you know, playing around with lines, seeing what would work, seeing, you know, what happens if you do this, if you do that. So you know, I don't feel a need to have it on my computer as long as I have access to whatever public -- publicly-facing interface Statewide Database sets up.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. We actually do need a certain amount on all of our computers because we'll be needing to -- when we interact with the public, they'll want us to look at the -- at the documents that they're going to show. So it is an absolute minimum. Whether or not we all want to be equipped in terms of how we work with it, that's one thing. But we all need to have -- to be able to look at the documents. It's like, you know, you pulled up some documents and you can't open it because you don't have the right software. That's exactly what we have to have on our -- the computers. And it is important that whatever computers we end up getting have to be that capable, which is usually why you go -- why you don't go Mac because there are many more softwares -- and particularly as they get to that size,
they're all PC.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER YEE: I appreciate the Mac users for being non-partisan on the matter.

So in public-submitted maps, I mean, there's no legal requirement for them to submit it in any particular format. So there's no guarantee whatsoever that --

MS. JOHNSTON: They could be hand-drawn.

COMMISSIONER YEE: -- we'll happen to have -- yeah. It could be in anything. So there's no guarantee that we'll be able to read it on our machine. And then some of this is going to be web-based actually, it sounds like. And probably the one that the State supplies will almost certainly be web-based. So you know, that should be pretty easily accessible from pretty much anything, I would think.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So we're going to have to take a break in a moment. And we still don't have any set agenda items or dates. And so --

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I have everything just written in -- well, what I can do when we get back from our break is share kind of what I've been hearing and, kind of, make a suggestion, I guess, on what we can do and then, kind of, what meetings could look like. I haven't put on
dates and stuff so that, you know -- I'm not -- but I did hear, you know, three days at the most, maybe a week in between. I'm self-employed. So I completely understand, you know, all -- what everybody's saying. It's not going to be perfect, obviously. But it's just the different -- and some of it is just ideas that I've had based on the conversations in the processes. Anyway, I can share that.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And then we can add and subtract.

I guess my question was, do you want me to try to spend our break typing it up so it's a shared screen?

CHAIR TURNER: No.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Or is it okay if we just do it verbally right now?

CHAIR TURNER: No. You can just do it regularly. And I'm never going to recommend you do it on your break.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I know. I really appreciate that of you. And think about that every time I'm offering. But I want to facilitate the process. Not, you know, not in the technical word, but I want to make it easier for all of you.

CHAIR TURNER: You just read it and that'll be great. Staff will capture some of it for us if they're
back, and we'll agree on it. And you'll be able to move.

Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. Well, I do have it written down, so --

CHAIR TURNER: Perfect. Okay. So we'll be back at break at 3:29.

(Whereupon, a recess was held)

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you so much. And we are at -- returning from our break. And we're now establishing what our agenda items will be and our future dates.

And Commissioner Sinay, you had a -- is going to read out some of possible agenda items for us, please.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yes. And I also worked through some -- or I have a proposed times for meetings because I think it will be helpful if we can figure out what our calendar might look like so we can work on our personal and professional calendars too.

Anyway, so action items for the next agenda, just the one that's coming up -- some of the items for the next agenda. I don't want to say action items. So we heard we need to talk about the contracts, we need to create the interview questions in a closed session, we need to do the interviews in a closed session, and then one -- the -- just I guess we need to discuss equipment.

And legislative wanted to come and talk to us about
updates -- or about the software; is that correct?

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Mapping software. And we had asked for a standing agenda item on census 2020 just so that it's on our agenda until we don't need it on our agenda. So every agenda would have census 2020 on there.

MS. JOHNSTON: An update on the timing?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Anything -- we just want to put census 2020.

MS. JOHNSTON: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: And whatever might have to fall into there, we can fill it.

MS. JOHNSTON: Well, we need to --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: But that way we don't forget.

MS. JOHNSTON: Well, in doing an agenda item, you need to be specific enough to give the public a good idea about what's going to be discussed.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: So let's -- I'm going to put census 2020 update?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Yeah. I think -- I think -- yeah. Because that's basically what it would -- what it would be. So that was -- that was just, in general, what I heard we needed to do, you know, for the -- here. Let me go to the big thing.
The main idea is to remember that we're trying to reimagine what the CRC 2020 is going to look like. But we don't want to forget the lessons from 2010. So one of the thoughts is having -- discussing 2010 and having -- I -- having kind of the Commissioners, you know, figuring out a way to bring in the Commissioners to share some of their best practices, what they've learned, questions -- and answer questions we may have.

Also, I think it's important to invite the Irvine Foundation to come and speak to us because they did invest so much money in 2010. And from everything I understand, their priorities are different. One of the Commissioners -- former Commissioners was from the Irvine Foundation. I don't know if she was with the Irvine Foundation at the time they were making the grants. But there are several -- I know one of my former coll -- I was a San Francisco Foundation fellow. And another one of the alumni from that program, he was also with the Irvine Foundation and did that. So that would be easy to bring someone in just to kind of -- what they thought.

And then they funded -- I think Karen would be important to bring back from 2010 to understand, kind of -- you know, she -- I feel like she -- a lot of people gave us their feedback already on what worked and didn't work. But we had asked specifically if she could, you
know, talk to us a little bit and give us some wisdom on
the line drawing.

The League of Women Voters -- and there's a reason
why I'm choosing these two for the 2010. League of Women
Voters and Common Cause as grantees from the Irvine
Foundation and ones that kind of managed the whole
collaborative in 2010, just to kind of get their feel.
So that was the bucket of 2010.

Then, I think it would be -- power -- kind of
understanding power and how it relates to Community of
Interest and VRA community, you know, just those two
communities, the direct link. Here's my all-star panel,
if we could have something like this. I know that
Commissioner Sadhwani knows most of these people as well.
But I would say Peter Lou (ph.), Manuel Pastor, and
Angela Glover Blackwell, and the -- well, Peter Lou
hasn't necessarily worked with Manuel Pastor and Angela
Glover Blackwell. But they could all -- there's a new
National Equity outlet. And so that would get us another
data set in another way to look at data. Everything
we've gotten has been very data, kind of, driven. But
there's ways that we can better understand the -- just
that piece.

So the other piece -- bigger picture is this whole
idea of belonging or inclusion. How do we try to think
through our best -- in light of our barriers that we have because we have to do certain things because we're a State Commission. How can we think about the language we use, the way we dress, all, you know, all those things. I know it sounds silly. But it is really important on this whole idea of belonging and inclusion. And thinking about our -- how we create policies, how -- a good person that can talk on that, again, is Dr. Powell, J. Powell. He's written a lot on that and has created the Belonging Institute.

Outreach, best innovative practices, especially -- we don't want to talk to people who have done outreach in the past. We want to know who's figured out new innovative ways with the virus. You know, how have people come out with the pandemic. And so I think a lot of the community-serving organizations -- I would rather we call them community-serving organizations or civil society organizations, verses advocacy groups because they're advocacy -- advocates has a negative connotation a lot of times in a political connotation. But these are really civil society organizations that are trying to create a better democracy and engage folks. But those are a lot of the ones that were part -- that have been calling in and were part -- are part of the redistricting collaborative that's been created.
Also, census. Who's doing -- you know, we can look at who's got good census information. You know, who -- which regions have been successful and how. We need to understand the rural. So what -- who's doing outreach in the rural area and how we can learn the rural. LGBTQ. I would say youth, 16 to 24, is another one we want to understand how to engage. And there might be -- some of these are best -- you know, looking at best practices. People who are doing voter registration right now. You know, we're in the middle -- they may not have time to talk to us.

Don't worry, Commissioner Le Mons. I'm not saying all of this for next agenda.

I could already see -- I knew when I was writing these down, I was like, think. This is over some time. And I will assure you it will be engaging and interesting. And I will also assure you that if we could get some of these folks, that we would have a lot of the public watching and listening in because --

There is a thing that someone said. And I don't think it was here. But it comes back to here. And it's who and what is credible. When we're out there and we're listening to the community speak -- and I've heard us think about the -- you know, it's this whole who and what is credible. And I've been thinking about that a lot.
We keep saying there's people that are out there to get us. Or there's people that want us to fail. Why don't we invite those people in, and hear from them, and see what is it that they're thinking, and why do they want us to fail.

But also, I was really thinking of someone like Paul Mitchell who supposedly, you know, was -- created this whole strategy -- and I know you're listening, Paul -- created this whole strategy last time in 2010. Why not invite him in and kind of hear from him? You know, how do we learn that political savvy that Commissioner Andersen was talking about?

And then on the other side is how do we learn to listen to Community of Interest? And I think some of that would come out with the conversations we would have with Manuel Pastor, and Angela Glover Blackwell, and Peter Lou. How do we listen to Community of Interest? How do we ask questions and that -- and how do we engage with translators? That one is -- if you've never been in a community meeting, you do need some training ahead of time on how to engage with an individual verses a translator and all those differences. And how do you know when a translator is not translating very well.

There's administrative things we've brought up. We need to figure out, how do we create a budget. So I
think there's -- we need a -- you know, I'm afraid that we could keep spending money, but we don't know what our line items are. And so what is it that we need to understand about creating a budget, maybe. We need to get the update from the CSA regarding how much money they've spent and how much -- and they're still spending money. So I don't think we're going to get a short answer on that. How to ask for more money in the future. That came up in our first meeting. We wanted to create a social media policy. The timeline. So those are kind of the administrative pieces.

Gantt, does everybody know what Gantt is because people kept saying Gantt. But I wanted to make sure we stop in case someone didn't know what Gantt was.

