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Tuesday, November 17, 2020

CHAIR KENNEDY: Good morning, everyone. Thank you for joining us. This is day 2 of our meeting from the 16th to 18th of November, 2020.

The first item on our agenda is the roll call, so could the roll be called, please.

MS. SHEFFIELD: All right. Good morning, Commissioners.

Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Fornaciari. Is he there?

Commissioner Kennedy.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Le Mons.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Here.

MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Here.
MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Sinay. I can't --
COMMISSIONER SINAY: My apologies. Here.
COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Present.
MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Toledo.
COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Present.
MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Turner.
COMMISSIONER TURNER: Here.
MS. SHEFFIELD: Commissioner Vazquez. Okay.
COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Yes, here.
MS. SHEFFIELD: And Commissioner Yee.
COMMISSIONER YEE: Here.
MS. SHEFFIELD: Thank you.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you very much.
Are there any general announcements this morning?
Director Claypool, do you have anything?
MR. CLAYPOOL: I do not.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you.
So to review today's agenda, we have a presentation
by a team from the California Census Complete Count
office, beginning at 10 a.m. They will stay with us
through the break, from 11 to 11:15, and we anticipate
having a period for public comment shortly before 12
noon, so perhaps 11:45, 11:50, depending on how the
discussion goes.
We would then have -- we would continue with the executive director's report from yesterday, followed by lunch, most likely 12:45 to 1:45, public comment open again from 1:45 to 2. And at 2 o'clock, we anticipate discussing various RFPs, or at least one RFP. Don't know if we will be approving a scope of work today, but we will be discussing that RFP.

And then, after the break, which will be approximately 3:15 to 3:30, we have one more panel on global access, after which we would have public comment and close the day. So that is the agenda for today.

Who is moderating for us on the public comment line today?

MR. MANOFF: That would be Katy, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Good morning, Katy.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Good morning, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Would you please read the instructions for public comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I will, gladly. Uh oh.

In order to maximize transparency and public participation in our process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the telephone number provided in the livestream feed. The telephone number is 877-853-5247.

When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided
in the livestream feed. It is 91505532099 for this week's meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press pound.

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

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

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

These instructions are also located on the website. The Commission is taking general public comment at this time.

It looks like we do have someone in the queue.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. If you can invite them to join us.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I have.

If you can press star 6. Please state and spell
your name for the court reporter.

MS. SHELLNBERGER: Good morning. This is Lori, L-O-R-I, last name Shellenberger, S-H-E-L-L-E-N-B-E-R-G-E-R, and I'm the redistricting consultant for California Common Cause. Are you able to hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Oh, yes. Please share your comment.

MS. SHELLNBERGER: Okay. All right. Good morning, Commissioners. I'm calling in regarding the handouts that were posted yesterday, and the potential action items you may take today related to those, and really just calling for clarification.

As you all discussed yesterday, I know you didn't receive some of these materials until the public did, I believe. They weren't posted until the lunch break yesterday, and some of those are quite substantive, and I know that you'll be discussing those in your subcommittees.

And in particular, I wanted to ask a question about the voting rights memo and counsel's statement of work, as well as the proposed COI budget strategy map, and ask you if you're planning to take action on those items, because there are stakeholders who are interested in providing feedback on those documents, and there just
isn't sufficient time, with the 24-hour turnaround, for many of those groups to circle the wagons and speak to their stakeholders and provide meaningful feedback to you.

So I wanted to flag that, and also get a sense from you all this morning if you have a sense of whether you (audio interference) subcommittees, because there are folks who would like to listen in to your discussion, and also to reassure the public that you won't take action on items until they've had a chance to provide meaningful public feedback. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Let me ask Director Claypool what our time line is on the RFPs. We certainly want the public to participate and have adequate time to review materials, but on the other end of some of these processes, we have hard deadlines that we have to meet, and unfortunately, very burdensome bureaucratic processes that some of these things have to go through. So let me ask Director Claypool if he could speak to where we stand and how much time we could be able to defer any decision on these items.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes, Chair. So the items that are posted are for review and comment. The Commission needs to take a look at those statements of work and decide whether it's the type of work that they're looking for.
So it's anticipated that, by the following meeting, the December 1st through 3rd, that we would have these in their full form, so we could take comment all the way until then, and make changes, any necessary changes, at that time, before moving them to the Department of General Services.

So I believe that both Commissioners involved with crafting those were looking for suggestions at this point, and not final conclusions, but I'll defer to Commissioners Yee and Sadhwani on that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Yes. A couple items, and thank you, Ms. Shellenberger, for calling in.

So first, there have been some changes to the recommendations that were in that memo, which I was hoping to bring to light, hopefully today, and I also just wanted to note that our conversation about this is actually scheduled tomorrow at 10 a.m. or possibly just before, if there's, you know, time permitting.

Justin Levitt is planning to come and be available to answer questions of the Commission. My sense is he probably would be willing to also take questions from the public if we wanted to open to public comment. Our hope is to advance the statement of work. That is only one piece of the RFI process, but to advance it so that we
can have the sense of the Commission to move forward and
actually develop --

MR. CLAYPOOL: You're kidding me. Okay.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Director Claypool, you're
not on mute.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, okay. Our hope is to
advance the RFI, as Director Claypool mentioned, in its
final form in our December meeting. So I hope that that
would give plenty of time for that.

I did want to note that the memo had recommended
discussing RPD analysis in closed session. After
discussing that with counsel, we will actually be holding
that conversation in public session. The recommendation
from counsel was that once we actually have data
analysis, that that might be something that we would need
to discuss in closed session, as it would relate to
potential future litigation, but at this stage, that we
should have that conversation publicly.

So both for Ms. Shellenberger, the public, as well
as for the Commissioners, please note that that
recommendation has changed, but unfortunately, it is not
updated in the document. If we think that it's possible
to update it and get it on the website, I'm happy to do
that today.

And I don't know, Commissioner Yee, if you have
COMMISSIONER YEE: Nothing else to add. Thank you so much, Ms. Shellenberger, for your attention to this. Any other comments you wanted to bring to our attention?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Ms. Shellenberger is actually gone, but we do have somebody else in the queue waiting to share.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Just before we go to the next caller, so the bottom line is, we anticipate discussing these things during the course of this week's meeting sessions. We do not anticipate taking action until the next meeting, which will be from December 1st through 3rd. So we look forward to comment on these scopes of work at any point between now and the time that we do take action during the course of the next meeting.

So with that, Katy, you can invite the next caller.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I will do.

COMMISSIONER YEE: I think Commissioner Sinay had a comment.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: If you'll press star 6.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Sorry. Sorry. Yes. Can we hold?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: I --


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


PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Please share your comment.

MS. BANH: Okay. So I just wanted to echo Lori Shellenberger. For example, the communities of interest strategy map, I know there's no intention, but for example, under "Accessibility Considerations", not having the word "disability" there when this goes out to the public is going to cause some consternation. The word "ability" -- so oftentimes, in the disability community, we feel erased when the word "disability" is not used.

So I know the intention is good by using the word "ability", but by using the word "ability," we're erasing the disability community. So I was -- for example, if I had time, I would share that the accessibility considerations should for sure include the word "disability" before it goes out to the public, I mean, before it becomes final, because the disability community is not going to -- it's going to feel very unseen with that language.

As well, under "Commission-Identified Goals," under "Representation Considerations", because the disability community is such a large community, to not have that as
being one of the groups under "Representation", I think, would be amiss as well.

So I'm echoing Lori Shellenberger's thoughts, to just ensure that there's some comment back, just so that you have the best thoughts from the different groups, so that you can finalize a document that will speak to the widest audience. Thank you for your consideration.

CHAIR KENNEDY: And thank you for your comment. That is very helpful input, and we can make the necessary modifications before we finalize these documents.

MS. BANH: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I did see Commissioner Fernandez's hand and someone said Commissioner Sinay also had her hand up. Okay. So Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. I just -- I'm really not sure how to put this, but I do appreciate that it's short time frames, but I also only read it last night, and so moving forward, yes, we always want to post information as soon as we can, and get the information out there, but oftentimes we may not have 24 hours.

So I just -- we have these deadlines and these time frames that we need to meet, and we need to make sure that we're mindful of that. Again, posting, we've had issues with that, but I also did not review the information until yesterday. So we need to keep moving
forward, and I appreciate the comments, but we also have
deadlines and time frames. So just be aware of that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Fernandez.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Hi. I appreciate both callers,
and I definitely appreciate raising the awareness on
using the word "disability" versus "ability." I know
that, in the past, I've been told to use "ability". So
it's always helpful to learn.

You know, the hardest part -- and I think this is
important for the community to understand -- is we can't
share a draft and get everybody's input behind -- you
know, among all the Commissioners, and get editing and
(indiscernible). So the only way we can get the input of
our colleagues is to present documents in public, like we
are now. That's why there's "draft" written on things.

Also this is a map, and the main purpose of this is
actually to hand it over to staff, and now we have
staff -- hello, Mr. Ceja -- the purpose is to hand it
over to staff, and really have staff dig into it, and so
the actions are not -- the proposed actions are just so
that -- all of them are very open and broad, for staff to
have parameters to come back and actually give work
plans, and staff will have more time than the
Commissioners have up to now. Up to now, it's been all
on the Commissioners to do the outreach and talk to
groups, and a lot of talking to groups and input on the
panels and stuff went into those documents.

All your letters that you -- the eighteen-page
letter that you all submitted went into that document,
and a lot of the expertise of the Commissioners around
the table. You know, half of us or more, I always like
to tell people, are either working in the community or
community organizers, and so there's a lot of expertise
around, but now we'll have someone who can focus on this
and go deeper, and the purpose of this document was to
have it ready to hand over to staff, so that they can
start making those connections and actually create a much
richer document than that.

So hopefully, the community understands that the
document, more than anything, was to make sure it
captured all of what we've learned in the last three
months, and to really give Mr. Ceja an opportunity to
step off from there, and he doesn't have to do three
months of work that we already did.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Vazquez.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Sorry.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Vazquez.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: Thank you. Yes. And
building off of my subcommittee members' comments, also wanted to particularly invite the public to think broadly with us in response to this document. So we made many attempts to make sure that, you know, the proposals that we listed in the strategy map said, you know, "not exhaustive" when we're talking about strategies and partners, potential tools, not exhaustive, you know, considerations include, but are not limited to.

So we really do understand that -- we do not consider ourselves experts in sort of all of the potential considerations, and wanted to create a strategy map as a jumping-off point, but really hope to get both your very specific feedback, if you feel like there, you know, are things that absolutely must be included in future documents, but also really invite you to think broadly with us about the overall strategy, and really invite comments at a high level about sort of what we have proposed here today, and know that your specific language edits or specific considerations are also welcome, but I think I would personally really love to hear feedback on the overall strategy and orientation for some of these actions.

So thank you again for your feedback, and we appreciate it, and are listening.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect. Thank you, Commissioner
Vazquez.

Katy, do we have other callers?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We do have one more caller in the queue.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. If you could invite them to join us.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes. If you'll please press star 6. If you'll please state and spell your name for the court reporter.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Hi. This is Lori Shellenberger calling back in.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Oh, okay.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Do you need me to spell my name again?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: No, that's okay.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Okay. I just wanted to -- first of all, I really appreciate the thoughtful consideration of our comments, and I also should say, you know, everyone appreciates the work that the subcommittees are doing and putting into these documents that you're posting, but I also wanted to just flag one other thing in terms of the public being able to respond and provide meaningful input, but having sufficient time to do that, and it's related to this.

I understand that the Commissioners have frustration
about this too, as you're all getting started, and with staff being onboarded, and getting you to the dynamic between the Commission and your staff, but the agendas that are being posted are not particularly helpful for the public.

It's not clear what documents will be associated with which agenda items. There are speakers who are coming who still aren't updated on the agenda, and there are times certain for items, and I appreciate very much the Chairs who have been rotating in doing their best to apprise the public at the beginning of each meeting as to the schedules for the day, but the groups who want to engage and who are monitoring the process go beyond the group that I help facilitate and am able to give real-time updates to as I watch your meetings, and let them know when items are being covered, but it requires my full attention.

There's no multitasking, right, because I'm not -- it's a little bit of a surprise each day as items come up, and I understand that it's fluid, and you have to have some flexibility to get through items, and you may move things up, as yesterday you moved more quickly through your agenda, and become more efficient, but I just wanted to flag that the agenda is really critical to the public being able to plan to engage, and to
understand when you're really taking on more substantive items that they should be prepared for, and can manage their time and communication with their stakeholders in order to give you the best input possible.

And I understand turnaround time can be critical, but you also are in the process of making decisions that have such a tremendous impact on this entire process, and so you were given extra time to do this work, in the ramp-up, and part of the reason for that is so the public could have meaningful input, and I just can't emphasize enough how critical some of these decisions are, and that there are a lot of really amazing groups out there who have expertise, you may not even have heard from yet, who may want to weigh in, and so I just want to emphasize again the need for as much public notice and explanation about what you'll be doing so that the public can do that. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Ms. Shellenberger -- she's gone again. Okay.

Any further comments before we go into our presentation from the team from California Complete Count?

Commissioner Le Mons.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: We might want to consider brainstorming at some point the kinds of feedback that
we're looking for, and we can post an open call for feedback on our website, so that the public doesn't have to necessarily wait for an agenda item. I think the team -- the group, that put together the eighteen-page document did an amazing job of being able to translate their concerns, be able to foreshadow for us.

So I think we should think about that, so that we're not in a situation where the public is just reacting, because a lot of these groups already have opinions, and already know what they want to do, and already know what they would like us to do, and I think, if they could kind of take the same approach as the group -- the collective that put together the eighteen-page document, and get that to us, we can have that be a part of our consideration set from the very beginning, which will help us a little bit with some of the time constraints that we face, because this won't be solved with just posting a day or two earlier if we're always on our heels. You know, we don't want be on our heels through this entire process.

So I think that might be a way that we reorient our relationship to the public, and their feedback, because I don't think they're sitting around just waiting for us to put a topic on the agenda. They know what they want to chime in on, and that doesn't preclude them from
participating while we're talking live as well. So
that's just a recommendation.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. And you know, as we redesign
the website, hopefully, we'll be able to give additional
encouragement for individuals and groups to provide input
at any time, particularly in writing, but also during the
course of the meeting.

When I redesigned the agenda for this meeting and
going forward, you know, one of the things that I did was
highlight on the first page, in a text box with large
letters, "The Commission welcomes public input", and we
do want that message to be loud and clear to everyone out
there who is interested in following us. So yes, as we
discuss the website moving forward, we definitely want
that to be very prominent on the website.

Commissioner Taylor, you had a comment?

COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes. Without being redundant,
I would like to concur with Commissioner Le Mons. I had
written down, while Ms. Shellenberger was giving her
comment, "Open call", so I think that somehow, if there's
partners out there that have information related to our
business, that they should send it in at any time, and it
shouldn't be a wait. We should be able to actively move
upon that information. Information is key, is what we've
continued to say, so please give us this information as
soon as possible, so that we can make judgments accordingly.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you. Director Claypool, can I now turn it over to you to introduce our guests?

MR. CLAYPOOL: I was assuming that that was going to be Commissioner Sinay. However, I can introduce the guests, if you wish.

We have with us the director of the Census, Ditas Katague, and we also have the chief business officer with him, Sonya Logman Harris, and so I'm going to turn it over to them.

MS. KATAGUE: Great.

MR. CLAYPOOL: And thanks to both of you for joining us this morning. We really appreciate your time.

MS. KATAGUE: Great. Well, thank you so much for having us. I just want to say, like, I just got a call that an old, old friend of mine just passed, so I'm a little bit distracted. So I will get back on it, but to make sure I give you what you guys (audio interference).

Anyways, I'm a little bit -- so I just want to thank all of you, Chair, Commissioner Sinay, Commissioner Vazquez, Executive Director Claypool, all of the Commissioners, for inviting us here to speak.

I am Ditas Katague, and I'm director of the
California Complete Count Census 2020 office. I'm joined today by our Chief of Staff, Sonya Logman Harris, and I'm going to share a little bit about my background, just so that you know who I am, where I'm coming from, and Sonya will do the same.

I did listen yesterday for a little bit, and I want to make a little, tiny clarification, just for the public record, and I know you guys corrected it today, as it was stated yesterday that the U.S. Census Bureau Office would be coming this morning to present. I was like, oh, really? But actually, I just want to make just an important clarification, that Ms. Logman Harris and I are from the State of California's education and outreach campaign, and we do not work for the U.S. Census Bureau, and we do not represent them in any way in our presentation. So while our campaign worked in coordination with the Federal Census Bureau, our purpose and duties are fully separate and distinct.

I'm just going to take fifteen seconds more, just for the benefit of the public listening, to further clarify, because I know we've been doing this for, you know, three years, and so we know it like the back of our hand. Some people, like, aren't familiar.

So the U.S. Census Bureau is responsible for counting every resident in the United States, and the
associated data collection and data processing. It's the
largest peacetime operation undertaken by the federal
government, and it takes place every ten years, which is
why a lot of people don't really understand it, and the
federal census, it's been a part of the U.S. Constitution
since 1790. Their role is to count everyone once, and
only once, in the right place.

So then there's us, the California Census Office,
and we are a limited-term body established by the
governor to coordinate the State's outreach and
communications strategy, which focuses on the
hardest-to-count residents here in our state, and those
that are most likely to be overlooked by the federal
census. So thank you for indulging my little
clarification.

So a little bit about me. This was my third
decennial, and probably my last one I'm going to work on
for the State, serving in this leadership role over the
State's outreach reports, and you want to hear
specifically about the 2020 outreach and investment, and
we're going to go ahead and talk about that.

I'd be remiss and not serving the public interest if
I didn't mention that our entire 2020 census outreach and
operational strategy was based, you know, partly on the
efforts, successful efforts, of our 2000 effort and the
2010 census efforts, which were originally -- and it was also created to remain in support of the U.S. Census Bureau's enumeration activity. Right?

We always go into it saying, we're here to support the Census Bureau to do a great job to count, you know, the entirety, to count, basically, you know, all Californians. So just keep in mind those past efforts' mechanics. I might be better suited to answer some of your questions, considering the tight timing and funding parameters that you have.