MS. JOHNSTON: I don't know.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I looked it up because, you know, I'm like, you know, yeah, I do time charts, that kind of stuff. I've never heard of Gantt. I can tell it's --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Gantt is a specific way of creating a timeline --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Right.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- with people's names on it and all the stuff. And I've been trained on it but never figured it out.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, you know, I've never heard of it until today.

MS. JOHNSTON: What does it stand for?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: It's a guy's name.

CHAIR TURNER: A person's name.

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: The guy's name.

MS. JOHNSTON: Oh.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Some of the tools that we wanted to explore, learn, play with, understand was kind of line drawing. Creative, innovative, government meeting engagement; how other places are doing meeting engagement. Well, just government. Sorry. How people are doing this, the Zoom. Is there anything else besides Zoom? What else -- you know, all that. The public input piece. Ideas on how to do public engagement. Oh. At some point -- this is when we had staff, but we need a better website that's interactive, that's engaging.

And then also we need to figure out the dockets, our material, and how they're connected -- you know, the agenda's connected to the material so that they're -- it all works a little easier.

I did outreach. I did agenda actions. And then we wanted to go more in depth on VRA. And I think what we wanted from that -- I was really trying to think through -- was how to look at the data and how to look at
the public input. How do we do VRA? So we understand
the laws. And we understand the numbers. But just kind
of play with the data and look on that is, I think, what
people kind of meant. But you all will correct me.

Line drawing. Better understanding the line
drawing. And again, doing kind of a workshop in
understanding it. And understanding if you move this, by
actually doing it -- because we're all different types of
learners.

Security. Just understanding what we need to --
what we don't know about security and what we need to
be -- keep in mind. And I would say security is also our
own personal security. I have been told by people who
have been on Commissions locally that it can get ugly
sometimes for us personally. I would hope not. But I
think we just need to keep that in mind.

Public relations and media training. Once we have
staff on board, we need clarity on how the executive
director and the Commission will work with each other.
We want to know how staff meets -- how they want to be --
what support they need. And there's going to be a whole
list there.

Around team building and planning, there was the
specifics like, how do we make decisions, how do we --
we're starting to know. Like, we all teased, you know,
Commissioner Le Mons, but we all kind of know -- we're starting to get to know each other's strengths.

And then how do we -- how do we -- and someone brought it up and I had already written it down -- but how do we learn best. Because this is really about learning as well as governments as well. And so if someone says I'm a -- I'm -- you know, some people are okay with me throwing out all this information verbally. Others are, like, going, why could she not have written it down and I can look at it? You know, we're all very different people.

I think that was all the -- the ones I had from -- so I'm sure I've missed a bunch.

CHAIR TURNER: Well, I'm totally overwhelmed with what you've already said.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I know. It is overwhelming. But it does -- there is -- it does make sense. There is a way to put it together so it makes sense. And it would help us all in the future.

Having said all that -- because I was overwhelmed as I was writing all of this and I had it all on Post-its, as you know. And then I put it on paper. And then -- but I would maybe make a recommendation that we do think about meeting every two weeks for three days. Maybe Wednesdays through Fridays -- but someone else may have
other thoughts -- with the first one -- our next meeting
being the 20 -- September 23rd through the 25th.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. While we begin to absorb that,
Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. Thank you,
Commissioner -- Chair and Commissioner Sinay. I had my
list too, but it's not as intense -- as intensive as
yours is.

The only other thing that I would ask that we have
as an ongoing agenda item might be, like, a
Commissioner's updates so that we can roundtable to see,
you know, what's going on, what did we do since the last
meeting, and if we have nothing to report, we have
nothing to report. But at least it gives us the
opportunity. If we did have some sort of engagement or
we talked somewhere, it would give us the opportunity to
bring that forward. I know being on the school board
that was always very helpful just so that everyone's
aware of our activities.

Yeah. The only -- I agree. The one thing I did
that you had, and I had too, was that when we post the
agenda items, if we can -- if we can have the handouts
directly under the agenda item instead of having to go
through the whole list to see which of the -- which
handout or presentation belongs to each agenda item. Or
maybe just number them, something like that. But
there's -- there's like other stuff that our -- I would
say I'm nit-picky. So I'm not going to go through that.
But for the most part, thank you Commissioner Sinay for
putting that together.

CHAIR TURNER: Absolutely. It was very impressive.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I think we want staff reports too
as well as Commissioner reports each time, yeah?

CHAIR TURNER: Yeah. Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. And I -- and I --
so I was kind of envisioning the finance committee
going with Raul, you know, in the interim and looking
at the budget and have a -- you know, he was talking
about a spend rate and a -- you know, and understanding
the breakdown of costs and understanding spend rate for
meetings. And kind of, you know, trying to, in some way,
project that out so we could all have at least some kind
of rough understanding, at least in the beginning. And
that we can -- that we can sharpen up over time as to,
you know, how fast we're burning our cash.

MS. JOHNSTON: Could we have an update from all the
subcommittees? What's happened on census; what's
happened on the communications solicitation; all of the
subcommittees?

CHAIR TURNER: On the agenda, Marian, you're saying?
MS. JOHNSTON: Yeah. Just a suggestion.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

Commissioner Fornaciari?

COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: Yeah. And I -- and we talked about a Gantt chart -- putting a Gantt chart together. And I'm just kind of -- that's something we can put to -- you know, that one or two of us can put together, you know, draft in the -- before the next meeting that we can talk to then. I just would offer that up to the Chair, if she wants to appoint somebody to do that?

CHAIR TURNER: Certainly because I think it would be beneficial. Are there any volunteers?

Commissioner Kennedy?

Anyone want to work with Commissioner Kennedy on the Gantt chart?

Commissioner Taylor.

Beautiful. So appointed as our Gantt chart creators.

Okay. I'm stuck. I don't know how to move from here with all of those things.

Commissioner Sadhwani and Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. You know, I so appreciate Commissioner Sinay pulling all of these pieces together. And I think that there's value to all of these
kinds of conversations. My only concern -- and I think that this is where maybe we need to have a little discussion of, like -- I'm not completely certain of a Gantt chart. I'm very familiar with a -- with just, you know, work plans and timelines, in general, and I very much support them. I -- my own -- I think that those -- we need to discuss how those two inter -- that these two kind of intersect. Because I -- I hear a lot of trainings and conversations, which I do think need to happen. But at the same time, I think we also need to be very mindful of our time. I think all of the conversations that were mentioned here could potentially take us an entire year in and of itself. And so how do we -- how do we allocate our time in such a way that we can foster some of these conversations, while at the same time being mindful of what our benchmarks are, how we're moving forward? Right? Like, what's our -- what's our timeline to get this -- like a plan together to actually hire a line drawer?

CHAIR TURNER: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right? Like, I'm not saying that we need to do it today. I was -- I advocated against that. But, like, roughly though, October 15th? November 1st? December? Right?

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Like I -- I think we need to have some sense of some of those benchmarks, because we need to be prepped and ready. At what point do we want to -- I hear that -- and I think it's important the conversation about best practices of community engagement. By what day do we want to start going out to communities? Right? Like, if soon, as most people have suggested we ought to do soon, how soon do we need to have that training? Right?

And I think it is super important to get those best practices, especially during COVID. I agree. I think folks that are out there doing census work right now, probably both government agencies and community serving organizations, I think both would be really helpful, because we are operating under such difficult circumstances. So things like, you know, are we actually going to be live anywhere? Right.

You know, the technological pieces, all of those things. Do we want to use other platforms, Facebook Live, right? Like, I see a lot of city council members and stuff doing Facebook Live. Is that something we want? I don't know. Right. Like, so -- but I think that we need to, you know, kind of teeter between yes, we want these trainings. What's -- what's the time frame? What's the rough time frame, at least now, so that we can
better think about this work plan and how both the
trainings and conversations work in conjunction with
those dates that we might set for ourselves.

CHAIR TURNER: Yeah. I think the beauty of a Gannt
chart is providing the frame that will be able to
allow -- that -- it's been years since I've ever had to
look at one or use one, but with the framing of that,
that actually sets the timing for the required elements
that we need to complete. I think it'll show you spaces
where you have almost the luxury of having some of these
trainings and be able to then kind of sequence them in
within the timeline that will allow us not to miss the
deadlines, not keep putting things too far off.

And so I think the way it's written out and then the
I think that's it. And I think that's precisely the
point of why we would use and need a Gannt chart.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Right. I think on this
issue of chart, I -- to me I think it's just another way
of calling it a timeline or a workplan is what I'm
hearing.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I would suggest that we let
the subcommittee put some dates and some bigger pieces
together. I feel like, just in our interactions over the
last several days, we seem to get a better-quality conversation when we have something to look at and to react to versus trying to just kind of piecemeal something now. And I -- and I feel like that's not the best use of our time. So we can have Commissioners Kennedy and Taylor -- and thank you very much for volunteering to do that -- it might give us a more substantive conversation.

And along those lines, I'm feeling like that about what Commissioner Sinay just said. It was really interesting, but after a while I just kind of lost track, and I -- it was just too much. And I feel like I'm not able to give a substantive kind of response to all the different kinds of things that she did say.

I will say that for me, I would propose instead of three days every two weeks, I would propose maybe two days every week, only for the first, maybe month to month and a half, because I think there's a lot more things that we're going to need to be getting up to speed on. I also want to ask, is meeting on a Saturday something that is an option? Only because I'm also thinking about for those of us who still have a full-time job trying to balance everything out too, that it's just another, you know, kind of balancing act. And I know that, for those of you, you know, who have other kinds of family
commitments, you know, taking away a weekend isn't great. I'm just trying to figure out just some kind of middle ground for everybody.

MS. JOHNSTON: I have no idea if the state building is available on Saturdays. We can check that out.

CHAIR TURNER: Good. Commissioner Toledo and then Fernandez, and then Yee. Okay.

You're on mute now, Commissioner Taylor.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Oh, thank you. I, too, was a little overwhelmed by the list that Commissioners Sinay was able to capture. And I think there needs to be some prioritization as well on that list. So if we can -- certainly there's the things that we have to do. Those elements that will go into our work plan or a Gantt chart, that -- those are the things we have to do and what and -- but then there's the training elements. And even within those, there's the must haves and the nice-to-dos. And so we -- it's almost a process of going through that list and prioritizing what do we have to have and then what else would we like to do that might augment. But maybe the like-to-dos can happen once there's an executive director or additional staff that can help us, you know, help us allocate our time and ensure that we're meeting our requirements and the things that we have to get done and our deliverables in a timely
manner. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioners Fernandez, Vazquez, and Sinay?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I agree with Commissioner Toledo with the must haves versus nice-to-have or like-to-do. And we also have to think about right now, our staffing is very limited to Raul and Marian. So we really almost have to wait for some of these until we have staff, so that they can coordinate it and get it all together. But I -- that really wasn't why I raised my hand.

Why I raised my hand is just so that we're aware, the next time that we meet in two weeks, when we do, hopefully, and we hold the interviews for executive director, I anticipate that potentially taking two days. Because one day would be writing questions and maybe, at that point, we'll want to write the questions for all three positions, thinking ahead.

And then the second day would be actually doing the interviews. So right there in itself, I mean, I think we might have two days' worth of activities, just based on the last -- was it seven days of activities that we've had -- and how quickly or how long we've discussed every agenda item. I just think that it'll be challenging if we get to the -- we'll only have potentially one day
more, which is fine.

   I'm with Commissioner Akutagawa, where I'm still working full-time, and I'm still trying to catch up, because I didn't realize we had a meeting. So it's impacting that piece of it. But I'll be able to catch up. But every two weeks, three days, I'll make it work, but it could be a little bit stressful for some of us, just so that you're aware. Thank you.

   COMMISSIONER YEE: I'm sympathetic, certainly, to those -- for those -- for whom it will be stressful. Also, I agree with Commissioner Akutagawa that, especially the beginning, I think we need to meet a little more rather than a little less. There's so much to do. And we don't really even know -- I don't feel like I know what is a must-have versus a want, you know, nice-to-have quite yet. Some things might turn out to be must-haves that, you know, that I don't even realize.

   I did, just for a comparison, of course the 2010 Commission was different and under a more compressed timeline. But I just did the math, and the eight months that they met mostly from January to September in 2011. So eight months they met 84 total days in 27 separate meetings. So that's about 10 days a month they met, about three meetings a month they met, just for comparison. They were under a more tight deadline, of
course. And it averaged about three days per meeting.

With the interviews, by the way, if we do five interviews. That's already more than one day just for interviewing, even, yeah, assuming we can get them scheduled tightly like that, so --

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh. Thank you.

Commissioners Vazquez, Sinay, and Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Sorry. Still working with tech issues. I was going to say, I think some of the bigger conversation, whether or not we deem them nice-to-haves versus, you know, these are critical grounding questions that we need to answer, I think could be -- could be paired and parallel with particular processes.

So, like, in some ways, we're -- well, in many ways, maybe even most, we're going to be continuing to build the plane as we're flying it. And so I imagine that there may be meetings where, you know, maybe we just kickstart the community engagement piece of it. And we're probably going to have to figure it out as we go and need to build in some of that flexibility to say, in the beginning, it may just be more important for us to just get out there and start building up relationship with communities and the -- and at the same time have sort of a continuous learning process happening, so that
we get better as — I feel like it may benefit us to view this as an iterative process.

So we're -- you know, our first community meeting is not going to be the most productive. We are going to get better as we do it. And so also building in some of that learning, some of these bigger questions about power and, you know, best practices, I think, can happen along the way. And we'll get better. And we'll be better at, I think, engaging with that information when we have some lived experience doing it.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioners Sinay and Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Just as a reminder, since a lot of you said this was overwhelming, I just wanted to remind everybody that this came from seven days of everybody saying what they wanted. And I didn't -- I took liberties in thinking through how to organize your thoughts and who could actually answer some of those things. But I'm trying not to take it -- you know, I'm like, wait, I know it's overwhelming. I asked if you wanted me to write it down because I knew it was overwhelming.

I do want to say that I think some lessons that we -- that -- let's be aware and careful not to learn our lessons in the community if there's things we can learn
before we go into the community. Not all of us have the same experiences, and that would be the same as I need more lessons around using the data in lines. You know, we each have different -- different pieces, and just like we don't want to talk to the press without having media training, there is some of that that we need to be aware of when we're going into the communities.

But again, I was just trying to take everything you all had thrown out at different times with my little Post-Its and put it in a way that wasn't as overwhelming as just reading my Post-Its. But I apologize that it wasn't more organized.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sinay, you did -- you did an amazing job at capturing it. The fact that it's overwhelming, it absolutely is, not as a result of what you captured, but as a result of what our needs are after so many days of meeting. And we -- and I think what was important about your being able to capture it all and share at this moment is that we continue to say yes, let's follow up on that. Yes, we were kicking some things down the can, you know, kicking the can down the lane. And then when you see all of what you have gathered, what has been accumulated, you get the sense of, oh, my, that's a lot that we need to do. So certainly not directed at you. Don't take it personal,
but, yeah, it's a lot we need to assess.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, it was a lot. I mean, I didn't mean to say it -- I was taking it personally, but I just wanted to remind everybody that I wasn't just create --

CHAIR TURNER: It's -- that's off hands.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- that I wasn't just creating it out of the blue. The other thing I meant to add is I think the public probably has some public comments on this.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh. I'm certain. I hope.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Madam Chair. I am confused. When are we meeting next and the specific date, and what's going on? I have a rough agenda that -- and I think I -- I have a bias going into this, because I'm scheduled to be chairing the next meeting.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: So I'm kind of, like, ah, what am I going to be talking about? But based off of what everyone has shared, it seems like there are a lot of things we need to do, but a lot of things that we can't do yet, because of just limitations in staffing, limitations with Bagley-Keene 14-day meeting requirements. We don't have contacts with some of the
guest speakers that we want. We don't have their
schedules. We don't have the schedules of our
interviewee or potential candidates.

So I think for me, it would be helpful if we can
move to discussing what dates we can all meet as a
Commission and then what general items we would like to
cover in just that meeting. I think Commissioner Vazquez
kind of alluded to that, that we are literally building
the plane as we fly, and I can't even see past the next
Commission meeting because who knows?

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh. Commissioner Ahmad, you said
you have something written as an agenda?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah. So I have the -- the top
and the bottom, which is -- was really easy, you know,
call to order, establishing a quorum, Commissioner
updates, staff updates, approval of minutes, subcommittee
updates, and then another item for census updates. And
then at the very bottom, standing items of the discussion
of meeting dates and future agenda items, similar to what
we had on this agenda, and then the very last one is
public comments on any item that's not on the agenda.

In the middle, I have -- I don't know if this is
something that's possible, maybe counsel can guide us on
this, if we can go over, like, the general items that we
wanted to discuss, in terms of updates and then jump into
a closed session halfway through the meeting to go over
interview questions for our executive director position
and then continue executive director interviews. Time
permitting, jump back into an open public meeting to talk
about which large bucket areas of training we would want
and which guest speakers that we see we could potentially
invite for the next meeting.

MS. JOHNSTON: May I ask you a minute -- a question
about minutes?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Yeah.

MS. JOHNSTON: The practice of the last Commission
was not to bra -- not to do formal minutes, except for
closed sessions where they're statutorily required.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: By posting the agenda -- by posting
the video, that is, in effect, a record of the meeting
and nothing more is required. And given the lack of
staff at the present time, so I don't think you need
minutes, unless you want them.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Oh, thank you for that
clarification. I just thought that was a standard
practice. And that would apply for this meeting as well,
right?

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay. So that's one less
agenda item.

CHAIR TURNER: Well, I'll go Commissioner Fernandez and then Yee, and then I'll wait for my turn and then after Yee I'll go.

Commissioner Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Chair. I would -- I would suggest that we not only pick the next meeting day, but maybe like the next three or four, just so some of us can plan around it. And then also so we can, if we're going to have presentations or speakers, we can start asking for their availability and start filling in the blanks. Instead of waiting for the next meeting to set up the next meeting, we can try to be a little bit more proactive about it. That's just a recommendation, I guess, on my selfish side of it. So thank you.

MS. JOHNSTON: The soonest the notice could go out would be next Tuesday, which would be the 8th. So the earliest you could possibly have a meeting would be the 22nd of September.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner Yee, and then Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. And counsel, could you continue with that? Just tell us more. What actually has to go out? Do we have to have all the agenda items decided on then before that? Do we do that together --
MS. JOHNSTON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER YEE: -- or does the Chair?

MS. JOHNSTON: If there's an emergency, you can add an item to the agenda. But generally you need to have the agenda with enough description that people know what's going on.

COMMISSIONER YEE: And that can be said by just the Chair or -- I mean --

MS. JOHNSTON: It can be set by the Chair --

COMMISSIONER YEE: Finalized --

MS. JOHNSTON: -- with --

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: -- finalized by the Chair with input from the Commission.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Okay.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner -- where's my --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Le Mons.

CHAIR TURNER: Le Mons. Thank you. If you see -- if you see my names, that -- I don't know if you can see it with my screenshot on, but I keep a whole page just for lists, and then I got lost. There's too many names. Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: No worries. No worries. Process, I guess. I can't imagine 14 people building an agenda, so I'm like, this is not a good plan in -- in my
That's way too many people trying to build an agenda. I'm wondering, counsel, if there is -- I think, first of all, thank you, Commissioner Ahmad. I think you have the framework. And I think, to Commissioner Fernandez's point, there's only so many things we're going to be able to cover, based upon, you know, what it is that we have to accomplish in that next meeting.