So I was lucky enough to address a 2010 Citizens Redistricting Commission last time around, and I have served on the U.S. Census Bureau's National Advisory Committee on Racial, Ethnic, and Other Populations from 2012 to 2018. That was my volunteer work, six years of that, so I get it -- you guys, I know, are volunteers as well -- and served as the chair the last three years, from 2015 to '18, which is a really important time for the decennial, in preparation, and I always like to say having an inside look at the sausage-making is always interesting, since our work here at the State is supposed to support the U.S. Bureau's enumeration efforts and their activities.

So I spent the last three years in local, state, and federal government, ranging from chief deputy
commissioner to chief of staff, and of course, now
director again, but I do have other gigs in between, just
to be clear, not census all the time. And I spent six
years as chief of staff to the California Public
Utilities' Commissioner Sandoval, and here's where we
focused on increasing the public engagement in the
sometimes overly complicated public utilities
proceedings, if any of you have ever tried to participate
in that, ranging from climate change, greenhouse gas
emissions, to regulating transportation network
companies.

So I give you that background because I just want
you to say, this civic engagement, and improving and
creating opportunities for meaningful policy engagement
for the public, it's in my blood, it's in my bones, and I
am just so thankful that you guys are here to make sure
that no one is overlooked.

So at this point, I'm going to turn it over to Sonya
to introduce herself.

MS. LOGMAN HARRIS: Thank you so much, Ditas. Thank
you so much to the executive director and all the
Commissioners for having us today.

As already mentioned, my name is Sonya Logman
Harris. I have the distinct opportunity to serve as the
chief of staff here at the Census Office. I sort of say
"here" even though we're all in virtual land. You know, I have had, really, I think, an appreciation for the census since 2010, which was the first time that I think I met Ditas.

At that point in time, I had served in the lieutenant governor's office, and our then-lieutenant governor was on the Complete Count Committee, and I remember Ditas, you know, really, even then, championing, you know, making sure that we get to all parts of California, to make sure that folks know about this amazing thing called the census, to make sure that they were seen and heard.

So my first opportunity was really headed down to El Centro, California, to work with then-Senator Ducheny, and so I say all of this because the impact of our work, you know, has definitely had an impression, you know, on my career as well, and so excited to have served, and continue to serve, really, Ditas and the entire team, making sure that all of our operations here at the Census Office run as smoothly as they can.

I sort of say that because I know we'll talk a little bit about, you know, some of the challenges that our team has seen, and some that you might see as well as you continue your work, and so again, just super grateful to be here. I'm very excited to help you all as you
explore next steps for the Commission.

    Thanks, Ditas.

MS. KATAGUE: Great. So as I read the public notice for your meeting, I was struck by the need to make sure that we use your time wisely, because you guys have a huge job ahead, I know, and I'll give you enough background and context to answer any questions that you may have later.

Again, I want to thank all of the Commissioners for your service, and I can appreciate your passion for wanting to reach Californians who may not know about or even have the language to talk about why their community matters, right?

So certainly 2020 has been an unprecedented year across the board, and our census outreach effort has definitely seen some great challenges, from COVID-19 to wildfires, hazardous air quality, evacuations, heatwave, public safety power shutoffs, civil unrest, and of course, at the very core of our work, the ever-changing time line and operational adjustments of the U.S. Census Bureau.

I look forward to discussing both the similarities and differences between what we sought to do in our decennial census outreach over the last 20 years and what you're required to do as the Citizens Redistricting
Commission, and I want to make sure we give you a good frame to consider your work. Since many of you are new to working with state bureaucracy and administrative rules and procedures, I think that you'll find some great comparisons and differences in our work as we describe our approach, strategy, and office structure.

As I mentioned, this is my third decennial in this role, and each time it's had its challenges. I want to give just a tiny bit of historical context. Although the 2020 census outreach campaign faced challenges like no other decennial, our efforts and strategy were, you know, really foundationally based in some of our successful efforts from 2000 and 2010.

Just to give you a quick, thirty-second, like, snapshot, I just wanted to kind of go over themes, budget, and time frame of 2000, 2010, and 2020, so you can kind of understand like, how we got to this 187 million-dollar project. So in 2000, we had sixteen weeks to implement, soup to nuts, 24.7 million. We had fifty-five staff.

We used the special consultant state classification to hire folks for less than nine months who had special abilities or talents, so we just didn't use the retired annuitant avenue for hiring, because we needed to hire folks from the community with deep relationships,
language skills, and an understanding for geographies outside of Sacramento.

The theme for 2000 -- it was called the "California, You Count" campaign -- was "Educate, motivate, and activate", but with only sixteen weeks, we went straight down to the grassroots immediately, and established our sort of regional ACBO approach, as well as statewide, and we did kind of this layering that we'll talk about when I talk about 2020.

So kind of fast-forward to 2010, not quite to 2020. We had sixteen months, rather than sixteen weeks, but only 1 million dollars initially, one paid staff person -- that'd be me -- and four borrowed. We ended up with a final budget of 2 million, and I think, as you remember, 2008 to 2010, it was some challenging economic times. The theme for 2010 was "Be Californian, Be Counted", campaign.

Because we had such a small budget, we focused in on convening, collaborating, and coordinating, right? I mean, what can you do with a million dollars? And we energized grasstops, and we leaned really hard on the philanthropic partners who we worked with in 2010, and they did a fantastic job, really carrying out similar, you know, get out the count efforts that we did in 2000.

So now I'll bring it to 2020. We had over thirty-
six months, and initially 3 million dollars, which
ballooned into 187.2, and thirty-six appointed staff, and
we'll talk about that, which you'll see later. Our theme
was "Census For All", and the campaign was once again
"Educate, motivate, and activate", but what we did is we
engaged grasstop leaders from 2007 (sic) to 2018, right?
So we had that time, and then we moved 2019 to 2020, to
our grassroots partners, to our contracted partners.

So I hope that's helpful, to jump into our initial
planning efforts. They started in 2017. We knew there
would be challenges, such as misinformation, uncertainty,
with possible actions from the federal administration,
and questions about the new online census form. We heard
rumors that there was going to be, possibly, a
citizenship question, which it did come to fruition, at
least the threat of it, in March of 2018. So we built in
contingency plans, and built into our campaign the
ability to be nimble to emerging issues, but we had no
idea that we were going to face all of that.

So these major events impacted communities in so
many different ways, because we're so diverse, and it
really stretched the ingenuity of how our partners
responded both rapidly and to get people, you know, to
really talk about the importance of the census, so tying
in all the stuff we were facing, as, you know, business
(indiscernible) are like, this is exactly why, you know, with fires, you people -- we need to know how many people are here, how many people need to be, you know, evacuated. So I mean, just our partners were in constant crisis management, so they're probably a little tired right now, and in rapid response, but they did a fantastic job.

So for the 2020 census, of course, the State invested 187.2 million. It is the largest investment California has ever made, and the largest investment made by any state. If you added up all the other states that made census investments, it wouldn't even come close. So this funded efforts by more than 150 outreach partners, many that you've met, such as community-based organizations, schools, higher education, local and tribal governments, and more. I do want to say, I know you're looking at ACBOs, but our jurisdiction partners, like cities and counties, they did a fantastic job, and they were very integral to our work.

We also engaged with partners cross-sectionally, and I'll again explain why we do that, to kind of create this coverage, bringing in leaders from faith-based community, labor, business, health clinics, and other key areas.

So that sort of groundwork was complemented with our media strategy, included statewide earned and (audio
interference) as well as partnerships with local and ethnic media outlets, for targeted reach into those hardest-to-count communities. Ethnic media has always partnered with us, from 2000, 2010, to 2020, and they're an excellent partner for getting the word out in a way that's digestible for the audiences you want to meet and touch.

So the State's funding was further complemented by philanthropic funding, and you're familiar with many of those foundations doing really great work, national advocacy efforts and funding -- so we had this big national, you know, contingency that really helped educate us and keep us abreast of what was going on in D.C. -- local government and community efforts. Local governments funded additionally to get out the count, and we focused on the hardest-to-count households, using trust the messengers to provide messaging in the really appropriate places.

So as you may know, hard-to-count households are those that are historically overlooked and undercounted in the census, and we have really great data to show that. They are households that have multiple structural barriers to completing the census.

So you know, again, we focused on the hard-to-reach, but we also very much, you know, wanted to make sure that...
the over 39 million Californians responded to the census, which is kind of overwhelming. Like, you know, how do you reach all those people? And again, we leveraged partnerships across sectors, funding sources in across jurisdictions, really reached out to even those folks that we didn't fund, and we couldn't have done it all without the amazing partners across the state.

And I want to just say, as a recovering Deloitte management consultant, I was focused on reengineering, and you know, with consultants, we're like, we can do anything, but like, a statewide outreach project to reach everyone in the state, I guess I really wasn't thinking back in 1999. I'm like, yeah, sure. I was young. I could do that.

But we always started our projects, as you guys probably are as well, with an as-is assessment. We did, both in 2010 and 2020, a statewide readiness assessment. So we did it in 2009, with the very little money that we had, and then again, we did it in 2018, and in fourteen weeks in 2018, we went up to over twenty-five different communities to answer the question across the state, which communities are ready for the census? Some hadn't even heard about it, right? It was 2018. Are the right community leaders at the table? Who are we missing? And are those community leaders the right folks to inform and
make that decision?

So we knew that we would have to initially activate leaders, sort of grasstop leaders, in these communities, and then allow -- you know, geographically bound those communities, and let those leaders come to the table. So I just think that's super important. It was really a base for what we did. Many of those community-based organizations' leaders, including counties, they became our regional contracted partners. I know you've been meeting with many of our ACBOs and regional partners, and they have tremendous experience in the field.

So just to kind of give you a philosophical approach, when we looked at -- we really looked at where our target audiences are, the hard-to-count, who they were, and how to reach them, and let me explain. Because we complemented the U.S. Census Bureau, their operations were based on, geographically, census tracts, enumerating folks, right? They enumerated by household.

So we had to really use the data that we had to focus on geographic jurisdictions and regions, and we originally had eleven different regions in 2018, although you guys probably saw that we have ten, but when we did our readiness assessment, and we went around and we spoke to the community, they were like, that's -- you know, you're separating these communities. You're separating
these counties, these jurisdictions that actually work
together and resource together.

So I think that's -- we changed, and we put San
Bernardino and Riverside back together in a region, I
think 7, because their foundations -- and they were just
so (audio interference). So again, as you go out to do
your assessment, you may find that what you guys came up
with right now could be, you know, slightly transformed
because of what you hear, and I want to make sure we say,
even if you're focusing on regions -- we ended up with
ten. We also had local Complete Count committees, which
was the U.S. Census Bureau. That's their kind of
organizing factor.

And I just, again, can't understate the just
importance of our jurisdictional partners, counties,
offices of education, cities. They do a great job, and
also call out to our statewide organizations. They focus
on vulnerable populations. You've probably heard from
many of them -- NALEO, AAAJ, California Calls, the Black
Redistricting Hub, CARE, CMC, Native Vote Project, and
many more. We have whole lists that we can share.

Then, also so we did, like, where are they, right,
so you can draw the lines. Then we did who are they, in
terms of who lives in those jurisdictions, and then we
talked about how do we reach them, right, how do we get
to them? And then we overlaid, so crisscrossed, and then
this way, like weaving a blanket of coverage. We did the
sector outreach, which included faith-based, labor, you
know, really trying to understand how we can get those
messages to those hard-to-count who were, you know,
low-income, immigrants, refugees, lacking broadband
access, young children, and adults.

So anyway, that just sort of gives kind of an
overview, like how did we, like -- we say, how do you eat
an elephant? Because like, reaching 39 million people is
huge, and we just had to really do it bite by bite, using
data to really focus our efforts.

So for the 2020 census campaign, we set a target --
again, you know, making sure we have clear goals of
securing a minimum of 2 million of the estimated 4
million in the hardest-to-count areas to self-respond.
And we did that partly because, you know, again, we were
complementing what the Census Bureau was doing.

They, you know, were doing their own ad campaigns,
and they, hopefully, were going to get the
easier-to-count, right? So they get the easier-to-count
to respond. We get the really hard-to-count, and then
they have to go out and enumerate folks after the
self-response time is over.

So for those of you that are not as familiar with
the U.S. Census technology, the census self-response rate is the percentage of households that completed their census form either online, by the phone, or by mail, and it's considered the source of the best, highest-quality data, since it's submitted directly by the household to the Census Bureau. So that was like, we've got to focus on that, because we want it not only to be complete. We need it to be accurate.

And we're super proud of our success we've achieved since the census began in March 2020. As of October 27th of this year, our self-response rate was 69.6 percent. That's like, over 10.5 million households, more than any other state, of course, and it put us above our 2010 rate of 68.2. So we're about 1.4 percentage points above where we were ten years ago, which is like a million more people responding than had responded in 2010.

So among the 10.5 million households that responded this year, about 2.5 million were in the hardest-to-hardest-to-count communities, and we're continuing to go through, and right now we're closing down, looking at all the wonderful things our partners did, trying to correlate the data to be able to tell more about the wonderful things that our campaign did and how effective we were. But compared to the ten largest states, because I'm a little competitive like that, California had the
highest self-response rate in the hardest-to-count areas, and we were able to slice the data and look at that.

So as you know, the number of self-responding households, it's only part of the final official count that U.S. Census Bureau will release in the coming weeks. The Census Bureau, you know, they were responsible, that thirty-plus percent of our households that didn't self-respond, and that was their job, to knock on doors and make sure they got that data. So I really believe our investment paid great dividends, as evidenced by a strong self-response result, and it really laid the foundation for the most complete and accurate count possible.

So I was also asked to talk about COVID a little bit, and how our folks responded, and without a doubt, COVID-19 altered our ability to safely conduct person-to-person outreach, and our partners quickly pivoted to reach the hardest-to-count Californians with a mixture of what I say high tech, cutting edge, and then also low tech, back to the basics.

You know, we had months and months of planning in-person activities. We were going to questionnaire assistance centers, which were done in 2000 and 2010. We were going to do neighborhood gatherings, and community potlucks, and rallies. All that was put on hold, but we...
adjusted. Outreach shifted tactics, while upholding necessary public health and safety measures.

Our partners were amazing. Some went digital. That included shifting towards webinars, virtual town halls, Facebook, Instagram live, of course, events. There were also virtual dance parties and art contests, channeling all this creative energy as we were adjusting to the new reality.

You know, we invested in curriculum, so using youth. The youth were such amazing partners this time around. But it was also supported by a multilingual phone and text banking.

So again, we're sort of overlaying, and so for what you guys have to do, you're going to listen to Sonya and I, and you're going to be like, wow; that's a lot of stuff, right? But you know, I don't know -- you don't have to reach 39 million people, or maybe you do.

We also saw a really great low-tech back to basics approach. Many households still experience digital divide, right, in our state. Partners wore census T-shirts to school lunch pickup spots. One of our partners dropped off T-shirts for all the clerks at the grocery store to wear, and you know, left fliers, you know, delivered meals, including educational materials, in the care packages, also food bags. Posters went up in
grocery stores, gas stations. Neighborhoods hosted art -- you know, chalk art contests, so when people walked around, that attracted children and families seeking just safe outdoor activities.

But later, as the Census Bureau resumed their in-person enumeration, some local state home orders eased, and partners introduced car caravans to parade through towns and neighborhoods while keep safe differences (sic) and dropping fliers on doorsteps, and we targeted those caravans in those census tracts that we could see from the data coming in on our mapping that were low-responding, and they were especially successful when we combined mobile and phone questionnaire assistance centers where people were guided through filling out the form.

Again, you know, all our work was geared towards the action of educating, but fill out the form. I think you guys have probably more complicated, because you have to educate people. You've got to get them to participate, identify communities of interest, do maps. That's a lot more complicated than, like, fill out the form.

So we adjusted our paid media strategies, but we were pretty in good shape with our original investment. We were able to reach people in their homes with telephone and social media, particularly during the early
stages of stay at home, and then we moved away from any paid media that was event-centered, instead asking Californians to take the census today, and reinvesting those dollars or working with media vendors for better placement time.

So we did have to kind of -- we were planning for, like, a year, and then, like, all that happened turned us upside down, and like, okay. We've just got to just do it, but you know, having that much planning time, and the creativity and adaptability of our stakeholders and our partners, media vendors. Our legislative colleagues were amazing. Local leaders are just incredibly commendable.

So that was, like, what I thought was the fun part, but you guys also asked us to talk about our office structure and background. So as requested, we're going to take a few moments to talk about how we evolved.

Now, the Census Office has moved around quite a bit, due to administration transitions, budgetary growth, and we basically started in the Department of Finance back in 2017. Then it was moved to the Governor's Office of Planning and Research, which is where we sat in 2010, and then, in July of 2018, we moved to the Government Operations Agency. So hopefully, the Commission will just stay in one place.

So I'm just going to jump back real quickly. 2017,
we started with a small team in the Department of Finance, demographic research unit. It was basically me and an executive fellow. And then, during that time, budgetary-wise, there was seven million in the 2017 Budget Act for the local updated census addresses, and those dollars went directly out to cities and counties to incentivize them to participate in LUCA, which is the Local Update of Census Addresses.

So if you think about that, those addresses have to be right in order for a household to get a form. So it was like, in fact, the invitation list for households to participate. So if those weren't right, then people didn't even get invited to the party, right, to be able to answer.

Three million we got late in May of 2017, and you know, we were told that's all the funding we were going to get, and so like, hearing that, you're like, okay. Three million. What am I going to do with that? And you want me to reach, like, the entire state?

So we just decided that we're going to, like, focus on what we did in 2010, but build a more robust planning and mapping tool. It's called SwORD, so you guys will see that. The intent of that was, if we didn't any other dollars, to allow coordination, and coordination among and across jurisdictions and funding partners, because
philanthropy gave a lot of money in 2010.

We also invested in a social science curriculum, where we could leverage youth, teachers, and families and schools about the census. And then, finally, we repeated what we did in 2009, which was to do this really important statewide readiness convening across the state, because, if we're only having three million, we need to find out where we need to work, and who's already engaged, and who can help us out there.

So in January 2018, we prepared a budget change proposal for 40.3 million, but luckily enough, in July, we received 90.3 million, and this is of 2018, and we moved to the -- we were moved to the Government Operations Agency, who built the entire administrative structure, and so I'm just going to touch on that as well.

So in response to this range of unusual challenges, Governor Brown issued an executive order. It established, officially, the census initiative. It also established our California Complete Count Committee, which was our advisory body to us. Separately, the legislature -- this is all in 2018 -- they formed their select committees, one in the Senate and one in the Assembly, and they did a joint sort of oversight.

The Census Office, we did that readiness assessment,
which, again, meeting with grasstoppers leaders throughout the entire state, are you ready? What are the assets that they have out there that they can bring. And then Governor Brown's proposed, again, budget, forty million, ended up being ninety million, adding to the ten before, a hundred million.

So with this influx, our office required much more support, as you can imagine. We became a program under GovOps, where we have a dedicated deputy secretary at the agency who oversees the program, Sarah Soto-Taylor -- I guess you've probably met her -- and with the support of GovOps, we were quickly be able (sic) to develop a request for proposal process for our partners, formatted sort of around how we got the money out in 2000, but since it's a lot more money, a lot more structure to it, and we contracted them to do outreach, and we also did a primary communications vendor.

So anyways, all that going through, I'm rushing you through, but it just was a really long process. You guys can see the color of my hair. My hair was jet-black when I started. So I'm so serious.

So now we're in 2019. We're able to award our contractors, in March 2019, and then more money came, and we got up to 187 million, but during that time, we also developed our Language and Communication Access Plan.
LACAP is what we call it, and we identified languages that regional contractors would conduct their outreach in, to ensure equitable education, motivation, and activation. I know you guys have been talking about that yesterday.

In July 2019, our media contractor was selected, our big one, and additional outreach contracts were signed in the fall and winter of 2019 to round out the full complement of outreach for statewide sector-based outreach as well, and existing contractors were given -- you know, capacity and expertise had additional funding.

So anyways, I was like kind of out of breath, here, but I'm going to turn it over to Sonya. She's going to go over more detail on the budget and operations, and her general operations.

Go ahead, Sonya.

MS. LOGMAN HARRIS: Thanks, Ditas.

So I feel like our story is so robust.

Hold on just one second, and let me grab a visual aid for the Commission really quickly. Maybe, Dan, because I can see you in the video box, do you mind just shaking your head if you can see that pie chart okay? Perfect. Okay.

So as Ditas mentioned, we had quite a bit of resources, 187 million, and so just wanted to give you a
little bit of a visual representation as to where some of those investments went. So also as Ditas had mentioned very early on, we did make investments in sort of really supporting some of that U.S. Census Bureau work, through local updates of census addresses, so making sure that the file -- that, you know, the census workers would actually be moving through was as accurate as possible.

So just focusing on the pie chart on the left of your screen really quickly, that's that sort of blue sliver, you can see the majority of our dollars needed to go directly to what we call lovingly our ground campaign, and then, subsequently, followed by our media campaign, roughly forty-seven-million-dollar investment initially, which did see a little bit more as we moved on, and then, you know, sort of what we needed for staff, you know, keeping the lights on and such.

So here on the right is -- you know, as Ditas kind of walked through, we had administrative community-based organizations to really look at and coordinate activities across the regions themselves, as well as, you know, county contracts, tribal government contracts, the specific sectors that she'd mentioned really needing that blanket of coverage, right, and so that orange chart on the left is sort of further broken down on the right for you, just to kind of get a little bit more context as to
how those things -- or what that picture of coverage
looked like in total.

And you know, these are charts that you can sort of
track along and see how they've adjusted over time, you
know, should the Commission like -- they are found in our
legislative reports. So I just want to call that to your
attention as another good resource for the Commission, as
you're sort of understanding where and how our
investments are made, you know, as a resource to you.

So you know, as Ditas also mentioned, the campaign
was really built to be data-driven, so taking information
from the work of our partners and all that they were
doing, but then also really overlaying self-response rate
data to especially inform what we were doing in the
nonresponse follow-up period.

So Ditas mentioned that thirty percent that the U.S.
Census Bureau had to secure on their own, right, so those
folks that didn't go online or mail in their form, you
know, or call in to the U.S. Census Bureau, and then
really inform what strategies we would deploy during that
period of time.

So in front of you here is just a quick snapshot of
one of the derivatives from our SwORD tool, so we were
able to work closely with all of our regional program
managers and our partners in specific regions, you know,
other local folks, colleagues from the legislature, et cetera, and really look on a weekly basis, as the campaign evolved, as to, you know, how were communities responding.

You know, what were some of those hard-to-count characteristics that Ditas mentioned at the outset, that we knew particular communities might be facing, and you know, how could we really deploy, again, in an all things pandemic world, you know, in a way that was safe, to help compel those communities to really understand the importance and of course, get counted. So you know, just a little bit more as to the underpinnings of SwORD, and really what that meant for helping our team organize, but then also empowering, you know, our community members with key data points to really help them with their planning and execution.

Next step. We couldn't do all of this work without our own team, and so you know, just wanted to give a little bit of perspective as to some of the functional areas that our team oversees, and particularly want to focus on the outreach team as you all consider, you know, structures moving forward.

Again, this is a structure that evolved over several years, and we know that you are up against a much tighter time line. We had a full dedicated communications team,
just kind of starting from left to right here.

The operations team really focused on supporting things like SwORD, among some of the other technology tools that our office used. We did have a full-time leg. director, to make sure that our engagement with the legislative colleagues, you know, was informed, but also you know, making sure to support their work, because they were a key partner in all things census.

Moving along, at the outset, we had had one person completely dedicated to all things outreach, but as our campaign evolved, realized that we really needed two folks to help manage some of these roles. So we have a director of statewide initiatives, which really sort of looks at some of those things that cut across regions, in addition to our deputy director of outreach, who oversees that team of outreach members here -- again, probably most relevant to you all. And then last but not least, our administration shop really making sure, you know, as contracts were coming through, you know, that all of those sorts of things -- all the T's were crossed and the I's were dotted.

Let's see. And then I think, Ditas, that was sort of the core areas that, you know, we really wanted to highlight, again, all of our work really supported by thirty-six appointed staff, and then we also did have
some technical and legal support from other staff on loan, you know, and as we looked forward, you know, to kind of the operational time line of our office moving forward, you know, we're really focused on collecting those final reports. They started rolling in yesterday, in fact.

So it's been so fun to see, you know, all of the things that our partners have done, the amazing little nuggets that may not have risen to the surface prior to really conducting end-of-campaign assessments, and then we're sunsetting our office for -- all good things must come to an end, and some of our RPM team will be rolling off at the end of this month, followed by more team members whose terms will end in January, and then our entire office operation will, you know, conclude and publish all final reports, and conclude all operations by June 2021 of this year. So that gives you a little snapshot on our budget, a little bit more on some of the tools that we used, our office structure, and then kind of what we've got in the months ahead.

So Ditas, I'm happy to turn it back over to you for recommendations.

MS. KATAGUE: Sure, and then we'll open up for questions. So redistricting is, of course, a critically important step that flows from the U.S. Census Bureau's
decennial count and data processing. You know, as Sonya mentioned, our office is ramping down, but you guys will be able to access our amazing partners, grassroots, grasstop leaders they work with. Many of our statewide and sector partners have historically engaged in integrator voter engagement, and would be well equipped to help you guys quickly with your work, so you know, making sure that you connect with them, and you guys probably already are.

But I think, you know, what we want to be able to just, in general, undertaking something, outreach community engagement-wise, but yet still steeped in the state administrative processes and rules, with just a few high-level recommendations.

You know, you guys are working on a clear strategy and implementation plans, and as you consider those, look at three elements, including your strategy, tactics, and your desired incomes and -- desired outcomes, and be very specific about that. But ensure a clear vision for your work that will allow others to understand how to plug in and assist you, because people are going to want to help. That's what we found with censuses, is even if we didn't fund you, people were just so impassioned about it when they figured out and listened to why it was so important.

You know, consider a broad network of
community-based partners, and don't forget, again, our local jurisdictions. They were awesome. Some of our counties were, like, our go-to people for a lot of things. We're grateful for the dedication of our partners. There was like over 150, plus they had additional sub-grantees. They were so -- they were really the backbone of our community, and as the Commission moves forward, directly engaging with our community partners will allow better standing (sic) of their capacity. And as I mentioned, many of the statewide organizations have deep reach into multiple regions, all the way down to the grassroots level.

So try not to design your RFP, or you know, the sort of state structures so that it's so limited to -- you know, that it doesn't exclude sort of the ability of these existing organizations, because some of them are in multiple regions, but not all of them. So you just want to be able to let the folks that really have the greatest qualifications, the greatest reach, be able to apply for your outreach dollars in a way that really will serve your end goals. So don't let bureaucratic, you know, rules and stuff preventing you from getting, you know, the best people to do the work.

So establish a simple, you know, messaging framework. Develop those key talking points and
resources early. I noticed Fredy just started, so I know he's probably working on that right away, and he was with Senator Durazo, who I adore. She was such a great census partner. You guys are lucky to have him.

Build in time. This is huge. Like, we learned this in 2000 and 2010, but definitely build in time for administrative processes. And so for those of you who haven't work with the state, take a deep breath. State processes for procurement, they take competitive processes. They have a lot of rules.

You have an amazing attorney, general counsel with Kary, so she knows how to navigate those, but executing contracts requires review on both sides, so you just have to keep that in mind. Time lines for processing payments, even more, because you've got to get the money out there, right? But after you have a contract, that takes time, sometimes up to forty-five days. So kind of just be thinking about that as you go out and engage, that yeah, to get the dollars out there, it does take some time.

So just, yes, ensure you're giving yourself enough time to complete these critical steps. And then, sort of, finally, create tools to be transparent and remain accountable to the public, and I hear you guys talking about that, and I'm guilty of using acronyms and other
things, so I always appreciate it when the Commissioners stop and say, okay, wait, let's explain it, because in census land there are so many, you know, different acronyms.

So I just want to kind of wrap up, and then we can head into questions. I hope we covered what was requested and published in the public agenda, and we have lots of time for questions, but I just wanted to add this sort of last thing, and that's that, you know, I've been working on civic engagement, and census in particular, since 1999, and our key talking points, repeatedly, whether it's on social media or in person or what have you, for the census, why the census is so important. It's about two things. It's about power and it's about money, right?

The money thing is easy, comes to federal programs, funding roads, but the power is sometimes -- you know, we have to explain to folks who are like, why should I fill out the census? Right? The Citizens Redistricting Commission, all of you Commissioners, like, you are the effectuation of that power piece, right, how our democracy plays out.

And so you know, the census feeds into you guys, so we just want to be as supportive as possible as we can within our construct, but you know, we spent, you know,
how many years of my life working on census? If we don't get this piece, you know, right, and help you guys in whatever way we can, then, you know, what was all that work for? What were all these gray hairs for, if we can't get this next piece? And I have faith, and I know you guys will do whatever you can, so whatever we can do to help making sure our democracy plays out, and everyone has the opportunity to participate in a meaningful way.

So again, thank you for your commitment and your passion to ensure that all voices is heard. So I'd love to open up to questions. I know I talk really fast, so I apologize.

CHAIR KENNEDY: We really appreciate all of the information. This is really enormously helpful for us. I'm sure that the outreach subcommittee has gleaned a lot as well, and I guess I will start with them. I have my own list of questions, but I will let Commissioner Vazquez or Commissioner Sinay start off with any questions they might have.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I've had the privilege of having long conversations with Ditas, and so I would like to let my questions be last, and allow my colleagues to ask their questions.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Vazquez, are you
okay with that? Okay. So then, I'll open up the floor to others.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: This was just an incredible presentation. Thank you so much. I really appreciate it. I'm just like writing notes all over the places, and questions that I have, and I appreciate you willing to share your -- or I don't know. Did you say you're willing to share your partners with us, which would be great? That's a great starting point.

Then you also mentioned -- I can't remember if it was Ditas or Sonya. I think it might have been Ditas. You noticed that when -- or you mentioned, when you did your statewide readiness assessment at twenty-five communities, in order to determine if the right leaders are at the table. How do you know if the right leaders are at the table? Right? I mean, it sounds easy, but I'm thinking it might be a little bit more challenging to do.

MS. KATAGUE: Yeah, and I think, you know, part of it is the partners that you bring to the table to actually create those convenings, right? So we had a sort of multidisciplinary -- we had the legislature, so Chris Wagaman and their team, the select committee of those chairs. They were on our planning committees. You
know, we consulted -- you know, both sides of the aisle. We're saying, where should they be?

We used Department of Finance. We reached out to partners that we had used in 2000 and 2010, because some of them were still around. We also reached out to philanthropic partners. The thing is, when we did this in 2009, people were already talking about that, and as we moved into 2018, you know, there was originally, in January 2018, a convening of sort of grasstop leaders by the California Endowment. So it's important to look at who's already doing this stuff.

So if you look at -- and I mentioned Integrated Voter Engagement. That's been around for about a decade or so. They don't just -- these groups don't just -- they don't just kind of parachute in. Like, sometimes, for census -- they're really embedded in the communities, and so they know the communities.

And so it's important to have the right people at the planning committee, and having local folks identify, you know, who should be -- like, we had a panel of local folks discussing and talking about their region in the sort of first readiness assessment, and then we did these big mapping things about what, you know, ethnic media should be there, who isn't there. Yeah. So it starts with having the right people, jurisdictionally, from
other places in the planning committees for each -- it's a lot of work, you know, because you've got to do a planning committee for each area that you're going, and making sure you're having the right folks.

I hope that helps, you know, from -- you just need to also make sure that, you know, you look across, mentioning, you know, in 2010, like, what did the CRC do in 2010? Were there communities that were left out in the past? You know, like, we didn't do as much in 2010, because we didn't have that much money, but we knew, like, you know, we missed the disability community. We missed, you know, engaging labor better.

So the kind of thing is, like, making sure you're looking back to see what did we miss, and what we could have done better, lessons learned, but betting the right planning committee and the right people at the table will really help you identify area by area. I hope that helps.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: It does, and you also mentioned -- I mean, obviously, your partners. So did you grant funding out to different partners? And if so, did you do that yourself, or did you have someone, like, oversee that piece of it and handle it?

MS. KATAGUE: For the readiness assessment or in general?
COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: In general.

MS. KATAGUE: So in general, we didn't do, really, grants. We did contracts. We did RFP. And so back in 2000, like, because we were so quickly (sic), we had to divide the state up really quickly, and we went -- you know, we only had sixteen weeks. That's why we went with these sort of administrative CBOs for those regions, because again, you know, as I mentioned and Sonya mentioned, the administrative processes can be overwhelming, and we didn't want to do, like, 500 contracts. So we tried to limit it.

We knew, though, however, that using jurisdictions like counties -- and those were interagency agreements, to be fair. They weren't competitive. There's one Sacramento County. They're going to get the contract. So we're able to use the IAs, jurisdictionally, but then we did the competitive bid for administrative CBOs, and then they subcontracted out to their partners.

Did I capture that right, Sonya, in terms of --

MS. LOGMAN HARRIS: Yeah.

MS. KATAGUE: And then don't forget the statewides. They were able to fill in. Like, I just think of First 5, amazing, right, because there's kids under five everywhere. They, you know, were statewide, but they looked at who we had, and (audio interference) in that
eastern part of San Bernardino County, don't really
have -- you know, there's a dearth of community-based
organizations to lay a foundation effort, but you know
what? There's schools there. There are, you know, Head
Starts there.

So we were able to fill in those gaps in really
looking at it comprehensively, so contracts, limiting, by
giving the dollars and giving them an order to
subcontract, and making those administrative CBOs or
those regional partners, or even the statewide ones, be
responsible for really going deep.

MS. LOGMAN HARRIS: And Commissioner, the only thing
I would add to Ditas' sort of notes, particularly on your
question of, you know, how do you know if you have the
right of complement of folks, I think that really goes
back to, you know, I think a lot of the deliberations you
all are moving through now, right? What's the strategy,
what's the tactic, and what's the outcome?

So whatever the Commission wants to see as the
outcome, what's the strategy you'll implore (sic)? Who
do you need to have to inform that, and then ultimately,
how do you execute those tactics, right? And so I just
want to kind of plant that seed as well, as you all move
forward. I know that you're sort of interested in
prioritizing, perhaps, rural and underserved communities.
You know, how are you going to define those things?

You know, one of the things I think we, you know, ran into with, you know, some of the work that we did with our rural-focused contractors is there really isn't one definition of "rural". There's no magic wand that we can wave, right? So you know, just kind of wanted to add a little bit to Ditas', you know, thoughts there.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you. I appreciate that, and then I'm sorry for the rest of the Commissioners, but I've got two more questions. Also I think -- I can't remember if it was Ditas or Sonya. You mentioned right now you're collecting reports. So are you collecting reports from the partners? So did you set up, like, goals and strategies for them, you know, so that it would be somewhat universal or consistent?

MS. KATAGUE: I'll let Sonya take that one.

MS. LOGMAN HARRIS: Yes. Thank you so much. Each of our contractors, as Ditas had mentioned -- and I say contractors in sort of the very formal context of the state way, and I think I really want to acknowledge that they were much more than that to us than just simply a contractor, but because of the structure that we built, we actually had a deliverable-based contract, and you know, want to point out that there is very specific time lines that then get associated with that.
So at the outset, you know, of their contracts, each of these partners were asked to put together a strategic plan. There were sort of other junctures throughout, an implementation plan that we asked of them to really then understand, you know, how they would actually execute their work. And so now that we're at sort of the conclusion of their journey with us, it's really trying to capture, you know, how did you do? What went well? What are some of those lessons that we need to capture for 2030? You know, all of that good work and data that we were able to collect through SwORD. You know, what are some observations that we really want to take from that, again, as you just mentioned, so that our team can kind of take all that, digest it, and produce, you know, what our team will need to in terms of campaign wrap-up.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. I think that's it, other than, is there funding left over for us? Just kidding. No. Thank you so much. I really appreciate the work, your effort, and this presentation was -- it was just great. So thank you so much for taking the time.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Toledo is next.