And I'm wondering if -- and I don't know if this is a subcommittee situation. And this is where, I guess, counsel comes in. We have this whole laundry list of stuff. I think staff, meaning Raul, specifically, with the support of Marian, probably can help prioritize. Like, the one thing we've observed, or I've observed with Raul is, I think he has a good understanding of us, and listens to us and knows where what we want to do intersects with process and what's doable based on state requirements and everything that's required.

So I think that if maybe we created a laundry list, not as extensive as all of the things we've talked about today, but that we want to cover in the next couple of meetings, if you will. And then the subcommittee working with Raul could structure the agendas for those things. Because I don't know that we're going to be able to do that here in this meeting today. I'm just not thinking,
looking at the time, that we're -- and today's the last
day, I think, of this meeting.

MS. JOHNSTON: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: So I'm trying to be realistic
and go, okay, it's 4:13 on Friday, day seven or eight of
Zoom meetings, and we're trying to structure agendas for
multiple meetings into the future. Hmm. I don't know.

MS. JOHNSTON: I think -- I think your first
priority is executive director. And if you think that's
going to take two days, then unless you have a three-day
meeting, all you're going to do is executive director.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Like that kind of guidance.
Yeah, I think that's, like, real helpful. And then if we
know -- if you're saying we could post on Tuesday and
then we could also conceivably post multiple meetings
though, right? Like for Wednesday or Thursday of next
week, we could post another set of meetings.

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: And so the subcommittee could
inform that with the support of the Chair or staff.

MS. JOHNSTON: If -- if you -- the subcommittee can
make recommendations to the Chair and then have the Chair
decide. If it's a decision making, it either has to be
one person or the notice committee.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: So, yeah. I mean, I think it
would be a matter of -- I'm sorry to, you know, turn this into a whole dialogue -- a matter of empowering the Chair, not to -- so not trying to overburden the Chair, of course. But I think we're in this point where we've got to empower someone to be able to say, okay, got it. Here's what needs to happen over the next series of meetings. I have a good sense of what we need working with staff. I'll sign off on these. And what we agree to in the next time that the time that we're here to gather is how many meetings that we want to do that for through what period of time? So that's my recommendation.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh. Thank you.

Commissioner Vazquez and then Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: I agree with Commissioner Le Mons. I think probably the best use of our time now is to figure out our collective capacity to meet over a series of meetings over the next really, I would say, two to three months even, so that we can block that off and adjust our personal and professional work calendars. Because, I think, also part of, for me, why this meeting was particularly overwhelming, was it was scheduled fairly last minute and then has extended far beyond what I think it had originally, you know, had potentially been. Right? First, it was framed as five days, and now
it's seven or eight, at least.

So I think we would be wise to block off the capacity, and then, to Commissioner Le Mons' point, empower the Chair/Chairs over those meetings to try to get in what we have already identified as existing business. And knowing that as these meetings progress, we're going to need to adjust, in somewhat real time, the agendas moving out. But at least we've got the time blocked off for those meetings, even if we don't have enough of an agenda to notice those.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh. Okay.

And so, Commissioner Akutagawa and Commissioner Toledo, Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: On that point, and I agree with everything that was just said. I -- on that point, I'm thinking about how this -- these series of meetings were structured and the agenda for these series. We started last week Wednesday. We went three days last week, four days this week with one agenda. And it continued on every day based on what we were able to get through. I'm thinking that perhaps using that as kind of our model, can we -- can we schedule out, with the adequate 14 days' notice, weekly meetings up to a certain point using the same very large agenda that gives us the kind of flexibility that we would need to determine
whether or not we're going to continue to meet or whether
we're going to -- we're at a place where we -- we may
say, okay, it doesn't make sense to meet today. We'll
just con -- we'll just reconvene the following week
during the times that are scheduled, but we're going to
use the same agenda items. Because I'm thinking about
the -- even just using all the things that we said were
important to us, if we were to agendize all of those
items, that would give us the flexibility to then build
an agenda real time without -- without perhaps running
too far along, just far enough that we can then determine
what's going to be the agenda for the following, let's
say, beyond a three-week or four-week span of time.
That's -- so just a thought there.

MS. JOHNSTON: You've got to work a little bit
backwards, in that by the time you're in your third week
of the meeting, you already have to have your plans for
the following meeting in place, so you can give your two
weeks' notice.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah. I was even thinking
that within the first two weeks we could start to figure
out what the agenda for the following further out weeks
would be. But we would still be -- we would still have
enough meetings scheduled that then we're not going to
lose time, like a two-week period of time like we are
going to be this time if we -- if we plan it out. And then at that point, it gives us the time to really think about what those agenda items are going to be. Because we already know, to a degree, there are some certain things that we have to do, like the executive director hiring and the interviews and all that.

And then there are other things that, I think, Commissioner Sinay, based on all the things -- and I do want to say, yes, those are all the things that we all talked about -- we can agendize those things. And I felt like in this agenda, we moved around based on what was relevant at the time, who we had scheduled. So I feel like there's some flexibility because we build a really large agenda. We just get through all the things that we need to get through in like, let's say, a three-week time frame.

MS. JOHNSTON: There was some public comment that that was hard for the public to follow. That would be my only suggestion is you try to, as far as you can, set up times.

CHAIR TURNER: Specific agenda items. Uh-huh. Commissioner Toledo and then Andersen?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I was --

CHAIR TURNER: And then Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I was thinking in the same
vein as Commissioner Akutagawa, in terms of scheduling
our -- because of the notice requirements, scheduling, a
long meeting, where we could adjourn and -- adjourn and
be able to come back to items and thus, be able to, if we
wanted to meet more regularly, and maybe we don't, but if
we wanted to, wanted that flexibility, could potentially
tackle some three days one week and three days the next,
or such. But it would still be one meeting that would
have an agenda, and we wouldn't have to have, you know,
the items -- the Committee would have to develop the
agenda and the items. But there are certain items that
we know absolutely will have to come back to the
Commission in the next couple of weeks around the
recruitments and the postings and some monthly
expenditures. So we certainly could fill that and -- and
more probably.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner -- I think --
Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I thank you both,
Commissioner Akutagawa and Commissioner Toledo. I think
those -- if that's allowable, I think that would be a
very good idea. The only thing I would like to put out
right now is priorities, because we do only have two
staff. And I think the most important thing, in terms
of, when can we actually schedule these things, and who
are the five candidates for the executive director, and when could we actually interview them?

And two would be our technical experts, i.e., the line drawing, our videographer, our language people who we're trying to hire. When can we get the training we would need to proceed on that? And if we're actually bringing in our experts for those issues because, again, in these areas, we're not the only game in town, in terms of redistricting. And we do need to get our contracts out with those people soon.

Now, it doesn't mean like tomorrow, but the sooner, the better. And if we keep on doing 14-day, 14-day, you know, we're in trouble. So I think if we could say, you know, Raul and Marian, thank you so much for everything, all you're doing, but could you prioritize finding out when these five candidates can come in and, you know, we can actually come back to you with, you know, this expert, that expert. Could you find out when they can be here? Because without that, we can't actually put things really on the agenda, like, we had to float them this last time, and that caused different conflicts.

MS. JOHNSTON: If we could get an idea from you about what days, starting two weeks from now, you all are available, then we could work with the candidates.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yes. Well I'll get the -- I'll get
the candidates scheduled. I need the dates. And -- and I -- and if I know --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay.

MR. VILLANUEVA: -- what kind of folks you want for me to try and bring in, I'll do that. The main reason --

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

MR. VILLANUEVA: -- you're -- it wasn't your presenters were floating, is your -- because they were asked to come in and provide an extended Q&A, where was the best time for them with their schedule, and that's what made the scheduling.

CHAIR TURNER: Right. And we can answer the question, I mean, on -- go ahead, Commissioner.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: There will be a flexibility issue that I'm sure you'll be happy to address. It's just we're saying and do this and do this and do this. I don't want to lose assigning too many tasks, that I'd like to make sure we keep those at the highest priority because that -- everything else flows from that.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Correct.

CHAIR TURNER: Before we throw out some dates, Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh. Well, I wanted to throw out dates.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh, good. In a moment.
MR. VILLANUEVA: Yeah.

CHAIR TURNER: I just wanted to make sure you get your turn --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: -- before we shift.


CHAIR TURNER: Please. Please.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: So I very much appreciate the comment from Commissioner Akutagawa, Commissioner Toledo around having a large agenda. I also think that as we move forward, one of our -- one of our public comments earlier today was thinking about the committee structure of the previous Commission. I'm not suggesting we have to keep the same one, but I think we've already said in our agenda we would want to have an opportunity for a report back from all of those subcommittees.

If it's a report back and potentially some report back and potential action on that subcommittee, that gives us a lot of flexibility from time to time -- from -- in each meeting. And I think it's also on us from time to time to say, no report at this time. Right? To say, hey, we can be on the agenda. We don't always have to talk. Okay. Step back sometimes to know that maybe we have a specific priority for this meeting. And
so to that end, I don't know if people like that idea or not, but that's kind of sounded like where we were going.

I just want to throw out, so in September, it sounds like we have very specific things we need to do. We need to interview the executive director candidates. We need to develop those questions. Those are -- just some going to be closed. Is that correct? Some -- there are some closed session that goes along with that, correct?

I would just suggest following Commissioner Sinay's lead here, three days, September 23rd through the 25th, as well as September 30th through October 2nd. So we have three days in each of those two weeks. We would agendize very -- to somewhat general on those two. However -- however, the first three days is committed to the executive director. If -- if, when we contact folks, those first three days don't work, then we can keep it then for the September 30th to October 2nd.