COMMISSIONER TOLEDO: Thank you, and thank you for the wonderful presentation.

I'm curious. You started off with talking about the
pandemic, the wildfires, and the unprecedented issues that you guys have dealt with, and I'm curious as to whether you would have done anything differently during this past year in terms of reaching out to the communities, especially in light of coronavirus, in terms of the COVID pandemic and just being able to reach people more meaningfully.

MS. KATAGUE: So you're saying in light of all that stuff? Gosh. You know, because we're so at the mercy of the Census Bureau on things, I think that we were lucky to have partners that were listening on the ground for what they were hearing. Because sometimes the Census Bureau would tell us one thing with the national, but there was, like, different things going on, because it's a big organization, but for me -- I don't know. I think it happened organically, but I would have wanted to start earlier, and this is just my preference, because I have a seventeen-year-old daughter.

The youth, I really believe, were so instrumental, and you know, we wanted to do that sort of early on with the curriculum, but involving them. I think that the energy that's out there -- at least, you know, my whole goal was not, like, to take census -- like, this is my third time -- and to be able to build kind of like the social movement infrastructure that's needed across the
state to activate, because I saw that the youth are really the ones that are going to move this forward. So even if they can't vote, right, they could fill out the census form. And I think we're seeing the youth be really much more engaged in terms of taking part in our democracy, with a lot of different things that are out there that, you know, still online, but I would say your social science teachers, they're the ones that are -- you know, they're teaching us.

Like, if you look at -- our teachers, our social science teachers, are really the guardians of our democracy, because they're teaching our kids -- senior year, they get one semester of American government, right? So just understanding of, like, how can we use, locally, teachers and our youth that are right on the brink of becoming, you know, adults and voting, to really understand how to participate in our democracy.

So I don't know if that really answers your question, but that was, like, a sweet spot in my heart, because I have a seventeen-year-old, so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you so much, Chair, and thank you to both of you for being here today. This is an amazing presentation, learning so much. So this is
great.

I actually wanted to follow up on the social science teachers, and just learn more about how you were able to connect with them, if there are sort of existing groups that we could just tap into and suddenly reach, you know, hundreds of teachers across the state. You know, how did you all do that, and what are your recommendations for us?

MS. KATAGUE: So you know, I'll tell you the lessons learned from 2000 and 2010 was that the U.S. Census Bureau created this, like, census in schools, statistics in schools, and they created it from the national level. Then it got down -- like, in 2000, they just sent us pallets of Scholastic paper. Like, what are we going to do with these? We've got three weeks (audio interference), right? So In 2010, Regina Brown-Wilson, she was one of my key staff. She was at the Department of Education. She's like, you know what? We should work with the county offices of education.

So we didn't have a lot of dollars. We picked, like, the top, I want to say, ten counties' offices of education that had high Title I and Title III, because, you know, those are, you know, low-income, limited English proficient, that were going to know less about the census, and we said, how do we, you know, get them to
1. do some stuff in the schools?
2. So that was 2010, and because I came in in 2017,
3. understanding how long it takes, and the resistance that
4. can be taken to make any changes within -- to our school
5. curriculum, and the fact that I know a lot of teachers
6. who have, even now, you know, with COVID and teaching
7. online, so much on their plate, I didn't want to put more
8. on there.
9. So what we did, I said, how do I get to get
10. California teachers to create curriculum for California
11. teachers? Right, so a curriculum created by California
12. teachers for California teachers. And Mayor Steinberg
13. connected me with Frank Pisi at the Sacramento County
14. Office of Education, and this was early on in 2017. I'm
15. like, Frank, come talk to me.
16. So we talked about what could we create, and for me,
17. again, having a student, fifth, eighth, eleventh, and
18. twelfth grade, and mainly because my eighth-grader at the
19. time came home and she said, Mom, Mom, we talked about
20. census in my GATE -- whatever, history class, social
21. science class. I said, what did you talk about? She
22. said, it was a glossary word, and she's like, the teacher
23. didn't have anything to say about it.
24. I was like, well, what did you say? She's like,
25. well, you know, I stood up -- of course, because she's my
daughter -- and said, this is why it's so important, and you know, she kind of laid out -- because I drag her to all my speeches, right, about -- and a lot of the kids said, well, that's too much information. That impacts my privacy. I'm not going to do that. And she said, you know what? You give more of your private information when you fill out a Buzzfeed quiz about what Harry Potter house you're in. You need to participate.

That's where I said, okay. Fifth grade, they do, you know, California history. Eighth grade, they start to do the introduction. Eleventh grade -- and I see Commissioner Fernandez -- and then twelfth grade, American government, U.S. government. Don't do the scattershot that the Census Bureau did, because it only went this deep from the national level. Start from the bottom up.

So Frank Pisi has a network, and Michelle Herczog in LACO. LACO was amazing, first of all. LACO is amazing, and we can connect you with our partners there, Carolina and Esmerelda, and Michelle Herczog, and they took it, and they took teachers out of the classroom, social science, and they created the Count Me In curriculum. So they already have democracy, you know, and civil engagement stuff embedded in social science, and these social science teachers are amazing, and they truly are
passionate about, you know, teaching our students. So we
can absolutely connect you. Sorry. That was kind of a
long story.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Great. We are at 11 o'clock, and
need to take our required fifteen-minute break for our
support staff. We hope that you are able to stay with us
on the other side of the break. I know that I have
questions. Commissioner Yee has questions. Other
colleagues will have questions, and then I'm hoping that
we actually have time for a few minutes in case the
public has any questions.

So thank you very much for all of this so far, and
we hope to see you again on the other side of the
fifteen-minute break. So we'll be back at 11:16.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 11:01 a.m.
until 11:16 a.m.)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Welcome back from the break. Thank
you for sticking with us.

And Commissioner Yee, you are next.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you. Thank you to both our
presenters, so helpful, and congratulations on just the
excellent job you did and reaching the end of the
process, and sorry for your loss, Ditas.

Two questions. So one, could you tell us more about
the SwORD tool, and how it was developed, and what it was
used for? And second, a question about language access, wondering how you made decisions about what to translate, especially for, you know, online things, printed things. Obviously, I'm sure you, you know, worked with CBOs, you know, in all different communities for specific minority language needs, but how did you decide what to translate on, you know, more statewide efforts that you did?

MS. KATAGUE: I'll take the SwORD question, and then I'll give Sonya the language question.

So on SwORD, I mean, it really started back in 2010. We worked with the California Advancement Project, and because we had questionnaire assistance centers, and we placed them in those census tracts -- this is in 2010 -- to provide assistance in language, staffed by the right people at the right places, like in Koreatown, or you know, where we saw that they were sort of undercount or hard-to-count areas, we were like, oh, my gosh. We have all this great stuff going on. How are we going to let folks know where to go?

So I was like -- it was right when the Find my Starbucks, you know, thing would come out, where you could find your local Starbucks, and I literally -- this is 2010, okay, guys, so it was like way back when. And so I said, can we do a QAC finder? And so the California Advancement Project did kind of a prototype for us, and
we were able to give that link, and then, also all the
locations, because we had the back-end data, to our
dlethnic media partners, who were able to push and support,
so really overlayed, here's on-the-ground help, where you
can get the help in language. Here are the times. And
then it overlayed the new and burgeoning GIS that we had.

So as we came into this in 2016, 2017, obviously,
GIS has really evolved, and you know, even in 2000, we
used maps, and we laid, like, tracing paper over it and
used pens, and I'm like, look. We can do this
electronically. And so we started to have, in 2017,
2018, when I was at the Department of Finance, because
they were the demographic research unit, little joint
application design sessions with users from Secretary of
State, from counties, and we depended on Yolo and
Sacramento County, tell us what you would need.

The intent was first to have a QAC finder, too, so
we could communicate where we're going to put all the
support, but also to communicate -- and when you look at
our SwORD tool, it has the latest ACS data. You can see
what makes places hard to count. You can see, you know,
with Puma -- I'm getting way too technical in it, but you
can see where the census tracts are, and then you
could -- they're hard to count, but have our variables.

Then you could overlay what assets were there. Was
there a school there? Is there churches there? Like, you just start to overlay it, so that you can see the lay of the land I mean, almost like, you know, going to war, right? You had to see the land that you wanted, to make sure that you had the assets out there.

So anyway, we partnered with Esri. Jim Miller came onto Department of Finance demographic research unit sort of later, toward the end of 2017, and really took this mantle on from DRU, and then he joined our team about a year later, to build this amazing tool, and I think three of the Commissioners have log-ins. It has a lot of stuff in it.

So it was used not only for planning, where do you go, but then the intent was to get what activities were being done, and then you overlaid the response rates as it came out, so that you could do rapid response. Like, you'd say, oh my gosh. Koreatown is not doing well. Who do we have there? Oh, we've got this, you know, Korean minister, and he can get the word out.

So that was, like, the intent of it, and then it really evolved as our users -- sophisticated and not sophisticated -- and our contractors started to use it, and they were like, I could use this to understand where I could do car caravans. I could use it to figure out where to put languages.
So it was this great evolution. It wasn't just about open data. And I know we're, like, all about open data, which is great, but it was really about how you build a tool where people can use data easily, and that they can have data visualization to really understand the communities. I know that's kind of like a -- but it's really a wonderful thing that, you know, hopefully, you guys will get to play with it, and maybe we'll do a little demo or something with it.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Great. I'm not seeing any more hands.

MS. KATAGUE: Sonya had the other question. Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Sonya has the other question.

Sorry.

MS. LOGMAN HARRIS: No worries.

So Commissioner Yee, I sort of captured a -- I feel like your question has a few parts, so how do we determine languages, and then how did we actually translate, what materials? And so kind of --

COMMISSIONER YEE: And how did you decide, you know, especially at the higher levels of statewide materials, you know, what to translate?

MS. LOGMAN HARRIS: Right. So I'll kind of give you that in a couple different sections, because our campaign certainly evolved. So one the first steps our team took
was really to develop something called a Language and Communication Access Plan, which we lovingly refer to as LACAP, which I think Ditas may have mentioned earlier.

You know, when we looked at what the U.S. Census Bureau was providing in terms of languages, we noticed that it may not necessarily address all of the uniqueness that is California, and so Ditas also mentioned PUMS and PUMA. It's a level of data within the Census Bureau datasets that we leveraged to then extract limited-English-proficient household derivatives, which then led to English plus twelve.

So our communications campaign was fully integrated in thirteen languages. Rather than building one web site, we actually built thirteen, fully transadapted, so some of the fun stuff behind the scenes.

In addition to that, you know, all of our sort of major pieces were produced in all of those languages. So when you think about, you know, our doorhanger, you know, that community partners had requested, right. When you think about, you know, commercials, when you think about, you know, our digital ads, all of those pieces were transadapted.

So that was one piece, sort of through the core portion of our early education, which I assume is the place that you'll remain, but do want to point out that,
with SwORD and sort of that self-response data, you know, we were able to, in subsequent or sort of later components in the campaign, target, you know, our limited dollars to those communities that maybe weren't responding, that may have been, you know, for example, primarily digesting Chinese print, you know, as a primary form of communication, and so we were able to sort of stretch some dollars later on, you know, kind of in the campaign, as it relates to our nonresponse follow-up period.

So hopefully that answers, and then our community partners also used the language -- LACAP plan to help inform some of their work, and so depending on the size of the community is really, I think, the best way to sort of explain kind of the different thresholds. We did ask our partners in LA to obviously cover all of the thirteen languages, because the city-state, it feels like, of LA County, you know, is so diverse in and of itself, and then some tiered requirements for some of our other partners. And happy to furnish that plan to the Commission as well, just as a reference point for you.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

MS. LOGMAN HARRIS: Absolutely.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sinay.

MS. KATAGUE: Yeah. Our partners -- sorry. So our
partners even went, like, sort of a step further, but I also want to say that it included -- it was language and access. So for our disability partners, it made sure that they were able to access materials. They were able to access the website. So I don't want to forget about our amazing disability partners, too.

    MS. LOGMAN HARRIS: Yeah. Thank you, Ditas, and I think making sure to call out, too, you know, I think, the partners' work, you know, going back to they were more than contractors. They really were our family. You know, they also wanted to see, you know, access, in and of itself, and I think even a language justice plan would be an example of something that our partners came up with on their own. So just a good point there, Ditas, as well.

    CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sinay.

    COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you. Thank you, Ditas and Sonya. This has been really, really helpful, and I feel like we could probably sit here and talk all day, going back and forth. I really wish we were in the same room, so that we could, like -- you know, this is one of those conversations that, you know, yes; let's do the demo right now. Yes. So I definitely would like to figure out how we can schedule a demo, or Fredy gets trained in it and then bring it back to us, if you're all
I also wanted to make sure that -- I know, Sonya, you had a conversation with Director Claypool and Commissioner Vazquez, but if there are good team members that are transitioning out, especially in the outreach and communication, please have them send their resume over to us, because, you know, we're building our team, and we would love to build it on -- you know, use the foundation of all the great work that you've all done.

As Ditas said, you know, this is linked together, and it seems like, in the future, it would behoove the State to look at, how do you create an infrastructure that supports both the census and then transitions over to redistricting, versus creating two separate infrastructures. There's things that we could really, really benefit doing together.

I wanted to -- I have two questions. One is, we have been hearing from the community in different -- you know, publicly as well as, I think, in conversations that different Commissioners have had one on one, that the Commission needs to insulate itself from making grants into the community, because you may look political, or what about those folks who don't get funding? And so I know that the census was different, because groups weren't doing advocacy towards you all. It was more that
they were part of the outreach partners. But I was curious, in all the different work that you've done, if you had some thoughts on that.

MS. KATAGUE: So I mean, I think that making grants directly all the way down to the grassroots level is just administratively not necessarily feasible. I mean, that's why we kind of brought up it and then administratively done. It's just with how long it takes to get, you know, one contract done, you know, unless you have some legislation that allows you to do sort of grants. There's definitely -- sorry. My dog is playing with his toy.

There's definitely -- you just have to be able to look at your time period, and what is administratively the best way to get that out there, but allow whoever you do contract with some flexibility, if that makes sense. But you guys are going to be held, because you're giving the money directly to those -- you know, the state rules, but if you can write the RFP, and working with your lawyer, of course, to give them some flexibility to get really down there.

Sonya, do you have any comments on that as well?

MS. LOGMAN HARRIS: No. I think that feels right, Ditas. I think, you know, a little bit of a blind spot for me is, again, going back to kind of Commission's
desired outcomes. I think, you know, the work you all are doing is incredibly important, and there will be so many individuals, groups, public that will be interested in that work, and will want confidence that the Committee did it in such a way that upholds public trust.

And so to the extent you can really infuse some of those outcomes, also, in whatever solicitation you may do, whether that may be, you know, grant or contract or whatever your attorneys advise you in, you know, those will be good things, not only to lean on, but then, also you know, when folks say, well, where did those dollars go, you know, you'll be able to point to well, they went to these activities, or these expectations, or whatever they may be.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Great. Thank you. And then my second question is more, Ditas, you're wearing your national hat on the advisory committee -- I always forget the longer name -- but are there things that we should be thinking about as we're looking at the national data that may be coming out? Because a lot of our work is absolutely connected to the census data.

MS. KATAGUE: Yes. I noticed that in your minutes from a couple weeks ago. You guys had the ASA, the American Statistics Association, their latest on what they're looking at as moving forward. I think there was
also something from Bill O'Hare, who is well known in the
data space.

So I would just encourage, if the Commissioners
haven't yet read, that is on your -- you know, you guys
already have it. It really gets you steeped into what's
going on on the national level around data, and there's
also -- many of the partners out there that you're
working with are part of the National Census Quality
Reinforcement Task Force as well.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Great. Thank you. That's it
for me.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Great.

You mentioned earlier working with the schools, and
Commissioner Le Mons and I are the team starting some of
the outreach contacts in San Bernardino and Riverside
counties. I'm in San Bernardino County, and I've become
aware of the fact that San Bernardino County schools are
one of the lead agencies for something apparently new
called the Civic Engagement Initiative, and I was
wondering if you had experience with CEI, and how that
played in with your work. I'll have further questions,
but I'll stop there.

MS. KATAGUE: So I think that's really something
that Frank Pisi had -- he's part of that too. You know,
there's a number -- and I think Michelle Herczog is as
well. So they do a lot, and it's great that they're part of it, and you should absolutely tap in with them. So the teachers and the curriculum folks, they're all put together, and they get this stuff. So I would totally, you know, if I were you, really see what they can do to really help and push that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes. I'm also on our lessons learned subcommittee, along with Commissioner Ahmad, and you know, it just seems to me that, particularly for the 2030 exercise, if there's a way to work with Complete Count before then to add a little bit to the curriculum that you've already developed; I don't see a reason for us to start from scratch, but it just seems like such a natural to do an add-on to the curriculum that you've developed that would focus on redistricting. It seems to me that that would be phenomenal.

I've done work in a lot of countries, and one of the things that we found very helpful to us is coming up with a glossary, and I don't recall if you came up with a multilingual glossary that then becomes a resource for your partners on the ground, and for the media, and for the public at large.

MS. KATAGUE: That's a great idea. I know that we did, you know, sort of our one-pagers and information, and then had them translated, but I think, considering
that, you know, we were like, why is it important, and we
need you to do this action -- understanding, again, what
is the action that you need them to take, right? What do
you want them to take? How are you going to measure
that? Are you going to be measured by, you know, how
many people are involved, how many people submit
testimony, how many people come, you know, to your
meetings?

I think you probably -- and this is just me
guessing, because, you know, I don't know this realm as
much, but you know, you have to understand what is a
community of interest, and why could I be missed? Why
could my community be missed, and why should I be at the
table?

So I mean, those are, conceptually, a little bit
more complicated than power, money, fill out the form,
right? Be counted, have a voice heard. So yeah, you're
dealing with a little bit more complex concepts than we
were in terms of messaging.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Right. Were you able to get
broadcasters and/or print media, I guess, to provide free
space for PSAs?