If we prioritize the executive director, the -- those first three days, September 23rd through 25th, then the second week, September 30th through October 2nd, perhaps we focus on getting that report back on the Gannt work plan and beginning our conversation for outreach, identifying further what it is that exactly we need. If there are additional speakers, we get them put on the future agenda so that we know what we can do.
We can start planning. Right? It sounds like there's this back and forth, like, hmm, we got to -- we got to build the plane while we're flying, and yet we still need a little bit more discussion or training. So let's figure that out at that meeting. And then from there on, if we agree with those six days, then we move to two days, Thursday, Friday of every week of October for the 8th and 9th, the 15th and 16th, the 22nd, 23rd, 29th, the 30th.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Except Thanksgiving weekend.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah, just at least through October, maybe by November, we want to be, you know, doing, you know --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Sorry. October, November --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- community outreach.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- you know, it's all the same.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. Right?

MS. JOHNSTON: On the 23rd to the 25th, could you also do contracts that need to be approved?

MR. VILLANUEVA: I don't --

MS. JOHNSTON: Do you think you'd have time for that?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I didn't hear that. I'm sorry. It was --

CHAIR TURNER: She's asking -- and Raul had left --
MS. JOHNSTON: On -- on the 23rd --

CHAIR TURNER: Raul -- Raul had suggested that we do contract continuation. And she's asking, on that first date, will we have time? She wants us to interject that with the executive director.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: The one thought that keeps coming up for me, with the executive director being our priority for the next meeting, if we have time to -- and I don't know which Commissioners we'd want to invite -- but hearing from past Commissioners on what we should be looking for on the selection of that executive director might be helpful. That was just one of the things that kind of came up, because it's such a critical role. I know we're in different times, but that was just one -- I'm trying to do 2010, actually do work, and learn. I'm just trying to balance all of that.

MS. JOHNSTON: And you'd want to have that before you do your interviews.

CHAIR TURNER: Yeah. And, well, for me, I -- I don't want to have that for executive director.

MS. JOHNSTON: Okay.

CHAIR TURNER: I think we can make the decision without 2010. I do see there would be a lot of value in having 2010 testimony for a lot of other areas. But I
don't want to slow the process.

Commissioner Toledo, Commissioner Kennedy, Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I just wanted to get some guidance from counsel on, in terms of transparency and -- and items, any time we have an action item, there needs to be some communication to the public. And -- and how specific do we have to be with our agenda items in order to be able to take action on the items.

MS. JOHNSTON: Enough to know what it is that you're considering taking action on. For example, for the census, we put -- I think the way we phrased it was census timetable and possible action so that there would be a range of actions you might take having to do with the census timeline. You decided letters, not litigation at this time, but at least people knew that you wanted to talk about the problems with the timing of the census. So enough that people will understand what you're going to be talking about.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Next Commissioner?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Thank you, Madam Chair. I actually would be fine with getting some input from 2010 Commissioners about the executive director position, but
I would say we need to get that before we go into the closed session to develop the questions.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I --

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioners Yee and Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER YEE: On that point, I'm wondering, Commissioner Turner, if you could say more about your -- why you would rather not have that input?

CHAIR TURNER: Well, I -- I am -- I think it -- I think it slows the process. And I think there's enough of expertise here and have worked with the executive directors. And we have the -- the guidelines of what it is we're looking for. I think we've been through that, and we're in agreement that it's what we need. And I don't -- I can't imagine -- I can't imagine how much more helpful and -- and where I would make great changes about what we're looking for based on testimony of what was done in 2010. And we're in a whole different world for 2020.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I see. Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: It's just a personal preference to move more than anything else.

Commissioners Sadhwani and -- I may have forgotten someone -- and Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Just as a compromise here, I'm wondering if in order to continue the process moving
forward, if we can formally request of any 2010
Commissioner who would like, that we -- we seek their
input and if they could please provide any best
practices, lessons learned, either written or as a -- as
a short video that they could submit to. So it's not
like, you know, an arduous task, you know, they can just
like, do the -- do a quick video themselves and tell us,
like, here are the five things that we wish that we had
that we didn't have or something like that, you know,
just to make it easy for them, so that we can still get
some of that feedback, but that we can continue the
process moving.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I was going to suggest
something similar. I too don't want a presentation from
2010 on selecting an executive director. I think that we
can do that. I think we have enough expertise in the
room to do that. If they want to chime in at public
comment and give us some caution for two minutes here and
there, great. But to schedule that as a presentation, I
personally don't -- don't see the need for that. There
was something else, but I -- I can't remember now.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Yee and Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. I think there's a question
hanging on whether we could also consider the contract
renewals at the first meeting in September. And I think it sounds like something we'd have to make time for, you know, whether or not we think it's comfortable, it's -- it's a matter of urgency. So I would say hopefully, yes.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez and Andersen and Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. I also agree, in terms of, I feel we can move forward with the recruitment and interviewing process for the executive director without necessarily having feedback or receiving feedback from the 2010 Commission. If they want to provide feedback, that's fine. But I do feel that all of us have enough experience, in terms of what we believe that executive director position needs to encompass and what the duties and functions and hopefully what their experience would bring or what experience they should have. So that's just my opinion.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I also agree with the -- I would like to invite them to bring information for us, the 2010, but I don't think we need to hold on it. I actually want to talk about the -- as what Commissioner Yee just brought up. I feel that we really do have to deal with the contracts that are out there. And I think
we have a few items which are holding us up on that, in
that we are asking for additional information.

And so I'm very concerned that I -- if we do the
executive director on those first three days, then we
should put -- you know, what -- I think we can ad -- try
to address those items, those contracts. And I don't
think we're going to get anywhere, because we
don't -- we'll still say I don't have enough information.
So I'd like to get the experts or information on the
agenda for line drawers, the videographer, and the
language scheduled. And if you're not doing it in the
first -- the -- the 25th or the 23rd and 24th -- 23rd,
24th, 25th, then that should be on the 30th, 1, and 2.

CHAIR TURNER: But I'm going to ask Le
Mons -- Commissioner Le Mons, let me ask Raul, I don't
know, but is that the same agenda -- is that the same
contract continuation that you're thinking of?

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yes, and -- yes, and that -- there
was an earlier discussion that the Commission felt that
it would be helpful to have a workshop type of -- of
experience, in terms of understanding the role and -- and
activities of working with the line drawer bidder.

CHAIR TURNER: You -- before you go there, Raul,
what I'm -- you listed that out as a complete and
separate item. Right before you left, and you were
rushing to do something --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Right.

CHAIR TURNER: -- you said we'd want to make sure that we do con -- continuation of contracts, interviews for executive director, a community engagement plan, and then workshops for line drawer and technical drafts --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Right.

CHAIR TURNER: -- drafts, something like that you said. So I'm talking about the first bullet you started out with.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Right.

MS. JOHNSTON: One was the contract for -- for recruiting employees, recruiting applicants.

MR. VILLANUEVA: So that would be the interagency agreement. And if that goes through before, it'll already have been either approved or disapproved by the Chair and the subcommittee.

MS. JOHNSTON: Right.

MR. VILLANUEVA: What I could --

CHAIR TURNER: But I'm also referring back to what you said.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Right. Right. And -- and --

MS. JOHNSTON: And couldn't it --

MR. VILLANUEVA: And may -- and maybe because I left
so fast, but what I was alluding to was that the group, the Commission had felt it couldn't move forward with a line drawing contract, I mean, a line drawing RFP, because there was a sense among members or Commissioners of -- of needing a better sense of what the line drawer does, as well as what the -- as -- as the engagement piece. And that's why I was saying, well, okay, make sure you're taking time to flesh out that engagement piece, and make sure you're taking time then to understand this line drawer thing, because that seems to be the prerequisites to moving forward with putting together a statement of work.

CHAIR TURNER: We understand that.

MR. VILLANUEVA: That's what I meant.

CHAIR TURNER: I -- I thought you had mentioned something totally separate.

Commissioner Le Mons?

MR. VILLANUEVA: I was just leaving too fast.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I want to reiterate my recommendation earlier of establishing a subcommittee to work with staff to prioritize and come up with an agenda. We all agree to live with it, knowing that they will do their very best with the dates that we give and to come up with something that makes sense from a priority standpoint. Because, I think, quite frankly, Raul and
Marian have the best understanding as to what intersects what and what we need to do in kind of a sequence beyond our more altruistic stuff. So we'll get to that, too.

But for these next six days that we identify.

Also, I want to nominate Commissioner Fornaciari, if he's open to it, because I think he wanted to be a part of the Gannt subcommittee, and I think he has that structural kind of thinking, and he has a good grasp of what it is that we want to do and someone else working with him. I know he's on some other ones, but someone else working with him and Raul could whip out some agendas that we can live with.

MS. JOHNSTON: You already had two people on the Gannt, Kennedy and --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: And I know. I know. No, I'm not suggesting him to get on that. I know. I'm talking about the agenda subcommittee.

MS. JOHNSTON: Okay.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Oh. I -- I missed that. I guess that was part of the discussion. I apologize for having to take time away.

MS. JOHNSTON: I've taken good notes.

MR. VILLANUEVA: As -- as I understood it, Marian and I were to work with the outgoing Chair and the incoming Chair --
CHAIR TURNER: That's right.

MR. VILLANUEVA: -- on developing the agenda, not --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Ah.

MR. VILLANUEVA: -- not a subcommittee.

CHAIR TURNER: That's right.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I apologize. Okay. There we go. So do -- maybe that's it then, Chair. Can --

is -- are you and the incoming --

CHAIR TURNER: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: -- Chair comfortable moving forward and saying we get -- we got this guys, and then if not, then let's zero in on what you need --

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: -- to be able to do that.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: I've drafted while you all were talking.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: So I'll send something over to Raul soon.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Oh.

CHAIR TURNER: Beautiful. Beautiful.

Commissioners Andersen, Yee, and Sinay?

And Vazqu -- I'm sorry. Andersen, Vazquez, Vazquez and Sinay. Oh. Vazquez -- Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I was going to bring up that
very point, that I think it's already the Chair and Vice
Chair that are those committee.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Let me know if you need any of
my notes. I can get it to you. I'd also want to make
sure that on the next agenda we do have -- an agenda item
for the next meeting is to hear back about how we do
contracts or grants to nonprofits, how do we work with
nonprofits, so that we have, you know, just have the
clarity of on how we would do that piece. And I would
recommend -- I know it's not going to work, but that we
think about the line drawing workshop with the executive
director. I mean, we're going to need to, just like the
six and eight needed to kind of bond through training, I
feel like, yeah, the executive director may need to
connect, but that might not be as important, but since
that's going to be a key -- key player. And the
executive director will be helping us facilitating that
process of hiring them. But I do want the nonprofit
piece. I think the sooner we know that information that
will be one of the pieces that can help us.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yeah. I totally support the
plan where the Chair and Vice Chair are coming up with
our agenda. We have the Gannt subcommittee. I might --
I might suggest that we, today, identify at least an interim, even, it doesn't have to last forever, but an outreach and engagement committee of some sort, so that the Chair and Vice Chair, as that's going to be moving, that there's a couple folks who can kind of think across meetings about what that plan will be.

What I'm hearing is that our -- that contract continuation when it comes to language service -- language interpreters, line drawing in particular, that that -- that those are contingent on what we come up with regarding engagement and outreach, to some extent.

Right? That we want to have --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Right.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: -- some conversations there before we figure out that -- that contracting part. So while yes, it's something that needs to be on the agenda, it's going to have to be on the agenda long term. So at least from the planning standpoint of that, if there's a subcommittee kind of thinking about it, as we're moving from one meeting to the next, and the Chair and Vice Chair are changing, that subcommittee can kind of provide some broader oversight and continuation of that work so that we can continue to move it forward, if that makes sense.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yes. Good idea.
CHAIR TURNER: Let me see if there are any volunteers.
Commissioner Sinay? On the community outreach -- community engagement subcommittee. Any others?
COMMISSIONER FORNACIARI: I think Vazquez is raising her hand.
CHAIR TURNER: And Vazquez. Yep. I see her. And that is what happens. Your hand is right behind your name. It's me. And I like that, lifting up the yellow book, too. It might be something we think about later. Uh oh. Unless it disappears.
Okay. Commissioner Vazquez and Commissioner Sinay? Thank you.
MS. JOHNSTON: On the other -- on the other subcommittee --
CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Kennedy?
MS. JOHNSTON: Excuse me a minute.
CHAIR TURNER: Oh. Yes, go ahead.
MS. JOHNSTON: On the other committees, you've had different subgroups. I don't know if you want to continue that practice or not.
COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: That was a bit why I was tentative in raising my hand. But just because both Commissioner Sinay and I are both Democrats, I don't know
if we wanted --

MS. JOHNSTON: It's not -- that's not required by law. It's just whether or not you want to have that as a policy.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Or practice.

CHAIR TURNER: And perhaps their first meeting, they can come back with some suggestions for subcommittees, too, so we don't have to do it now.

Commissioner Kennedy?

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: Madam Chair, it's 4:42. We've been telling the public since we started last week that there would be time for general comment on things not on the agenda. Plus, we need public comment on the discussion about the agenda. So I would suggest that we cut to public comment. And if there isn't one waiting in line, we can continue our discussion. But I really want them to have the opportunity before we adjourn.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER KENNEDY: And we do have -- we have to break in twenty minutes, even if we continue after that, we have to break in twenty minutes.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh. Thank you, Commissioner Kennedy. I appreciate that.

We have a pretty good framework of what we're going to do over the next three days. We have subcommittees
that's going to create the agenda -- well, the Chair, Vice Chair -- the agenda. And we have a subcommittee now that also is going to work on the beginning of community engagement, and hopefully they'll come back and suggest subcommittees if need be. And so we'll go to public comment. Commissioner Fernandez, really quickly?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, it'll be quick. I just want to make sure -- Commissioner Sadhwani had thrown out some dates, and we didn't really discuss it. So I mean, I'm fine with the dates. I just want to make sure everybody else was good with the dates as well, so --

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Can we review those again really quick? Sorry.

CHAIR TURNER: Uh-huh. It's the 23rd, 24th, and 25th. Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, two weeks out. The following week, same thing, Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. That's on September 30th, October 1st, October 2nd. And then from there, I believe the suggestion was moving to Thursday, Friday, the 8th and 9th, of the following weeks. Okay. Good. Good. Good.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Was it all the Thursday and Fridays in October, I believe, right? So 8, 9, 15, 16, 22, 23.

CHAIR TURNER: Yeah. Yeah.
COMMISSIONER YEE: 29, 30, yeah.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I'm sorry. I cannot do Thursdays, Fridays on a regular basis, and particularly the 8th and 9th. I'm completely out of pocket on those dates. I'm also out of pocket on the 30th and the 1st. I have standing engagements that I can't move. But the week of September 23rd through the 25th, I know I can do. If it were the week of -- I could do prior to the 8th and 9th. So that October 5th, 6th, or 7th, I could do. But I cannot do the 8th and 9th.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. And what -- a couple of things. I know we've said before that we have a Commission of 14, as long as we have a quorum, we still can move forward. So there may be some meetings that we'll miss. The importance of at least saying it, is because we don't want to end up at a time when everyone is thinking someone else is going to be there. And I'm only bringing that up because to that end, the week of the 30th through -- 30th, 1st, and 2nd, there's a good possibility that I may not be there. It's like my 42nd anniversary, and I'm -- I don't know yet if I'm really leaving out of town or not. So that would be only two. We'd still have a quorum. But again, this is why
potentially you might want an idea, if people are not
going to be there, so we don't schedule meetings and then
we get down to our nine. Maybe it won't happen. But just
if we now --

MS. JOHNSTON: And you need a special nine if you're
going to be voting on an executive director.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I was just going to say
you -- well, I know we're going the Thursday, Friday, is
it more flexed -- is it better for people to try to go
Wednesday, Thursday? Because that often opens up the
Fridays for -- often I know people have standing
arrangements already on Fridays. Does that help anyone
if it's two days, Wednesday, Thursday?

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioners Le Mons and Taylor?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: I just have another question.
Would it be -- how do people feel about alternate
meeting, like a Tuesday, Thursday or a Monday, Wednesday?
Does it have to be two days in a row? I think that ends
up being a little bit more challenging for myself,
personally, is when I'm missing blocks of time. I mean,
I'm making it work now, but for an ongoing basis, to be
gone three, four days in a row, maybe, I don't know.

And then the other question is, are half days
possible, just out of curiosity. Right? Like, because
if we take right the middle of the whole day, like 9:30 to 4:30 is a full day. But if -- I don't know about that part. And I know this is probably the worst time to be raising these questions.

CHAIR TURNER: I guess --

MR. VILLANUEVA: One real quick thing about half days versus full days. It takes the same amount of contractor work to get started and going for a half day as it does for a full day. So once you got them engaged, keep them there for the eight hours.

CHAIR TURNER: Right. Thank you.

Commissioner Taylor?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yeah. I think I was going to mimic Commissioner Le Mons. I see the cost efficiency that's required for a half day, so that might have to be -- be tabled. But do we have to get into a set pattern of can we alternate? For those of us that make room in the front, can we move the next meeting to the end of the week possibly? So that way you -- you can just -- maybe we can capture more people if they have to -- if they are amending schedules.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. So you said move it to the end of the week. So we -- are we are talking about the ensuing and the continuous days? Are we okay on the 23rd, 24th, 25th for -- for the two weeks out?
Okay. And then the following week, is that what we want to change, or do you want to do the second week of the same thing?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: If I -- I think -- and just a suggestion, if -- if we did the 23rd, the 24th, and the 25th, and let's say that we still did the 30th, the 1st and the 2nd, I think we should consider, for those of us that are still working and run out of here to work, when we get off, maybe the 5th, 6th, and 7th of the following week to -- to where we can move. We can -- we can hide those hours somewhere else in the week.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Okay.

MR. VILLANUEVA: I like that, yes.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Would we meet 5th, 6th, and 7th? Because then ultimately that's -- one, two, three -- that's six days in a row again.

CHAIR TURNER: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: No. It's just a -- suggesting a format more than it was --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: -- suggesting of those -- those days. Just the movement.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I see.
CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I -- I --

CHAIR TURNER: Yeah.

Commissioner Akutagawa?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you. Yeah. And I appreciate what Commissioner Taylor just said, too. Because I know for me, I -- I understand about, you know, knowing that there -- we're not always going to have full -- full participation. But I already know that Thursdays and Fridays -- on at least for -- until the end of the year are going to be out for me. So that's -- I know that having that flexibility is great. I would also ask do we need to do three days in a row too, because, I -- I definitely appreciate what Commissioner Taylor said about trying to find ways to hide the time, and three days is kind of hard to hide for, you know, multiple weeks.

CHAIR TURNER: Well, it's -- okay. So what we said was three days over the next two weeks, and then we'll go to the two days of Monday, Tuesday -- or how about Tuesday, Wednesday, so we'll have a day off?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yeah.

CHAIR TURNER: And then Tuesday, Wednesday, the 6th and 7th.