MS. KATAGUE: Well, Sonya could answer that. I
mean, we had a comprehensive, multi-million-dollar sort
of media which has -- what do you call it -- added value,
but a good part of my time was spent on earned media, flying around, doing -- like, half the time, I didn't know if it was, like, part of our -- you know, because I would just, like, go out there and do this if we had paid for that and it was added, or it was like, hey. They called and they want to do, you know, a story on X, Y, and Z at the time. So yes. I just got a note saying our partner, AAAJ, they have a glossary. They had a glossary of all the terms in a lot of different languages.

So I think it's a wonderful idea, but I think -- and again, depending on your timing and whoever -- you know, I know Fredy is going to be looking at this, how you get earned media, where you do your placements, and really being able to tell the story. We had a lot of really wonderful reporters, and I probably credit my coms team, Martha and Diana Crofts-Pelayo, for, I want to say, nurturing some of the media.

Way back when, I talked to the Annenberg Innovation Lab, and I said, hey. Why don't you guys get a bunch of foundations to -- what they do at USC, and their health, is they sponsor health journalists, right, because journalism has changed so much they don't have beat reporters anymore. But you know, is there a way, because this stuff is so complex, to get a reporter to get deeper into it? Because, a lot of times, I get new reporters,
and we have to start them all over again, you know, like, sort of educating.

If we can get somebody who's along the way, like Hansi Lo Wang -- man, he's a superstar, you know, with NPR on census. Can you get folks locally, you know, just statewide, to be focused in on this redistricting effort with kind of the veil of, this is really community involvement, like, we're taking it that next step. I think you'll find some reporters that would like that, I hope.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Perfect.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: One of the challenges we have that's kind of unique is that there is local redistricting taking place at the same time as regional redistricting, at the same time as the state redistricting. We are looking at how can we share data as folks bring it, you know, through the COI tool, you know, or encouraging them to submit it locally, you know, just thinking of different strategies.

Do you have any thoughts from your experience at working at the different levels? Obviously, census, you just had an individual fill it out. It didn't matter. But we don't want to create confusion, and we want to promote engagement at all the different levels.
MS. KATAGUE: So you're asking how to share all of that data with the people that it needs to be shared with, right?

COMMISSIONER SINAY: That's one of them, and then -- well, what would your -- if you were sitting where we are, and had to think through the three different levels, what recommendations, from your experience in civic engagement and census, would you give us? And I know I'm putting you on the spot, but for either of you, you know, I'm just trying to collect this response from everybody.

MS. KATAGUE: Yeah. So you know, what's interesting is, the way that we designed it, with kind of that cross-hatching and different jurisdictions, is -- but they were forced -- and you can ask my partners -- really forced to get into the room together.

I remember, early on, City of LA was calling me. County of LA was calling me, you know, like, what are we going to do? It was like -- and I'm like, you know what? I'll come down there and meet with you, but you've all got to get in the room together. Right?

So it's almost like you can use the way you're structured to force them at the -- otherwise, you're going to go around, and it's just too overwhelming. So you know, I know I said "force", you know, in quotes. Force them at the local levels to work together, right,
to make sure that, you know, they're sharing what's going on.

It will make your life easier to overlay it, but that was kind of the strategy we had of state, local, city jurisdictions. It's like, all get in the room together, and let's work together on this. Even though you're going to have different communities of interest, you know, they -- it needs to be a public and transparent process.

MS. LOGMAN HARRIS: Yeah. And I think, just to add on to Ditas's sort of comment, I sort of don't think about it in the historical context. I sort of think about it in a lot of the confusion that maybe was coming between our U.S. Census Bureau colleagues making decisions or changes, and what they were doing, and then how that impacts the public, ultimately, in terms of confusion, or sort of not knowing, you know, what is the real end date?

So just kind of thinking about what you're putting forward in terms of a problem of that complexity, I think it goes back to the Commission, to the extent possible -- or Fredy, it sounds like you may be the guy in charge of this -- putting yourselves in the shoes of the public kind of from that UX experience. And so to the extent, you know, the Commission may be, you know, out front in
places, you know, where the locals may be out front in other places, but where do those critical touchpoints happen?

How does your topline messaging really sort of support all of that as you're sort of going towards -- you know, how can you use low-cost tools like your website, like social media, to really find the appropriate intersection points? Because when someone comes to you, they may be wanting to look at their, you know, City of Sacramento redistricting lines, but really all they -- when they Google, it's just California redistricting. So kind of just walking yourself through, and kind of really thinking about that UX experience, I think, you know, may be a valuable exercise through the outset.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Any other questions?

Okay. If you have a few more minutes, I had wanted to open it up for public comment at this point, so I can ask if you're available to -- yes. Noon is the end, but just a few minutes, and I'll ask Katy to read the instructions for public comment, and after she finishes, if any other Commissioners or staff have questions, we can take those while we wait for the live feed to catch up with us.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: In order to maximize
transparency and public participation in our process, the Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To call in, dial the telephone number provided on the livestream feed. The telephone number is 877-853-5247.

When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided on the livestream feed. It is 91505532099 for this week's meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press pound.

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

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

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

The instructions are also located on the website.

The Commission is taking general public comment on the presentation for item number -- and I apologize. I don't
have the item number on me.

MS. JOHNSTON: Number 8.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Item number 8, the presentation associated with item number 8. And we do have someone in the queue.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Go ahead and invite them to join us.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: If you'll please star 6 to unmute yourself. Oh, sorry. Do it again. I apologize. That was my fault. Please state and spell your name for the court reporter.

MS. BROWN-WILSON: Hi. This is Regina Brown-Wilson. Can you hear me?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes.

MS. BROWN-WILSON: I'm so sorry. I've never called in on Zoom before. Okay. I didn't know if you could hear me or not.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, we can hear you. Yes. Thank you.

MS. BROWN-WILSON: Okay. I am the executive director of California Black Media, and I've had the opportunity to listen to today's presentation, and a little bit of yesterday's, and I know that you guys have been meeting for a while, but I'll just get to the point of when we start talking about outreach. I'm also -- let
me just say, too, that I'm also -- or was -- a commissioner on the California Complete Count Committee, and so I've been able to watch this process for some time, and been very involved in the census efforts and the outreach efforts.

And you know, one of the things that I see missing is how we are going to have, like, a robust conversation with, you know, reaching these communities. I think that Ditas Katague and Sonya's presentation kind of showing and laying out what the census did, and knowing that you don't have the resources to do that, but what's the best way to do that -- I'm hoping to formulate some thoughts, send them in, in writing, to Commissioners to consider, and looking at public notice and due process in a way, when they're going to or having these meetings that are targeted to these communities, that we're really making sure that we're doing the proper outreach. And things that are already in law, already on the books, can make it so that we actually are doing our due diligence, or you're doing your due diligence, in reaching those communities, making sure that they're informed.

One of the areas that I'm really concerned with is where philanthropy may have been in terms of funding journalism, so that we have someone being able to watch and monitor these meetings, and making sure that there's
a readout, not just minutes, but a readout, something
that journalism plays a role in this aspect, and I think
that that is something that's missing. Not that that's
your fault, but it's something that's missing, and
something that I just want to make sure that's on the
record. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Ms. Brown-Wilson. That
is very helpful to us.

Katy, do we have any other callers?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Not at this time.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioners, a few of you
had questions.

Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I just one quick question.
In the beginning, Ditas, you had mentioned that you used
the special consultant classification versus the RA.
Could you go into that a little bit more? I understood
the benefit of it, I just wanted it explained just a
little bit more.

MS. KATAGUE: Yes. And again, we used that in 2000,
because, again, we only had a really short amount of
time, and probably Kary or somebody on your
administrative staff can go deeper into it. It was a
special consultant, I guess, classification. You can
hire them for nine months or less, and you're
justifying -- like, we had to hire somebody who was in a specific location, who had, you know, specific language skills that you, you know, not necessarily were going to get from a retired annuitant or what have you, to be able to do a, you know, specific set of work. So let's say you, you know, really need help in this particular area, language skills. So you know, you have to write up and justify the hiring of it, but again, it's a limited nine-month limited-term appointment, but you can definitely ask maybe your general counsel or executive director to look into that to see if that works. It gave us a little flexibility to hire quickly.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent.

Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair.

I just wanted to say to Ditas and to Sonya, I really appreciate the oral presentation, and just wanted to mention that I got an opportunity to sit in on some of those early mapping and assessment sessions that we did, and was awarded ACBO Region 6, with Pablo and other partners, as well as -- 4, and then, also 6, through Sierra.

So as you outlined the material today, and talked about the process, living through a lot of that, I'm
thinking, yeah, I saw even a bigger picture of the small part that we were holding. The thing I think that worked really well was the layering that you kept talking about, and so I just wanted to emphasize that beyond the statewide, the ACBOs, the county, the cities, the regional, it's almost like we had it sliced so many different ways, with intentionality, and looking at each specific hard-to-reach area, and ensuring that there were so many touches, or opportunities for touches, in each of those areas, and I think that worked well, and in throwing us into the room together.

You said, "force", quote/unquote. Yes, that was absolutely the truth about it, and was glad to be there, and the huge benefit was gaining clarity on what each was working on, so that there was not conflict, and that there was clarity on who's working on what, to ensure that we got it all covered. So I think it was a successful year. I think you all did a phenomenal job, and I thank you for being here today to present.

MS. KATAGUE: Thank you so much. That's like music to my ears. So I really appreciate it, and I appreciate the work that you did there in the Valley. So thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Vazquez, do you have -- nothing at this point. Okay.

Commissioner Sinay? No.
Fredy, do you have any questions?

Oh, Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. Thank you. I apologize. I have to turn my video off. Otherwise, it all lags. I'm having internet issues. So I won't see you, but I can still hear you. And thank you. First of all, thank you very much. It was a great presentation. You covered so much material, and so in detail.

I would like to, hopefully, get a copy of your slides, if we haven't already gotten that, and also that SCORE (sic) tool that you were working with, and the overlays, that would be very, very interesting. I'm not sure if you've given that connection to all of us or if that's gone through. I might have missed part of that, but I would really like that.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I can answer that for you all. I've emailed, reemailed both of those, because we have received them in the past, and both of them, as well as the -- yes. Those have been reemailed to everybody. So it's in your inbox.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Oh, great. Thank you very much.

Then, unfortunately, the overall -- this is wonderful. It's great information. It's exactly what we need to do. But we don't exactly have the luxury of only
reaching the people who are hard to reach. We have to also reach the people that you said, well, the Census Bureau took care of that, you know, because we have to reach everybody.

So in terms of not time -- obviously, the hard-to-reach people require way more time, because they're harder to reach, but in terms of, you know, I don't know, group, like percentage-wise, do you have any sort of either, like -- I can't -- I don't know, in terms of -- you can't really compare budgets, or you know, are they -- the full census was working on that, but in terms of -- essentially, how much time or -- how difficult is it to reach everybody compared -- like, we have a harder task. We've got to do both. Can you give us any insight into doing -- you know, how we approach both?

MS. KATAGUE: Well, and I don't know, you know, your goals, but I guess I would question -- if somebody told me that, I'd be like, do we really need to? You know, like, do you really need to reach 39.6 million people, and is that going to effectively, you know, get you what you need to do at the end of the day? I mean, I think that's where -- you know, when people said, Ditas, you've got to meet this many, and I'm like, how do you eat an elephant? One bite at a time, right?

So you've got to figure out, with your limited time,
what your goals are, and you know, like, does my
daughter's math teacher need to be involved in this,
right, or do you need to be identifying folks that are
already embedded in the community, doing work, to do the
reach, right? So I'm just not -- as Sonya said, I'm just
not real clear on what your measurable goals are, but I
think you have to ask those questions, like, what is
going to give us what we need?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Thank you. I appreciate,
you know, the look, and I really appreciate all the time
and effort that you've gone into in this information.
It's been very, very helpful. Thank you very much. I
apologize I'm not sort of fully there, but I am
listening. So thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Fredy.

MR. CEJA: Yes. Going back to your question, I will
have multiple questions, but in respect of the time, I
will chat with them offline, and I'll touch base with the
committee members as well.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

Well, then, let me take the opportunity to thank you
both. Again, this has been enormously helpful to all of
us. Wish we could have done it months ago, but as you
said, you know, we're in the process of getting ourselves
up and running, and look forward, certainly, to working
with both of you, and with the ACBOs and others out in the field that you've worked with so successfully.

So again, on behalf of the Commission, thank you very, very much for your time today, for sharing your wisdom and your experience, and we look forward to keeping in touch.

Okay. And with that, Director Claypool, it is now your turn to resume your report.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Thank you, Chair. Okay.

So does everyone have the draft fiscal year '20-'21 and '21-'22 spending estimate in front of them? Okay.

So as we discussed, it's a very high-level -- conceptually, a high-level view of what we have available to us in the three-year money that was allocated to us.

We start at the top. You're going to see that we have about 11,703,000 available, but really, a portion of that money is held against the possibility of litigation, and so we can't access that until after August 15th when you've submitted your maps. So really what we are playing with immediately is 7,573,000 that's shown as total available.

As we go down, I want you all to keep in mind that these estimates are based on all the way through 2022. So typically you would show the fiscal year budget and what you're going to spend, but because our process gets
three-year money, and because we have to just think in
terms of a set goal and then the litigation, I've
projected the expenses out for staff and for everything
else against that approximately nineteen-month period
that we're talking about.

As you can see, there are placeholders. We have
some interim staff in our operational budget, and I
placed staff there in preparation for our communications
director, and also for our deputy executive director, so
that we could just have something to budget with, I mean,
so we have some idea of what it might cost.

These numbers are going to change. Mr. Ceja is
going to have a different idea of the type of person he
may want. That person may or may not be an AGPA. The
same thing for deputy executive director, and that
individual may or may not add additional staff. So this
number will probably grow larger, not significantly
larger, because this part is really not as significant as
most of the other items that are in our budget.

Commissioner per diem, in order to come out to that
amount, there's very -- by the way, because of COVID, and
because we're looking at a virtual scenario, very little
of that million-forty-three is in TEC. It'll probably
grow. I think I put in an amount at about 50,000, saying
that there will be incidentals that you will have, but
unless we go out on the road, that number is not going to expand a lot by virtue of your travel expenses.

The way I came to that number, I took your last month's total amount of per diem for you, and just carried it all the way across until April 1st. I was figuring that you would have roughly the same amount of meetings.

April, May, June, July, and August, I actually put together a plan, -- not the plan, but a plan, of meeting, a meeting schedule, both in what I would've anticipated in your business meetings and also in your public hearings. This plan is going to change. Our deputy executive director and Mr. -- and our director of communications are going to put together a plan, and that will be the one that we actually push forward with.

However, the plan that I used had a significant number of meetings in it that came out to about fourteen or fifteen less than the first Commission had, as far as public meetings, but had it in virtual sites, so that you would actually -- if you used six-hour meetings, and you used the approximately nineteen meetings, you would end up getting about fifteen percent more public testimony, because you could switch from place to place to place, and you wouldn't have -- with the virtual meetings, that way, you wouldn't lose the time that it takes people to
transition to a microphone. It also anticipates that people will call in and use their own computer, so that we can fill up virtually an entire six hours with continual testimony.

So that was just the plan that I thought would work to make the estimate. Then after the maps are submitted, I figured your budget on about 30,000 a month moving forward, because we would have a reduced schedule, but you would still have to be meeting in order to -- on a fairly regular basis -- in order to meet with your counsel and anything else as we move through the litigation phase of this. Hopefully, we won't have litigation, and we'll save all that money, but I think that there's probably a good chance that someone will have an issue with your maps.

The DGS accounting is just two years of a contract you have at 10,000 dollars a year, just to take care of your basic accounting, your facilities -- again, just a complete -- an estimation of what your cell phone and telephone usage and everything else is going to be. It's high, but I also anticipated in that that our communications director would have, probably, specialty items that are going to have to be purchased in order to, you know, produce the types of communications that you're going to want to push out into the community. So I
intentionally made it high.

Your contract services. You see everything is noted in RFPs. They're for the legal services, and that's pre-maps. I used the estimation from what the legal services cost us, approximately, in 2010, plus a twenty-five-percent increase with the California CPI.

VRA counsel, an analysis consultant, again, I just used an estimate that I thought was going to be similar, with an increase. Those may increase beyond the amounts that I have in here, because we're going to be asking them to do, I think, a little bit more than they were asked to do last time.

Your line drawer is a significant increase. The way I calculated the line drawer amount -- and we can talk more about it, I think, in closed session, because I can't give you the amount that I'm using right now, because then it becomes the baseline for the contract, but with the line drawer, I recognized that last time there was a significant -- it was underbid to a significant amount, and so I wanted to make sure that we captured a more realistic number.

The data management and mining contractor, I just took an estimate from just numbers I've been hearing and plugged it in. That will change. I don't imagine it will be less than I estimated. If anything, I imagine it
will be more, particularly after listening to the security consultant yesterday, because the consultant -- with the security, with the state security, Office of Technology and their security system -- I was always considering that the security for your data would come under this contract, and not necessarily be one that we would run through the State, because I was just thinking that it would be another layer of audit and observation that would possibly slow us down.

It was good to hear that they would give us a once-over on our contract, and that they would be willing to look at what the data manager would provide in the way of security, but I want to make sure that we don't get lost in the -- get lost in running it through the State, when we need to have it in place in January. So that figure that I have also figures that the data manager is going to give us the type of security that we're supposed to be expecting.

Outreach is just exactly what's been submitted by the outreach committee. I think that this is going to possibly need to expand a little bit, particularly after the conversations we've been having. I think that there are ways to possibly help with that expansion without necessarily eating into our budget.

We still do have a one-time project with the
legislature, where they're required to coordinate a
project with us. I think that possibly part of that
coordination might be to have them help us with the
language access. They seem to be very interested in
expanding that. It's important for California
everywhere.

We're going to grow more and more into that model,
and all the State agencies, and so looking at this, you
know, that's something that we need to investigate, and I
will be talking with the communications director about
that possibility here in the next couple of days, about
what can we -- how much can we hope to shift in that
one-time expense to the legislature?

Then, finally, the line drawer and public meetings,
outreach. Those are actually -- where is that amount? I
have to apologize for this. I believe that that was
covered in both of our -- in the line drawer contract
above, and in our outreach, but I don't see it. The
bottom line is, the total available is shown there at
seven-five, seven-three. The total estimate of costs
from all expenses that I anticipate at this point would
be about thirteen-and-a-half million dollars, so we are
going to be over, just with these contracts and so forth,
at about six million dollars.