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Well, I'm thinking --
CHAIR TURNER: Commissioners Sinay and Fernandez?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I think one of the reasons that
that -- that there's longer days that the, you know, you
add -- you can always subtract a day, but you can never
add a day. And so that's why our agenda was eight days.
And even when they -- they were doing the selection
process, they always had much longer agendas than
the -- than they needed.

I also want to remind us all -- and I work -- and if
I don't -- if I'm not working at my clients, I'm not
getting paid. But we did make a commitment, and we were
asked over and over again if we did have the time to do
this Commission and if we could give the time. And so we
do need to balance both, but we need to keep in mind that
right now there is a lot going on. So we just need to
figure out the -- as we said, we're not always going to
have all 14, yeah.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yeah. Let's go to public comment.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner Fernandez?

MS. JOHNSTON: We need to move to public comment or
we're not going to have time.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes, and -- and I
completely understand that piece of it. But for me, I
can work any day of the week, in terms of for the
commission, but I would say the beginning part of the
week is easier for me, like the Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday versus the Wednesday, Thursday, Friday. And again, I don't expect anyone to tailor a schedule, or a calendar based on that, because I can make it work. I'm just saying that maybe we need to see what the other Commissioners' abilities are, or if something's better or not. If something works better or not.

CHAIR TURNER: I want to caution us. We have to go public comment.

Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Can I give some dates?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. Tell me what you all think, or don't tell me what you all think. I don't know. Here's what I'm thinking. We stick to three days, September 23rd, 24th, 25th. The focus there is the executive director. We continue the next three days, September 30th, October 1st, October 2nd, with a focus there on the outreach and engagement and also hearing that -- that Gannt plan. And then from there on --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: No. I'm not fine with that.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: No? Oh.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. I didn't realize I was on, because -- well,
CHAIR TURNER: Go ahead. Go ahead, Commissioner Sadhwani, complete, please.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Okay. And then I was just going to say, why don't we take that week of October 5th and not meet then. And then starting the week of the 12th, just to kind of put variety in our schedules, why don't we start Monday, Tuesday, October 12th and 13th? The following week, we do the 20th and 21st, which is Tuesday, Wednesday. And that last week of October, we do the 28th and 29th, which is Wednesday, Thursday. So that we're hitting different days throughout the weeks, yet there's a pattern. Hopefully, we can accommodate as many people as possible. I'm not wedded to that. I'm just hearing everybody and trying to move us forward.

CHAIR TURNER: Does any -- is the -- Columbus Day a holiday for anybody on the 12th? No? Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sorry. I didn't notice that.

CHAIR TURNER: I just don't even know if it's even relevant anymore. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Is that a state holiday?

CHAIR TURNER: Perfect. I don't know.

MS. JOHNSTON: Not anymore.

CHAIR TURNER: I was just asking. Okay. Beautiful.

MS. JOHNSTON: It's not a holiday.
CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Let's go to public comment.

Ryan, do we have -- I'm sorry. Do we have any public comment waiting?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We do.

And ladies and gentlemen, as a reminder, if you'd like to enter the public comment, we invite you to press 1, then 0 on your telephone keypad. Please spell your name prior to making your comment for the record. And first, we turn to the line of Rosalind Gold. Please go ahead. Your line is now open.

MS. GOLD: Thank you so much. It's Rosalind, R-O-S-A-L-I-N-D. The last name is Gold, G-O-L-D, Chief Public Policy Officer with the NALEO Educational Fund.

Commissioners, just want to first quickly thank you for the incredible and tireless work you've done the last two weeks. Your commitment is extremely inspiring, and we appreciate your dedication.

We're also delighted to see that outreach and public engagement has been identified as a priority. We just would hope that any structured dialogue about public and community engagement that happens in the next set of meetings that you talked about, you know, September and early October, is just seen as the beginning of that dialogue. You know, many of you have noted that we are faced with a lot of uncertainties in the public health
environment.

You know, I know our own organization, who has been doing Census 2020 outreach basically, in the course of three days, had to switch a outreach plan that had a lot of face-to-face and public meetings into one that was virtual. And so that public health environment is changing. We're learning a lot of things, and we'll be learning a lot of things about the software that will be used. But we don't know -- know all about it right now. And so we are going to need to calibrate the outreach that we do as community groups with regard to these developments and the recommendations we make about decisions.

So we would like to, again, see this as an ongoing dialogue, even if it's one that's structured. And again, we recognize that there are points where you folks are going to have to make definitive decisions about certain things. And, you know, I've noted the discussion about what that -- you know, coming up with a timeline. But we just hope that, you know, if there is a structured dialogue about community engagement in the upcoming meetings, that -- that now we have more than one bite of the apple, for lack of a better word, in regard to that discussion.

Thank you so much, again, for your thoughtfulness in
your responsiveness to community input throughout the
process so far, and we look forward to continuing the
dialogue with you. Thank you so much.

CHAIR TURNER: Ms. Gold, before you get off --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Ms. -- Ms. -- yeah.

CHAIR TURNER: Go ahead, Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Ms. Gold, this is Patricia
Sinay. I had a question on -- on the community groups,
and -- and you were talking about recalibrating, do you
all have funding? I mean, I know you're planning, but do
you have funding for -- for doing some of that outreach?
Is -- just kind of is that in -- in your guys' plans?
Because I know there's so much going on with the census,
elections, and -- and redistricting.

MS. GOLD: Yes. Yes. Some groups have funding for
census. Some groups have funding for census and voter
engagement. Some groups have funding for census, voter
engagement, and redistricting. So it really differs from
group to group. So that is just going to depend on the
individual group, as well as different collaboratives.
So yes, we -- you know, I can say for our organization, a
collaborative of funders has provided us with funding,
not only for our census work, but also for mobilizing the
community for redistricting, as well as working on unity
mapping. But again, that differs from group to group.
CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Thank you so much.

Commissioner Yee, did you have a question for the caller?

COMMISSIONER YEE: No, no.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

We're going to go to the next public comment, please.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

And next, we turn to the line of Kimberly Coles.

Please go ahead.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

MS. COLES: Hi. My name is Kimberly Coles, C-O-L-E-S. And I just wanted to, like all the other callers, appreciate you. But I so enjoyed getting to know each of you through your personal nuance or professional styles, and I wish that we could all be in the audience so that you could also see us. I'm calling specifically on a few things. But to follow up on your excellent dialogue, and what I suspect will be a sustained dialogue, on how to maintain your professional selves in this sort of new role that you're taking on as public servants. And the issues of Bagley-Keene are going to remain with you and be something you have to navigate.

But I'd like to specifically bring up Dr. Sadhwani's specific concern, and her need as a professor and the
professional obligation and responsibility to publish. I wonder if it would be useful to learn more about Dr. Sadhwani's current and planned research projects and how they might intersect with the CRC, and specifically any protocols of human subjects research that she might need to follow. And that may not be relevant, or maybe it is.

Public officials are classified under what's called exempt, but it doesn't mean that there aren't other obligations. And she knows this, and I'm not trying to -- to school her at all, but rather sort of think about that broadly, because it is -- and there are specific ethical or -- or responsibilities. And I know all of you face this, but that -- that's something that maybe we should all learn more about.

And I also wanted to uplift the sort of ideas that Commissioner Sinay was talking about, in terms of inclusion and inviting people in, and including people who are perhaps the critics and the people who are, you know, out to get you. But I've been so pleased with your -- your dialogues and thinking about the RFQs instead of RFPs and being innovative with community outreach and NALEO when working with nonprofits. So thank you very much. And those are my comments for today.
CHAIR TURNER: Thank you, Ms. Cole. We appreciate it.

And Commissioners Sadhwani, you can follow up later with the suggestions or just the kind of the comments. Do we have another caller?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We have no further questions in queue at this time.

CHAIR TURNER: And Commissioner -- I'm sorry. Commissioner Akutagawa and then Commissioner Yee?

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I think I just wanted to come back to what we left off at before the public comment. I know that Commissioner Sadhwani said, I think, the first week would be the executive director interviews, and then following that would be the community engagement and -- and other topics that we had in mind. On that one, I thought it was -- I -- I thought it was the opposite. I thought that where we left off the discussion is that we would talk about some of the things related to dealing with the contracts and then go to the executive director interviews the following week.

I do like the idea -- I will confess, I do like the idea of taking a break and -- and perhaps going two weeks and taking a break, maybe using that as a cadence. Maybe go, then take that break, go two weeks, then take another break the week of the 28th, and then start up again
afterwards. That -- that's just an idea that I would  
like to just put out for consideration, too, as an  
alternative.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Thank you. And on the agenda,  
I think that the capturing between staff and myself and  
Commissioner Ahmad, we'll order that we would be the  
discussion held today.

Commissioner Yee, please.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yeah. So -- so here we are  
doodling all the dates, wondering if we could just press  
towards a decision by looking at the dates Commissioner  
Sadhwani put out as -- we'll call that option A. Option  
B, I'm wondering instead of September 30 to October 2nd,  
whether some of the Commissioners would be better with  
October 5, 6, 7. Because I think later in the week was  
harder for some. So can we call that option B -- so and  
then somehow press to a decision here?

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioners, we have options A and  
B on the table.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'm just wondering if maybe  
between Raul and the committee whether this can be done  
offline?

CHAIR TURNER: Well, we have -- I think we have to  
say it -- don't we have to determine here to be able to
set it for public or no?

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I don't believe so. The last meeting wasn't done through public -- in a public setting. It was done -- but -- and maybe I'm wrong. So we're doing that (indiscernible) counsel.

MS. JOHNSTON: The staff just picked it arbitrarily because we -- you weren't meeting yet. We had to get you started, so we just picked it. But it's -- you should pick it.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: We should pick it? Okay.

MS. JOHNSTON: Or you should delegate it to your Chair to pick it.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: So the Chair has the ability to pick it then, and --

MS. JOHNSTON: If you decide that.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: And -- and the Chair would be able to work with Raul to get data and such, right?

MS. JOHNSTON: Yes.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: We have two choices on the table. Can't we just quickly go and see if we can come up with --

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Sure. And that should be fine.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Commissioner Sadhwani?

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Oh, I'm fine with either
option A or B. I just feel like we're all here. And for
me personally, I -- I'm not wedded to any of the dates. I'm fine with anything. I just wanted to give us something to react to. But for me personally, the -- the more we can, like, I can put it on my calendar, then I can commit the time. If we leave here, and we don't have a plan, I -- I -- things get really busy for me, and I -- I want to prioritize this. So it -- to the extent that we can calendar it, it would be better for me.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

So Commissioner Andersen?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: In terms of plan A versus plan B, I'm -- they're not -- not exactly consistent, in that, I'm -- or maybe I'm misinterpreting. But for clarification, the first one is the three days, and the Wednesday, Thursday, Friday. Then the Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, and then it's staggering every two days, I think, after that, where B is the 23rd, 24th, 25th, and then is it -- skip and then go 5, 6, 7? What then --

COMMISSIONER YEE: That's right.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: But then what?

COMMISSIONER YEE: Then -- then the rest of October as in planning. That was 12, 13, 20, 21, 28, 29.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Could -- could I
make a C?

CHAIR TURNER: Sure.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I guess, who'd want to go -- again, I'm actually quite pressed with time. So -- but if we do the 23rd, 24th, 25th, I -- I -- we need to go, you know, say during the 20 -- the Monday, Tuesday, Wed -- the Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and the 30th. Sorry. The first two weeks, the Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday. Then rather than doing a bunch of staggering, I'd say let's just schedule Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and do two of those. Because I think that we have to schedule three days or not?

CHAIR TURNER: We -- we do not have to schedule three, no.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Then I can vote Tuesday, Wednesday from then -- from then on.

CHAIR TURNER: Commissioner -- thank you.

Commissioner Ahmad?

So that's the C choice.

Commissioner Ahmad?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to propose option D. Just kidding. Just kidding. I think we all -- I think we all agree on 23rd to the 25th, yeah?

CHAIR TURNER: Yes.
COMMISSIONER AHMAD: We can? Okay. So what I had on the draft was September 30th to October 2nd, which seems to present some issues for some folks. And I understand. Like, we all have other things going. Life happens. If we can just agree on that next meeting, it would be really helpful, in terms of figuring out even the schedule moving forward. Because theoretically, we would have selected our executive director and that person could help us figure out scheduling moving forward as well. The only thing that I am thinking of, is if the candidates are not available to interview on the 23rd to the 25th. Do we want to push that out potentially another two weeks for interviews? So I'll leave it there.

CHAIR TURNER: What time is our required break, staff?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Our -- our caption people say it's okay if you guys want to finish your scheduled discussion.

CHAIR TURNER: Oh, beautiful, caption people. Thank you.

Commissioner Fernandez and Sinay?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I -- I just want to clarify that if we hold interviews the 23rd through the 25th, and we select someone, you still go through -- you want
to -- want to check references. You're going to be negotiating a salary. So it's not like they're going to be able to start right away. And then also, if we wait until that day to set the date for the next meeting, now we're another two weeks out again. So I'm -- I'm just -- so even if we select an executive director -- and Raul, you can correct me if I'm wrong -- but I would be surprised if they could start within two weeks. I'm thinking more of a month later we might actually get somebody that we can --

MR. VILLANUEVA: No.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- that we can appoint, I guess, at that point.

MR. VILLANUEVA: You can appoint them as -- as early as -- hire them on Monday, check references, negotiate Tuesday, Wednesday, and get them in place on the Thursday.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Well, that's -- that's, of course, if they don't have to give notice to their --

CHAIR TURNER: Right.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- their current employer. And for the most part --

MR. VILLANUEVA: True that.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: -- most people would give two weeks, I would hope. So --
MR. VILLANUEVA: True that.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: That's why I'm saying it's probably going to be at least two weeks, I would think, from when you interview and select, at least two weeks to when they could start. So I mean, that kind of throws --

MR. VILLANUEVA: Yeah, I took it -- I took it in terms of the things that you control. Four days.

CHAIR TURNER: Let me -- let me say this. Can we make our comments really succinct at this point and not reiterate. So let's just speak what we want to say and drop it. Don't add anything extra to it, just for this part of the conversation, so we can narrow things down.

Commissioner Sinay?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I -- I heard what Commissioner Ahmad was saying, but I want to go back to what Commissioner Sadhwani was saying. And it -- it fits. I have clients who I've said -- I've put on hold right now on what we can do, because I don't know my schedule. So for me, ideally we would have -- I thought we could -- we would be having a calendar out through December. But -- and so if we could just stick to the A and B, that would be great for right now.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Great. A being 23rd, 24th, 25th, 30th, 1st, and 2nd. And the A was then going from
the 5th, 6th, 6th, 7th, 7th, 8th, the whole -- the whole bit. The B was the 1st --

Commissioner Yee, you were B. Was it the first six days the same, or did you already change it to 11th?

COMMISSIONER YEE: It was 23, 24, 25, then October 5, 6, 7.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. And then --

COMMISSIONER YEE: And then the staggered days.

CHAIR TURNER: And then staggered from there, but --

Okay.

Commissioners, can -- we don't have to do it -- do we need a motion and all that, or can we just agree?

MS. JOHNSTON: You can just agree.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay.

Commissioner --

MS. JOHNSTON: You should get a sense of the Commission, and then you can set it.

CHAIR TURNER: So let's see. A -- those that think they're interested in A, can you just kind of hold your hand in front of the camera? All right. Let me see.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Who can do A. Who can do B.

Because some of us can do either.

CHAIR TURNER: Both.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Right, so.

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. Yes, thank you.
One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, A.
Okay. Who can do B? Nine. B, one, two, three, four, five --
MR. VILLANUEVA: It looks like B.
CHAIR TURNER: -- six, seven, eight, nine, ten.
Okay. We're going to go B. Okay. So B. So -- so we'll set our schedule as September 23rd, 24th, 25th, as October 5th, 6th, and 7th. And then from there, we will stagger Monday, Tuesday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday. Oh, but the only thing that we will have taken into --
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Please clarify --
CHAIR TURNER: -- consideration was Commissioner --
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. Please clarify -- oh, sorry. Could we please clarify? It goes 5, 6, 7. And then does it go --
CHAIR TURNER: It does not -- yes, 5, 6, 7, then it goes 12, 13.
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay. It's starts on the -- it starts on the Monday then the following week?
CHAIR TURNER: Right. And the -- and the only thing we did not --
COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Okay.
CHAIR TURNER: -- clarify in that, Commissioner Akutagawa, I think it was, was asking for a break in
between, after the six days. But the scheduling, that at
pattern is, is exactly what we've agreed to. And
so -- so that means that the week of the 11th, we will
not meet, and then we'll start the scheduling. Okay?

COMMISSIONER YEE: We said 12, 13, 20, 21, 28, 29.
I don't think we said the Thursday, Friday after, which
would be November 6, 7, I think, or 5, 6.

CHAIR TURNER: Well, what I was --

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Come on. Stop.

CHAIR TURNER: What I -- what I was addressing was
Commissioner, I think, Akutagawa, had also requested that
there be a week break at some point after. And we can do
that, but we don't need to do that. But I did not want
to not address it.

Commissioner Toledo.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I was just -- in -- in an
effort to try to move this forward, B sounds fine.
And -- to -- to me at least. I don't know about the
other Commissioners. And perhaps if -- if there's a need
to shift it a little bit, empowering you and -- and
empowering you to make any necessary changes, if
there's -- you know, if there's issues with scheduling of
the executive director committees or -- or anything else
that might come arise. You don't know. There might be a
national disaster or something, right? So we'll empower
you to work with --

CHAIR TURNER: Beautiful.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: We'll empower you to work with staff to do that. Right?

CHAIR TURNER: Okay. And the Chair will do that.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: I'd be comfortable with that.

CHAIR TURNER: Perfect.

Commissioner Vazquez?

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes. So just to -- to clarify, we do have a week in between the 23rd, 24th, 25th. There's a week, and then 5, 6, 7, correct?

CHAIR TURNER: That's right.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Okay. So --

CHAIR TURNER: Yeah, I think, she -- yes. Yes, that's fine.

Commissioner Le Mons?

COMMISSIONER LE MONS: Two things. I didn't know my mic was open. And so I apologize for that outburst. And then number two is -- number two is, just when you guys are looking at the agenda, hopefully, we don't have to use all three days to interview, that we could probably try to truncate it, hopefully. So that's -- that is one thing.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Should -- let's open one more time for public comment before we go. Because we
said at the end of the meeting, and this is the end of the meeting.

Ryan, do we have anyone waiting in queue?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We have no one waiting in queue at this time.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I don't think we heard from Raul whether there's anything still open.

CHAIR TURNER: Yes, he said there is nothing still open. I did hear from him. Thank you.

Okay, so at this moment, our very successful first meeting is adjourned.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I want to just recognize you, though, Commissioner Turner. It was so long, and you did a good job.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you.

MR. VILLANUEVA: Great job.

CHAIR TURNER: Thank you. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you.

CHAIR TURNER: Yeah. Thank you all.

Commissioner Le Mons --

(Whereupon, the California Citizens Redistricting Commission meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.)
CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, of the videoconference recording of the proceedings provided by the California Citizens Redistricting Commission.

_______________________  August 2, 2022
BRIANNA NEEDHAM          DATE