Before we go to discussion, this is the
information -- and this is going to fill out and be much more precise by January, once we put our contracts into place and once we know what we're doing for outreach. We will go to the legislature in -- or actually, the Department of Finance -- in early February, and we will lay out our case for making this adjustment.

Our biggest case for extending beyond our budget to this extent is that the amount of money that you received was based on a process in 2010. It doesn't have a basis in what you're trying to do, nor does it have a basis in the type of outreach we're trying to achieve. Those are required constitutional provisions, if you will, and so I think that we have a very good chance of getting a major portion of this, and then part of that sum taken over by the legislature for part of the outreach, or possibly getting all of this, but first of all, we had to get to this point to have an idea.

Now, the last thing I'm going to say is, for everything that you see in that budget, every time somebody decides that they want to add more, that budget expands more. I think we all understand how that works, and so I understand that the public is looking for us to really get out there and maximize engagement, maximize outreach, but as many Commissioners have said, including Commissioner Andersen and Commissioner Sinay, we only can
go so far before we won't receive the resources to go
beyond that point.

So it's just something to bear in mind, and we
will -- your staff, including Mr. Ceja and the deputy
executive director, when that individual comes aboard,
we'll do everything we can to stretch every dollar, but
it will come to a point where there is only so much that
we can do with what we have.

So with that, does anybody have any questions?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Turner, and then
Commissioner Ahmad.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair.

Director Claypool, thank you for the summary of the
budget, and I understand that it will possibly change.
The question that I have is in regards to the contract
services, the RFPs that are there. There are about eight
different areas that total the 5.4 million.

Are there any of these contracts that were similar
to 2010 that we can get a closer idea of? Because if I
just divide them up between the eight, I get 675,000, and
I know it's not an equal thing, but I'm trying to get an
idea of, as we're out in the subcommittee, for example,
for our data management and mining, I would appreciate
having somewhat of a ballpark of what we should be
working towards before we go into a different area or
needing to get more money.

So I'm trying to figure out, is there any way to put dollar amounts as a desired budget on these items, at least for the ones that we've had to use for 2010?

MR. CLAYPOOL: Absolutely. So the VRA, the VRA analysis, and the racially polarized consulting, I took a ballpark from what we paid last time, but I expect those to be higher. For what you're doing, I would like to have a conversation offline, and I'll tell you what we plan on budgeting, and why, you know, about how I got there, but I can't say anything about it here, because otherwise it becomes -- it's got to -- like with a house, if I tell you that I want 100,000 for my house, then that becomes the baseline for the house, even if it's not worth that.

So I would be very happy to share that information with both you and -- I believe you're working with --

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Commissioner Ahmad, yes.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes, Ahmad on this. I will be very happy to share the number with you, and how I got it, you know, as a subcommittee, and then we can work from there.

Is that okay?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. Thank you.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Perfect. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Ahmad.
COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you for this overview.

Just a quick clarifying question. What does AGPA stand for, the acronym?

MR. CLAYPOOL: That's an associate government program analyst --

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Got it.

MR. CLAYPOOL: -- and it is, by the way, so that we know -- it's the -- amongst people, before they go into management, there are a lot of different levels, but you go -- as you really get into the midlevel of typical State workers, you have ASAs, or associate -- or not ASAs, but SSAs, staff service analysts, and then you have AGPAs. You go from there up to an AGPA.

After AGPA, you either go into management or that's the highest you can go as just kind of a specific worker who's a -- a lot of times, they'll call them subject matter experts. So that's just the highest you can go before you're a manager.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Got it. And then just one other quick question.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Um-hum?

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you. In that time-based column, I think I figured it out. "RA" is retired annuitant, and "P" is permanent, correct?

MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes, it is.
COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay. Thank you.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Just for clarity, under "Contract Services", and please correct me if I'm wrong, but if my recollection serves me, in previous budget documents that we've seen -- and first of all, thank you. This is a very helpful document, and I think we've been asking for it for a while, so I do appreciate that very much. But in previous documents that we've seen, I think there was around four million dollars identified for litigation services that would be needed after the maps are drawn and accepted.

MR. CLAYPOOL: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Is that represented here, or is that somewhere separate?

MR. CLAYPOOL: If you go right below the bottom line, the negative six million --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Right below the bottom.

MR. CLAYPOOL: At the very bottom of the document, below the --

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I see. Okay. "Legal services".

MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: I see.
MR. CLAYPOOL: So that 4,297,000 can only be accessed once we go past August 15th -- and here's the question for that money. It says for litigation services. In theory, after you finish your lines, the only thing you have left is to settle litigation. So if Mr. Ceja is going out with announcements about what's going on with the litigation or this or that, in my mind, those services are for litigation services, because that's all we're really doing.

We'll have to wait to see whether the legislature requires us to have -- requires us to have additional money for administration and so forth, and that money can only be used for outside litigation, or whether we can spread some of our costs into it, and I've asked that question several times, and there are people, both in Department of Finance and at Department of General Services, who are talking about whether that's possible, but we're a long ways from that money, and we'll have that answer long before we get there.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Got it.

And I would just reiterate the point that you made previously, that I think that the number put here as estimated for contract services is an estimation, and from all of the conversations that we've had, just for the Commission's benefit, I could certainly see it
potentially being higher.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Well, yes. Some of the areas are --
like I said, with the line drawer, I expanded that out to
a number that was far greater than the 2010, far more
than just a twenty-five percent increase on it. But I
think the big unknown in our numbers three are the data
mining, because we don't know how much that's going to
cost, and then just how far we can go in outreach. Even
though I commend both Commissioners Vazquez and Sinay for
keeping us within that 2,065,000 that was budgeted for
it, I just see it getting larger than that if we're going
to try to have the goals that we were hoping to obtain
earlier.

By the way, in the presentation we just received, we
owe them a big thank you, primarily because I think that
we need to move to that clarification of our goals, and
going very specific on what we hope to achieve, and we
need to do that as soon as we can, because that will free
up both Mr. Ceja and our deputy executive director, when
that individual comes aboard, for them knowing, you know,
pretty much, this is what we're trying to do, and this is
what we've got, and we're hoping to get this much more,
but if we don't, then we'll have to compress back into
the amounts that we originally budgeted. So there are a
lot of unknowns there, but just having that clarity of
purpose will go a long ways.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Thank you, Director -- thank you, Chair, and thank you, Director Claypool. For clarification, the total estimated operating expenses are 4.8, the contract services are 5.4, and then the outreach 2.065. That should be my total, right?

MR. CLAYPOOL: I'm trying to go back to the document, here. So your total at the bottom should be just the subtotals of the 3,446, the million-049, the 20,000, the 302, and --

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Well, no. Okay. So if you go to page two, "Total estimated operating expenses, 4.A", that encompasses all of the numbers above, right?

MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay. Yes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So if I add that number plus the 5.4, which is the contract services plus the outreach --

MR. CLAYPOOL: Right.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So just for -- there might be something wrong with your spreadsheet, because I came up with 12.27, not the 13.5 that you're showing.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: So that's just a spreadsheet issue.
MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: But anyway, that's really not my point for --

MR. CLAYPOOL: I got it.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: -- raising my hand. So what would have been helpful is, it would have been helpful to actually show the numbers that you're using, instead of, like, a total, like total staff expenditures is 3.4. It would have been helpful to see the total for that, and also contract services, and for the outreach, only because, for me, as we move along this process, and as we issue every RFP, and we see what it comes in at, it gives us a better idea of where we're off, moving forward, if that makes sense.

Maybe I'm just too budget-oriented, but I would just -- thank you. It's a great starting point, but I would like to see something where we could actually -- I mean, you're tracking it, but I would like to visually track it in terms of, we estimated a million for legal services, but it actually came in at 800, or it came in over. So I think that gives us a better understanding or idea of where we're over or under. So that was just my only recommendation, and thank you again for forwarding this information.

MR. CLAYPOOL: The first thing I'd like to say,
Commissioner Fernandez, is that both you and Commissioner Fornaciari will get the full spreadsheet, with all of the numbers in it, as the finance and administration.

I completed this on Friday in the evening, and had intended -- had a conversation with the Chair and the Vice Chair about distributing it, because of the thought that it's still pretty much a draft, and then it starts setting people's expectations. But I will absolutely send you the full spreadsheet, and you can go over the numbers, and I'll make sure that it adds at the bottom, because I thought that -- I was fairly certain that it did, but I probably just included one of the subtotals in the bottom while I was doing it. It was a tired evening. Okay?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Anyone else? Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. Thank you, Director Claypool, for getting this draft budget together and just getting our thoughts rolling, and you know, with so many of the variables still up in the air, still, to have something to start getting our mind around is very helpful.

So you mentioned this in passing earlier, but you know, of course, we don't know if we can get that six million, or how much of it we can get. So in terms of planning going forward, I mean, a lot of these things
we're starting now, putting out the RFPs and so forth.

So just in general, in your thinking, which will, you know, need to be our thinking as well, how do we go forward with such uncertainty?

I mean, it's like a fifty-percent difference in, you know, budgeting, and I was, you know, hearing from the Complete Count folks the difference between 2000 and 2010, them going from 20-something million to 2 million, then close to 200 million. I mean, that's head-snapping, right, to get our heads around.

So for us, you know, with about a fifty-percent variable in what we'll be able to spend, how do we even think about that? I mean, that's a big, big variation.

So you know, in terms of, you know, how much to expect, I mean, we just can't know. It's such an unusual year for the budget for the state, right? It could be, you know, a total crisis when it comes to monies coming in, or it could be, you know, pretty okay. We just don't know. So if you can just say more about your thinking.

MR. CLAYPOOL: So we know the 2,065,000 that both Commissioners Vazquez and Sinay budgeted around, that's set at -- that's already in our budget. We'll send a release letter for that in December, and we'll ask for them to release that money, and then we know we can do that level of outreach.
We will get estimates on how much other things are going to cost, and then we will have to find out whether -- and the biggest estimates we're getting right now are estimates for the language access, and we will find out fairly soon whether or not we can get some legislative assistance with those monies and their required assistance in that coordinated plan. So that's one place where we might be able to make up some of this six million, that we won't have to pay for that ourselves, that perhaps the legislature will be interested in assisting.

The amount that was received by the 2010 Commission was 200,000. I would think that that is at least an amount that we could look to in that, and possibly a little bit more, given that, for the State, this language access issue is such a large one, and it's to their benefit to -- you know, it's almost like free research, if you will -- not free, but it has to be done anyway, so why not research it through a body that's trying to carry it to a very specific outcome?

After that, we're going to send out our RFPs, and we're going to get our responses. We haven't spent any money. We haven't spent a dime until we enter into those contracts with all those entities. We will be coming into that in January, and we will have a sense by January
as to whether or not we're going to get an increase. Even though the April letter is due to Department of Finance in first week of February, there will be many conversations across December and January between myself and well, your staff, and the legislature, and Department of Finance.

These conversations, we'll have a sense as to what we can do. So we may end up having to contract. We may end up having -- if you're right, and we are in that really major crunch, and there is simply no additional funding available, we will have to do what Ditas referred to as pull back to a consult. I believe she said "consult" and something else. We may have to pull into that posture, similar to the previous Commission, do what we can do with the two million that we've got for outreach, and then pull everything back, and only concentrate that money on line drawing, and the best form of data management that we can get at that price.

That's the plan moving forward. It doesn't feel good to move forward that way, because there's a lot of uncertainty, but in this -- if there was no COVID, and there hadn't been any of the fires that we had or anything else, there's still always this level of uncertainty kind of moving forward in the budget process, when you know that the amount that you've received isn't
the amount that you necessarily need, nor is it based on any reality other than ten years ago, with a totally different plan, this was spent, and so now we're going to give you another twenty-five percent.

And that's my biggest argument with the Department of Finance right now, is that yes, it's a lot of money, but it doesn't have a basis in what this Commission is trying to do, nor in what this Commission is required to do. You know, you have a requirement in the Constitution to have a robust outreach, and there's some other language in there that the first Commission simply didn't have the money to do, but that was contemplated by this budget.

So it's kind of a longwinded way of saying we have a plan, but it will be a little bit of a nail-biter going into January as to how far our plan can go, and at least starting with our outreach, fitting in the 2,065,000, that's a good start, because we know we can always kind of fall back on that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Anyone else?

Director Claypool, were there other elements of your report that did not get addressed yesterday?

MR. CLAYPOOL: No. This was the only thing that was outstanding, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: All right. Very good.
MR. CLAYPOOL: But I appreciate the opportunity to be able to talk about this part, because I think it's important for us to all start thinking about not only how much money we have, but also that public engagement part starting in April.

And I did -- like I said, I put together a plan. I'm going to run that by Mr. Ceja, and then we're going to kind of see what it looks like, but I think it might be important to, at the next meeting, provide you with at least a skeleton of what a plan looks like, so that this Commission can start thinking about the level of time commitment between April and August.

You had a speaker today say that they'd hoped that you would do more meetings than that first Commission did. I can't tell you the pace. Of course, they were going out, physically going to places, but the pace for thirty-five meetings, and your business meetings, and your line drawer, is very daunting.

And so I believe early, when I started, Commissioner Sinay had said, you know, there's a silver lining to this, in the sense that we can kind of stretch the boundaries of what we can do with videoconferencing and so forth, and that's going to save a lot of you in just the wear and tear of the travel, but six-hour meetings, you know, two or three times a week, every week for two,
two-and-a-half months, is something that we should start
contemplating.

So I will bring that -- I will work first with Mr.
Ceja, and then I will bring that kind of concept of what
one set of meeting schedules might look like, so that all
of you can take a look at it, and that will be on the 1st
and 3rd.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So that would be part of your
report --

MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes.

CHAIR KENNEDY: -- at that meeting? Okay. Very
good. Commissioner --

MR. CLAYPOOL: Given -- hold on. That will be part
of my report. That's all. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Turner, and then
Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Chair.

Director Claypool, I wanted to understand on the
full numbers on the budget, you said about giving it to
the financial subcommittee. Is that because it's a
draft? Is there a point where the rest of us, as
Commissioners, will get all of the numbers, and not just
the collapsed version, number one?

And then the second question is, what would be the
timeline or expectation where we're starting to receive a
budget versus actual, so that we can see what we're actually doing month over month?

MR. CLAYPOOL: We should have the -- now that we have the projected, the actuals are in there, and we tried to segregate them out, and I'm working with the staff person, Ms. Pacheco, that we hired, but it was -- just getting those projections was what we could do. By next week, we should have you, this is what's actually been expended. This is what we're still projecting.

As far as giving the total projections, once we do -- if we give it out to the entire Commission, then it's a public document, and then we have to -- it's kind of like we have to play our hand.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: I just wanted to -- you said that, and I just wanted to confirm that's why it's only going to the subcommittee. Okay. That's great. And so then after that, the actuals, you said we'll get it in a while, you're working it through, but then that expectation is, monthly, we'll get actuals at the close of each month on a regular basis?

MR. CLAYPOOL: Yes.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Okay.

MR. CLAYPOOL: And not only that, but also once we put our contracts in place, then it will all be pretty much actuals, and then the whole budget can simply be
given out each month to the Commission, because then, you
know, we know what we're dealing with and we know what
the expenses are. So I would expect that, no later than
probably mid-January to 1st of February, that this would
just become a public document, and we'd refer to it at
that time, because we'll be past the contracting phase.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: We had a little bit of a
collection yesterday, and I just want to put it forward
again, just that retired annuities (sic) may be a
solution, but it may not be the only solution, and that
we do want to make sure that we're getting the best
skillsets for what we need done, and I think about that
especially when it comes to technology and communication.

There's just so -- it changes so often. So just
something to keep in mind. You know, hopefully, you
know, there will be folks that we can recruit and bring
over that have some of that experience.

I also wanted to -- in regards to the meetings out
in the community, I feel like it's kind of a chicken and
an egg, but I don't -- maybe we'll talk about it while
we're talking about the strategy map tomorrow, but I
think staff needs some input from the Commission on how
we want to do the public meetings and public hearings
this time, so that you all have something to work from,
versus making some assumptions.

I'm not clear yet myself on what, legally, we can do, what we can't do, what does the first part look like, when we're getting the COIs, versus what does the map-drawing piece look like? And so I would hope that staff would want our input before they come up with the final plan.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Well, for clarity, the plan that I put together for budgeting on this was based almost entirely off what occurred last time, just because we had heard so much about having public comment and so forth, but it is not the plan. It's just something that I can anticipate that you would have at least that many public meetings. Whether you have them on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Thursdays, or you have them on the weekends, all the rest of that, is just -- I just needed something to work with.

As far as skillsets, we are talking with somebody who has been referred to us by the Census Bureau -- or by California Census this evening at 6. We are thinking about putting out just a job flier, and looking for people who can fill these positions, because the RA lists, whereas they're awfully convenient for filling quickly, and they're fairly inexpensive, because you don't pay for the benefits packages, they're exhausted.
Every RA is pretty much fully employed at this point, because of the restrictions on employing, and the governor's restrictions on employment, and so forth. So we're looking everywhere we can look. The difficulty with this particular Commission is how short-term it is, and so there's no real job security to this, but we'll find people. I just wanted you to know we're looking.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Sadhwani.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Thank you, Chair Kennedy. You always know when something's in my mind.

You know, I apologize, because it is often the case in which I have to step out of our Commission meetings to fulfill my other job requirements. Is it possible just to get some clarity -- because I feel like I've missed out on a couple of conversations -- is a recommendation for what our community outreach plan will look like -- is that coming from the Commission? Is it coming from staff?

I think it sounds here like it's coming from staff, from a budgeting perspective, and I can understand that. Certainly Commissioner Andersen and I have discussed this to some extent, also in terms of the line drawer RFP that we are working on, that we are actively working on, and trying to solicit feedback from potential line drawers in terms of what their proposed scope of work might look
like. But I'm just wondering if I could some additional clarity on that, because we have gone back and forth about, well, is it the Commission that's doing this, or are we waiting for our staff members to come on board? It sounds like our executive deputy director -- who knows what that time line is? So if someone could just help me better understand that, that would be great.

MR. CLAYPOOL: I could take just the start of this, and say that you have two different components. You have the outreach that Commissioner Sinay and Commissioner Vazquez are putting together, and that's wrapped around the 2.65 million that is in the -- locked into funding for that specific purpose.

We also have outreach that Director Ceja, our communications director, will be putting into place, and that is an operational budget expense, and that's something for him. So he will be putting together his plan for you. My understanding from our meeting today -- and I believe it was Commissioner Sinay had said that they will put this together and will be handing it off. That was the term that I heard. So I guess, Commissioner Sinay, perhaps you can tell us how that's going to work.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: The vision is kind of -- what we've created, the strategy -- I keep forgetting the name -- the strategy map -- is to give staff -- and right
now it's just Fredy, but hopefully, eventually, it will
be Fredy and the deputy executive director -- a summary
of all the work that we have done up to now, what we've
learned, you know, some of our different -- you know,
some of the pieces, so that they can go deeper and bring
a plan back to us.

Hopefully, they won't work in isolation. The idea
really is to bring in the different subcommittees when
needed, so it's created -- it's a staff-Commissioner
partnership as we create those, and that's why even in
the map, we said, this is done with this committee, this
is done with that, you know.

And I want to be really clear. This is just a
proposal and a plan, and conversation that still needs to
be had, so I don't want for anyone to think that
Commissioner Vazquez and I have taken the budget and have
already said what to do with it. It was just, we wanted
a starting point to have the conversation, so that the
different subcommittees and everybody else kind of
started having more meat on the bone, or I don't know,
maybe it's just, you know, we can make our sausages
better because I'm giving you the meat. I don't know the
right analogy.

But I do see -- and I would love to hear
Commissioner Vazquez, but I do see this. As we build a
new partnership, it comes back to the Commission and for
public comments, and we finalize it and tweak it and all
that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Director Claypool, and then
Commissioner Le Mons.

MR. CLAYPOOL: You know, great plan, and I thought
that the documents that you sent out, Commissioner Sinay,
were very useful, and again, I was very happy that you
envisioned staying within that parameter, because that
helps. We do need -- we're going to have that
collection soon, and we do need to have it, so that we
can have that in place, because that's one of the big
planning parts, so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner --

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: I'm going to pass. I'm going
to pass.

CHAIR KENNEDY: You're going to pass. Okay.

Anyone else?

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Vazquez.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Ah. It's very difficult to see your
hand against the background. I think we all need to
pretend that we're sign language interpreters, and have
dark backgrounds where we can see our hands easily.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: You know, my hand will just
disappear sometimes, though. So anyway --
CHAIR KENNEDY: Sorry.

COMMISSIONER VAZQUEZ: That's okay. This is a -- our proposal has -- it really is a skeleton plan. We imagine that it will go to staff and come back with a more fully baked budget proposal associated with it, especially as they have the time to go in and think through what grant or contracting structure could and should look like. What does it actually cost to fund, you know, direct outreach versus, you know, printing materials, what have you. That was not the focus of our work.

The focus of our work was to provide a strategy, a foundation for the details to be worked through by the staff, at which point, then, that's the second -- that's the third part of the conversation, where we go, oh, that was not at all what we were thinking; or you know, that's going to cost us way more than we thought, and we're not getting as much out of this two million as we anticipated, so you know, we're going to need more.

Here's our justification. Here's what we want to have, et cetera.

So even in approving the strategy map actions, the proposed actions which are on there, you'll see that they're intentionally pretty broad, and leaving room for staff to come back with a more thorough proposal. But
again, we will discuss, and probably have some input in
adjustments and amendments to be made.

So many of these things, at least the way I see it,
are iterative, and they hopefully start with the strategy
and the goals developed by the Commission, but then, you
know, we're not mind readers, so I anticipate that
there's always going to be some back and forth between
staff and the Commission.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Le Mons.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Yeah. I passed earlier because
I wanted to let Commissioner Vazquez go, as a part of the
subcommittee, and respond. I just wanted to thank both
of them, and say I'm glad to hear that clarified. I
mean, I understood it to be that. That's what I thought
we were doing. So I'm glad.

I understand why it's kind of confusing. I've been
one of the big proponents of pumping the brakes until Mr.
Ceja got here and he's able to be a part of the
conversation, but the expectation is not that the
conversation will be exclusively with the outreach
subcommittee and staff. This was just that early
foundation work, as Commissioner Sinay so eloquently laid
out, and supported by Commissioner Vazquez.

So we're just in a process, and I just invite all of
us to -- it's an art to be able to exist in chaos and
lack of clarity. It really is, and everybody is not cut out for that, and that is what this is, not just with the outreach, but every aspect of it, and so I'm learning to be more patient with those of you who are less inclined to allow the chaotic dots that are all out there and you know, have them connected. That gives you a sense of security that, at the end of the day, it's going to be okay.

I'm learning that that's not everyone, and some of these questions are necessary because a different level of clarity is required so that we can be comfortable and move forward. So I just wanted to acknowledge that clarity that was just offered, and I think that we're right on the precipice of getting this outreach piece off and running, and I'm looking forward to being a part of it.

The presentation earlier just got me all excited, because so much of the philosophy and what they do, I've done those things, and I live on those philosophies when it comes to community engagement, who we bring to the table. Like, I was just sitting there going, yes, yes, yes, yes.

So we'll eventually actually be able to operationalize a lot of that stuff, so I just wanted to say I'm thrilled, and my pass, of course, wasn't out of
any frustration. It's just, I wanted to yield. I should have said, yield and come back. So thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good.

So we are at our break time and lunchtime, and check your emails, and look forward to seeing everyone back, and thank you very much.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Could we get fifteen minutes to get our lunches and then be back?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Sure.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Is that going to be on a separate -- your social lunch going to be on a separate --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes, yes.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: That's been sent out.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: And then, sorry, what time are we returning back to public session? How long, total, do I have for lunch?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, we would be back at 1:50.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Great. Thank you.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Thank you, Chair.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay, very good. Thank you, everyone.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 12:47 p.m. until 1:52 p.m.)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Welcome back, everyone. I hope you
had a good break.

The next item on our agenda is kicking off the discussion of our scopes of work for what will eventually be requests for proposal. I'd like to ask Director Claypool if you could just give a very general introduction to what it is that we're doing with this segment, for those who are with us from outside.

MR. CLAYPOOL: I have to find the agenda, Chair.

Sorry.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, just in general, what an RFP is, what a scope of work is, you know, what we're trying to do with all of these procurement actions.

MR. CLAYPOOL: All right. Again, I don't have the agenda in front of me. I apologize. I'm just trying to bring it up right now. Okay. Agenda. Okay. All right.

So could you tell me which one we are on, Chair?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, we're on 9E and 9F.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Oh, okay. I can explain what we're trying to do, and that is, when we say, "potential approval and reporting on", I believe that both Commissioner Andersen and Sadhwani, and Commissioner Sadhwani and Commissioner Yee, are presenting these documents for review.

Eventually we'd like to have approval, in concept, of the statement of work, and then we can drop that
statement of work into the boilerplate kind of framework that Raul is securing from a statement -- or from a contract that had been let in the past, and then we would bring it back either for approval or, if the Commission's good with it, we would roll it forward to the Office of Legal Services for their review.

Once it's at the Office of Legal Services, it can get minor changes. It just can't get substantive changes. So if there was -- if you wanted to redirect to who people should report back to, or you wanted to make -- probably as big a change as you could make is if you wanted to say, there's a review period for a certain amount of time, and we're going to shorten it. You might be able to do that, but generally, once it goes up to Legal Services, they like it to be as complete as possible.

So right now, these Commissioners are going to present these RFPs, and we're just going to discuss each one, and see if anybody has any questions about them, and they should have all been posted.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So 9E is on the line drawers RPF, so if the subcommittee can give us an update on where things stand and what input you might need from the rest of the Commission at this point.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. Thank you. And I
apologize, Chair Kennedy. I didn't realize that we were on 9E and F. Yes.

So for the line drawer -- and Commissioner Andersen, feel free to jump in at any time -- I think we need a little additional time. We are working on developing a -- sorry -- secondary RFP, which would be somewhat different from what has been used in the past.

Our hope with the secondary RFP is that we can solicit from bidders, to some extent, their plan of how they see this work moving forward. We want their input. They know what line drawing looks like. I mean, I presume that we're going to hire someone with some experience. They are the experts here.

So we want to get some input from them about how they anticipate this process working during COVID, which is a part of my earlier question as to, you know, how are we going to bring all of these pieces together? But that is our intention, is to create that.

We're a little bit behind, and we anticipate finalizing a draft RFP for the Commission's review, as well as for the public review. We are going to push to try and finish that by the end of this week, which means after this meeting, and my hope is to have that, along with a similar memo that we had prepared for the VRA committee, with our recommendations available to the
Commission, as well as to the public, prior to Thanksgiving. That would give folks ample time, we hope, to review that document prior to our meeting December 1st through 3rd.

Commissioner Andersen, is there anything else that you would --

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. Basically, what's involved in -- as Commissioner Kennedy, and for the public, what's involved in the request for proposal 2 is, it's not that -- the choice in terms of how you evaluate the bidders and who applies for this is not strictly based on the lowest responsible bidder. I mean, it is, out of a scoring mechanism, and in that scoring mechanism, thirty percent is the actual budget cost, and then we have to -- which is different, because we did not do that in 2010. They did a different type of arrangement, which -- it again has to be very distinctive on the scope of work, and actually, it's a statement of work that has multiple components in it. It will be qualifications, experience.

In the secondary RFP, which is similar to what there is called an IFB, which is -- let's see. Wait. It is IFB? It's for bidder, yes, invitation for bidder, which is what they did in 2010, and you basically -- it's similar, but you have to really outline exactly what you
want them to do.

As Commissioner Sadhwani said, we were actually looking for more ideas for the line drawer, specifically because of the advancement in technology, and how many more line drawers -- this is done, and they're not just a line drawer, which I don't want to repeat things I've already said, but they need to be able to help us, assist us with our outreach in terms of collecting the information, not necessarily -- but realizing that all the information ultimately ends up in a map, and so that's their angle coming in to what we are doing.

Now, we have outreach and other things completely with that, but we have to have where that's all coming from at the same time. So we're trying to incorporate that into our proposal, as well as we have to do a cost -- the cost breakdown. We have to write up a work product, and a, let's see, evaluation process, and then so how we can actually then score it. So unfortunately, we don't have an example to follow, so we've been having to create this on our own.

So that's why it's taken a bit longer, but as Commissioner Sadhwani said, we hope to have this done, if not -- it'll certainly be done either by the end of this week or the first of next week, and the idea would be it gets posted with a memo, so the public and the
Commissioners have a lot of time ahead of time to review this, and it will be, actually, the full RFP, and then it will say specifically, look at sections, you know, dah, dah, dah, dah, so you can look at everything if you want to.

So basically, once we get to that 1st-2nd meeting, we can get all the comments together, and basically approve it, and then it will almost be out the door. That's the intent of the subcommittee.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Director Claypool, did you have something else you wanted to add at this point?

MR. CLAYPOOL: No. I still remain awed by how much Commissioner Andersen has taught herself about state contracting code. She has a career after this, if she wants to work in that. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Great. Eleven years from now, I can jump into that. Woo-hoo.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Any other Commissioners?

Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Thank you.

I'm wondering if Director Claypool could help the whole Commission get a little more clarity on RFPs versus RFIs. So as I understand it, and RFP is the more detailed approach, intended for competitive bids. We're seeking competitive bids, and I guess there's at least
two versions of that.

For the VRA counsel, we're approaching it with the RFI, which I take it is not for competitive bids, less detailed, but still, you know, you put it out there and see who responds. And then we've been discussing our RFI as an attorney-to-attorney approach, which I guess preserves -- potentially preserves confidentiality, if needed, and that's one of the reasons we're approaching it that way, besides it being just easier.

I hope that's correct. If not, please correct me. I'm still trying to catch up to Commissioner Andersen in learning all this stuff.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Looking for another career, too?

So RFIs are typically requests for information. If you use them as a contracting mechanism for anything else but attorneys, then it's really just, we're not sure how we want to do the line drawing, so please send us -- you know, respond to this, and give us information that we could then craft and turn into an RFP, a request for proposal.

So now we've got more information. Now we know a little bit more about what we want. So when you chain an RFI with an RFP, the thought is, it takes a little bit longer, but you can shorten the amount of time in the RFP that you actually let the contract out for, because
people already know about it, and so they're already
working to complete their RFPs based on what's coming in
on the RFI.

Now, you can also use an RFI for attorneys, and
Marian would be a good source for this, but the upshot
is, you request -- you do send out the RFI to try to
solicit a lot of bids, and you can take a look at who you
get, but I think the advantage of it is, is that you
don't necessarily have to take the lowest anything. You
take the most qualified attorney or the most qualified
firm who's going to do the work for you, and then you can
turn their response into your contract.

Is that about right, Marian?

MS. JOHNSTON: Right, and it gives you more leeway
in picking somebody that you're comfortable with as your
attorney, because it is a different kind of relationship.
It's just not a financial one.

MR. CLAYPOOL: But when you think about RFIs in that
way, you only use RFIs with the attorneys, because it's a
special relationship that the State recognizes, and so
they grant this more expedited methodology for going out
to the attorney.

So if you're looking at your VRA attorney, you could
use the RFI. If your VRA attorney said, hey. I can do
the analysis, too, then it seems like you could wrap both
functions in under one RFI. If, however, you say, no, we want to get somebody else to do the VRA analysis, now you have to go to an RFP, the request for proposal, because you no longer have this special path to that individual.

Marian?

MS. JOHNSTON: Unless you use an interagency agreement, which is an alternative way of working with someone who's employed in a public institution.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Commissioner Sadhwani, it looks like you're -- take it away.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Well, I'm wondering if, at this point, we want to move on from line drawer subcommittee to the VRA subcommittee, because I think you're starting to lay out sort of the landscape that we reviewed to develop these recommendations. So perhaps that makes sense, though I see Commissioner Andersen's hand is also raised.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes. I see Commissioner Turner also has a question. I was just going to kind of clarify, from the contract point of view, what the differences are here, quickly, and then jump into the VRA portion.

Commissioner Turner, did you want to actually go ahead?

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Yes. I think my comment
mainly would be for those that's taking note for future. I think one suggestion would be to have a class on understanding state government in all of the various ways ahead of time, whether that's just a couple of hours, because I think that those of you who have worked in state, I think you got it, and that's great, and you're trying to help us, but in a piece-parted (sic) way, to where it does not necessarily connect or stick.

I think, on next go-around, it would be a good idea to put that in the training kind of projection, of these are the classes that ordinary citizens from all over California can be a Commissioner, but they need this piece of work ahead of time, I think, this information.

Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Commissioner Turner. I have noted that. I guess my colleague on the lessons learned subcommittee has also noted that. So that will certainly by part of our considerations.

Before we turn to VRA, I neglected to open up for public comment, and I don't want to keep anyone waiting who might have intended to offer public comment when we came back from lunch. So my apologies to anyone out there who intends or intended to offer public comment, and I would ask Katy to read the instructions. Thank you.
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: In order to maximize
transparency and public participation in our process, the
Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To
call in, dial the telephone number provided on the
livestream feed. The telephone number is 877-853-5247.

When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided
on the livestream feed. It is 91505532099 for this
week's meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID,
simply press pound.

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

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

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

These instructions are also indicated on the
website. The Commission is taking public comment on
agenda item number 9E and F.

There is currently no one in the queue.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Any questions or comments from Commissioners at this point?

Director Claypool.

MR. CLAYPOOL: I just was suggesting we hold at least for two minutes on the lag.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I can do the quick overview of contract in these couple minutes, if anyone cares.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Go ahead.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Basically, for legal services, there are different parts of State contracting that you can do, and it's a whole State contracting manual, and they divide it out into certain sections. Because, basically, the lawyers write all the laws, they have a special category. They do a lot more as legal contracts, and that's what Marian was talking about, and that's what the VRA is essentially doing.

So while the names sound similar to, actually, competitive bidding, they don't necessary have to be competitive bidding, and I think that's what's really confusing us, because we're talking about RFI, RFI, but RFI for legal services has different definitions than RFI for, say, you know, a tool, a civic technology tool. It's a different -- as Mr. Claypool said, it is just for
information. You can't bid on it if it's for a tool, versus if it's for legal services. So I think that's what's kind of been one -- a bit tricking us.

Also interagency agreements have a special category, which is the other thing we're talking about, and then, actually, IT services and goods have another category. And IT, though, really specifically means, we're buying a computer, where it's not that -- and IT services are we're getting, like, a server to use in our building. It's not -- because we were kind of going, oh, it's technology services. It doesn't quite mean that. And that's why we're in, actually, Chapter 5, which is competitive bidding, and that's where it ends up.

You have the IFB, which is called a -- let's see. What was it, again? It's the invitation for bidders, and the difference between an -- so there's the IFB, the RFP regular, and the RFP 2, and the difference is -- and the IFB and the primary RFP are both -- they're different criteria, and the bottom line is, you must go with the lowest cost proposer, you know, the responsive bidder, or -- in the RFB (sic), it's the bidder, and the RFP, it's a proposal, and you have to go with the lowest cost on those.

The secondary RFP is the lowest-scored responsive bidder, and so the cost is a portion of it. It's not all
of it. The IFB is usually used for things you've just
done in the past. It's more routine. These are commonly
easy-to-describe items, and the reason why 2010 did that
differently, they kind of did a mix of things, because
they only had a couple of people who -- they went out,
but then it -- well, I won't get into the details of that
one.

The primary RFP does have State -- you know, there's
a time you have to let it bid for and that sort of thing,
which makes it much, much longer, and if you've done the
RFI, your request for an information, gave us an idea,
then you can limit part of how long the bid has to go out
before you can accept proposals, and that's the benefit
of shortening it.

Ultimately, it isn't just you do all one, and then
you just do the whole process of an RFP. It's a little
bit shorter, but it still -- ultimately, it kind of takes
around the same time, maybe a little bit shorter, and the
secondary RFP is for more creative processes, because you
don't want to just have it based on the bottom dollar,
and you want to look at evaluations and qualifications.
So in a nutshell, that's kind of it, if that helps, and
I'll answer any questions.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Are there any questions?
Commissioner Ahmad.
COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Thank you.

Commissioner Andersen, my only question is, where did you learn all of this information? Is there, like, a handbook or something you read?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: I just looked at the State contracting manual.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Okay. Okay.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Yes.

COMMISSIONER AHMAD: Awesome. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I just saw Commissioner Sadhwani's note that she needs to step away at 2:30, and she's critical for the next piece. So I don't know how we're going to move forward.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Well, actually, the next piece was tentatively scheduled to start tomorrow morning. So I'm happy to have Commissioner Sadhwani open the topic this afternoon, but I don't intend to exhaust it this afternoon. So I leave that up to her.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure. I can do -- would you like me to say a few words now about VRA components? Would that be helpful?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Sure.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: Sure.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.
COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: And Commissioner Yee, please feel free to jump in at any point.

Also just to round out the whole piece on the contracting, I'm wondering, at some point, Commissioner Andersen, because you have done so much, you know, research on this, perhaps you could, like, write up, you know, some of your findings.

That might be helpful for other subcommittees that are going to look at contracts, and it could also serve the lessons learned committee to know, and have, like, a log of all the different types, and how and when they've been used, so you know, what we're planning to do for line drawing now is different from the State Auditor's Office, which is different from what 2010 did, and kind of laying out that rationale. So perhaps that's something that you would feel comfortable doing.

In terms of VRA, you know, as mentioned this morning, we prepared a memo, as well as statements of work, as mentioned, in the RFI. One portion of the RFI is the statement of work, so we have prepared that for your review, as opposed to the full document of the RFI. I think, let's see where that conversation goes.

If we feel, as well as the public, like they are having enough of a chance to give input, we can, you know, move that forward and put together the full RFI,
and send it off. If we feel like there's still need for additional conversation, that's perfectly fine. We can kind of hold that for the next meeting, and finalize an RFI at that point in time.

You know, we put together a number of recommendations for you all in the memo. We will discuss them more in detail tomorrow. We do have Justin Levitt coming, the VRA expert and elections expert who has addressed us previously, and he was very generous with his time and willingness to come and talk with us. I think, because it was not formally agendized, we won't be calling it a training, per se, but he will have a few introductory slides, and then be able to answer questions about the process.

As I mentioned earlier this morning, one of the recommendations has changed. I'm looking for which number it is. Number 3 on the VRA memo, we do not -- you know, given input from Marian, we no longer feel like it's necessary to have that discussion in closed session, so we will do it in open session tomorrow.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa, and then Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Actually, my question was previously for Commissioner Andersen, but we could go ahead and skip.
CHAIR KENNEDY: No. If you have a question for Commissioner Andersen, then it's perfectly fine.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Okay. Commissioner Andersen, you had said something about the time frame. It sounded like the IFB and the RFP were -- one was supposed to be shorter than the other, but it seems like, from your determination, it all takes around the same amount of time. Did I understand that correctly?

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Not -- again, we're talking about two different -- there's an RFI that is involved in legal services.

Actually, Mr. Claypool might try and answer this directly. Did you want to step in?

MR. CLAYPOOL: If you don't mind.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Go ahead.

MR. CLAYPOOL: Again, RFIs are requests for information, and you use them if you're not sure what you want to do. They can shorten the time frame on an RFP, because they're usually chained to an RFP. So first you go out with your RFI, and you say, how should we -- what should we want in a line drawer? And you get all this input on your RFI.

Then you go back and you write your RFP for the line drawer, whether it's the standard or the RFP 2, and you let it -- typically, you can have as short as a ten-day
process for review, for any of them, but typically people let them for thirty days, and a lot of times, they'll let them until filled. So we'll just say, we're going to just take people's proposals until we have, you know, the one we want, but thirty days is kind of a standard.

If you use an RFI first, people are already starting to get ready to bid on the RFP, so you can shorten your time frame to ten days or fifteen days, and so you get about the same-length product, but you do it in two parts. That's what Commissioner Andersen is saying. So they take about the same amount of time. It's just that you have to write two documents, you have to process. So actually, most of the time, an RFI is going to take you a little bit longer, but that's the distinction between the two, and that's how you use them together.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Yee.

COMMISSIONER YEE: Yes. You know, I'm actually remembering that Raul prepared a handout for us on the approaches to procurement, so maybe, if one of us can drag that up somewhere, that might help us, or help Commissioner Andersen get a head start on getting a summary to us.

Two quick footnotes to what Commissioner Sadhwani already explained so well. One is that when Justin
Levitt comes tomorrow morning, he'll give a little catch-up background on VRA, but I really want to focus on VRA litigation, what it looks like, what triggers it, how do you avoid it, because that's why you hire VRA counsel, right, is to manage all that. So as you think about possible questions, that's one thing to focus on.

The other thing, the statement of work gets embedded into the full RFI, and we're told that that's just pages and pages of boilerplate that is not really up for discussion, because a lot of it is just set by legislation around, you know, small contracting requirements, small business requirements, and all these things that have accumulated over the years around such contracts, and those will not be -- we can't modify those. So that's why they're not up for discussion, and we won't be presenting those. What we are presenting is the statement of work, which is the part that we craft and which we have control over.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

Any other comments or questions? Commissioner Andersen.

COMMISSIONER ANDERSEN: Well, there's a little more on that, in that a whole lot of it is indeed boilerplate. It's straight from -- you know, it's either one group or another group, and it's really -- exactly. You cannot
modify it at all.

   Other things, though, do get -- there's the statement of work, and then there are other parts that do get modified, little bits, because you have to -- for how it gets let, there's a little bit in there. There's little bits, in, you know, small bits, and like, another section -- oh, there's the first two or three lines does affect the rest of -- in the -- it's not all strictly boilerplate.

   So I just don't want to deceive anyone, because you will see, when we put ours out, I'll actually indicate, you know, in, you know, section 5 or section 6, sample Exhibit B, look at the first paragraph, and that sort of thing, because you'll see -- and also remember our security agreement? There's a standard which we talked about, and then there's a couple things, depending on what we're doing. Now, again, that's not for legal, though, and the reason I'm saying this is for Commissioner Ahmad and Commissioner Turner, who were thinking about the tool and the data management.

   So there will be a few little areas that we will look at elsewhere, but it's not stuff that needs -- once you evaluate -- once we approve the scope of work, that has the intent, and the rest of it is following through, which is what Commissioner Yee was saying. I just want
to make sure that everyone knows, particularly the
public. I don't want them to think, wait a minute. We
didn't get to see that, and it's addressing the scope of
work.

It's just to make sure things are consistent all the
way through, and I think you'll see that when you look at
the full document. So it's just for a little
clarification, and I want to be -- we're trying to be in
front. We're not trying to prevent people from looking
at the entire document.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Director Claypool, did you have
anything further?

MR. CLAYPOOL: I didn't. I was just going to
redistribute that document that Commissioner Akutagawa
had talked about that we constructed earlier, just so if
you have any immediate questions on it, it will be there.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Thank you.

At this point, the next item on the agenda is the
global access panel, which is, I believe, scheduled for
3:30. I'm just wanting to confirm with Commissioner
Akutagawa that that is what we are expecting.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Yes, that is what we told
the presenters.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. So at this point, I would
propose that we recess for an hour, until 3:25, so that
we can be back in time for the panelists at 3:30.

Very good. See you in one hour.

(Whereupon, a recess was held from 2:26 p.m.
until 3:25 p.m.)

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you very much, everyone.

Welcome back. We are ready now for the last agenda item of the day. We have a panel organized by our global access subcommittee, so I will turn it over to Commissioner Akutagawa and Commissioner Fernandez.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. Thank you, Chair, and we meant to ask you, do you want us to moderate it after the presentations in terms of if there's questions, or do you want to take that back?

CHAIR KENNEDY: I'll continue to moderate.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. One of our groups is not in yet. I can introduce our first one, though, if you'd like. We've got Nahla Kayali, and she founded the Access California Services, and that's a health and human services nonprofit organization in Anaheim dedicated to the underserved populations. So we're very excited to have her onboard today.

And I'm hoping that our other three from the California Black Census and Redistricting Hub -- they're supposed to join us. We'll have James Woodson, Kevin Cosney, and Lanae Norwood. So hopefully they'll get here
quickly. I'll just go ahead and present them so that, when they're here, we can go ahead and get started.

So James is the senior policy and strategic projects manager at California Calls, and he manages the California Calls legislative endorsement strategy, as well as the policy work around the 2020 census redistricting and the Voter's Choice Act.

Kevin Cosney also works at California Calls. He's the associate director of integrative voter engagement, and he currently manages coalition building, outreach and public education for California Calls, Statewide Black Census and Redistricting Hub.

Then we'll also have Lanae Norwood. She's the strategic communications lead, and it's my understanding they're bringing her on because they contracted with her, in terms of "they" as the California Black Census and Redistricting Hub. So they contracted with her during, I believe, the census work that they did. So I'm hoping they'll be able to log in soon.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: I also want to say we did tell them 3:30, so they may just log on right, like, seconds before 3:30, so.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Very good.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Right. So we'll probably have Nahla go first, so that they don't have to jump
right into it.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I see James has just joined us.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Oh, yep. Hello, James.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Hi, James.

MR. WOODSON: Good afternoon, everybody. How are you?

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Good.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Welcome.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I introduced you, and said wonderful things about you.

MR. WOODSON: Appreciate it. Thank you. I think my colleagues will be joining in in a few minutes.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Yes. We did say that we told the three of you 3:30, so.

MR. WOODSON: Okay. No worries.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: But we'll have Nahla go first, James, so that you can kind of catch your breath. How's that? Does that sound good?

MR. WOODSON: (Indiscernible).

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: But then, as soon as, hopefully, Kevin and Lanae join us, then we can start after that. I don't want them to have to, you know, come in in the middle of a presentation.

MR. WOODSON: Sure. That works for me.
COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: If I could just, for the context, while we wait for the others to join us, I would just say this is -- I guess this is panel number 3 in the series of language access, I guess, global access panels that we've been having, and so for today, I just want to say that Nahla Kayali does represent Access Services California, and she'll be speaking about the Arab, Middle Eastern, North African, and Muslim communities.

And then, the last meeting that we had, we had presenters from PANA, Partnership for the Advancement of New Americans. They spoke primarily on black immigrants and refugees. However, from a distinct and specific cultural perspective, we did also want to have a presentation so that we can also hear from the black African American community, and so we're joined by our presenters who are going to be joining us from the Black Census and Redistricting Hub, and that's the perspective that they'll be presenting from. And so I just wanted to make that distinction, so that everyone is aware that that is the -- that is our intent in terms of this presentation.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Okay. It looks like we have -- we have three James Woodsons.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's Kevin.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: I think Lanae might be
with -- there. There she is.

MR. MANOFF: For those that are sharing James Woodson's invite, you can update your name in the participant list, I believe.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: James, I was going to say you've managed to clone yourself twice.

MR. COSNEY: If only there were three James Woodsons.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. So I think we're good. I think they were going to bring up Nahla's presentation at headquarters, right, Commissioner Akutagawa, I believe?

MR. MANOFF: We can take care of that for you. Stand by.

MS. KAYALI: Good afternoon. Can you hear me good?

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

MS. KAYALI: Thank you for inviting me. Thank you, Linda, for thinking of me and Access California Services to represent today. Me and Linda, we go back, served on various committees in the past, and we're great friends. We're very happy to see her part of the Commission, as a Commissioner.

Today I will be talking about the MENA community. As you see my face and how I look like, I'm a MENA member. So the MENA community stands for Middle Eastern
and North African -- next slide, please -- stands for the Middle Eastern and North Africa, as you see on the map, the pink and the yellow map. That's the countries that we represent.

MENA represents a very ethnically and culturally different groups who originally -- they come from North Africa and the Arab countries, like Morocco, Egypt, Algeria, Saudi Arabia, Palestine, Jordan, Turkish, Afghanistan. We go a little bit into the east. So this is the MENA community, where -- next slide, please -- the MENA region.

We speak many different languages, but we actually share a lot of cultural values, like family issues and parenting and the lifestyle. We share a lot of cultures together, and at the same time, we have different, for each country, how you see people from the south or from the north, from the east. So we are -- we speak different languages, and we have the Turkish, the Farsi, the Dari, Pashto, Hebrew, Armenian, French, Arabic. So we have many different languages, and we all practice the Abrahamic religion, which is incorporated of Islam, Judaism, and Christianity.

Next slide, please.

It's important to highlight the difference between Middle Eastern and North African are not every Arab is
Muslim, and not every Muslim is an Arab; and the MENA community, they mainly can have diverse countries, and that's the Persians are different from Arabs, different from Africans, the Iranians, the Turkish.

So we have a different type of cultures, but we have a lot of common cultures altogether, and the community -- the Arab community, twenty-two countries where they speak one language, which is the classical Arabic, but we have different dialects. Like, the Egyptian language is -- Arabic is different from the Syrian, different from the Moroccan, but we come into one classic Arabic language, which is the written and the reading Arabic.

Sometimes it's very hard to translate, because we always are asked to be translating materials for the county or for the city, and we always go into the classical Arabic. We can't go into any other countries to translate. We have to go with the common one language, the classical Arabic.

We've seen translations, and that happened within different government agencies, and we can tell right away it's not the classical Arabic, because sometimes, Egyptians, they use different words for certain words that Syrians or Moroccans or -- sometimes we don't understand each other of the different dialects, but once we go into the classical Arabic, then we start
understanding each other.

Next slide, please.

Please stop me if you have any questions or anything. Probably I'm going too fast.

And the important is that Muslims' religion is not an ethnicity or race. Muslims is someone who practice the Muslim faith, which is a worldwide faith. You can see, just like the Christians and Jewish. You can see Italians as Muslims. You can see Latinos are Muslim. You can see Chinese are Muslims.

That's not necessarily they're all from one country. I can see here Isra Ahmad. She's part of the Muslim religion, but I don't know where she's from. But we have a lot of commonality together, and some values, follow the Muslim -- they follow the Muslim faith, and I think I covered all of it. Muslims speak different languages, and in each -- one time, I was at the mosque, and they said, today we have 104 languages. So it's a worldwide faith.

Thank you. Next slide, please.

There are about -- and this is an estimate from Arab-American Institute. There's about 800 individual MENA, Arab community. They live in the State of California, and there's about 400,000 Muslims in California, where they overlap. They overlap with each
other, and the variety of languages spoken in the MENA community is -- Arabic is the major language, and then we have the Farsi, Persian, Hebrew, Pashto, Dari, Armenian, just like I mentioned the other languages in the past.

Next slide, please.

Our community, they come -- many of them, they come with limited English proficiency, and those are -- they come -- it depends on their background, their educational background, their professional background, and the socioeconomic for the MENA community, and they come to the United States for many reasons.

Some of them, they come as immigrants or refugees, but some they come for education. They come to do businesses, and just like any other ethnicity, and with the last heavily decreased by the current administration coming as refugees, and which we used to see a lot of influx of refugees coming from Muslim countries in the past. It is very important not to generalize. Each individual and family different, depending on their circumstances of their home countries and where they're coming from.

Next slide, please.

The MENA community, we have many barriers to practice. Many of the Muslim individuals, it depends on their circumstances, but language and literacy, language
barrier, cultural barrier, unaware of opportunities, unaware of -- they're not familiar with the American system here.

In many factors, they are embarrassed to speak in public because of their limited English, and they lack knowledge of the western culture, and this is many of the barriers that they carry with them, and we are -- the left-wing fears. And they mistrust governments, because of their backgrounds and what countries they're coming from, usually not really involved in government, and because we have a different structure. Democracy is not there, but if we go to the faith, the Muslim faith, there should be democracy, but right now, with governments, there's not democracies. And they come with the trauma, and that's what keeps them isolated, and they don't like to speak in public meeting, and they're always -- they don't trust government.

Next slide, please.

All that depends on how long they've been in this country, in the U.S., and we always encourage them to go to meeting and be engaged, especially who those they work long hours with low-paying jobs. They usually don't have time to participate, and we always encourage them to be civically engaged, and we have the citizenship classes. We always talk about government, and how to prioritize
their lifestyle so they can be able to be engaged.

Lack of awareness of opportunity. Sometimes they
don't know how to seek or see an opportunity. We always
have to mentor them, and we always have to talk to them,
so they can be able to be engaged, and they have fear of
deportations, and political repression, and they
practice, and they are worried if they speak out or if
they say anything that doesn't fit with the government
here, they can be able to be sent back home. And that's
the fear they carry.

And in some families, gender roles sometimes --
women doesn't participate a lot, and that's a few,
although we have other side of women who are
participating a lot. So it depends on the family
culture, not the country or not the religion.

Next slide, please.

So we have many recommendations, to choose many of
them, you know, to build -- for the Commission to build
the relationship with organizations and leaders and
trusted messengers who they can be able to be the liaison
between the Commission and the redistricting and the MENA
community, because they always happen to trust the people
that they know.

And AccessCal has been, you know, a trusted
messenger for almost twenty-two years, and we've been
helping the community, the MENA community, to be engaged. We participated in voter registration, the census. We always try to get them engaged. And one of the recommendations, you know, try to invite yourself to go to organizations or where the community meet, where they shop and they have community centers, or they have event, just to get to know this community, because mostly they're isolated. And collaborate to educate the MENA population in any issues, and we are here to help. Maybe collaborate with the MENA media outlets to announce opportunities for the MENA community to be engaged.

Next slide, please.

So motivate the MENA community as the member of the society, and redistricting meetings, if you can include us, we can be able to help you, to give you emails of the MENA community, who they like to participate and to be engaged. Encourage the Commissioners to visit venues like AccessCal, and where MENA, they concentrate of shopping, and educate the MENA community on what redistricting, because I'm sure a lot of them, they don't know what it is, and we need to educate them about it.

Next slide, please.

Develop and host training opportunities for the MENA community, and we can be the liaison for that. Appoint MENA community members to the California Redistricting,
and I see Isra Ahmad is one of the Commissioners, which
is great. Appoint community members to the Commissions,
if we can, and encourage them to participate.

Next slide, please.

So the role of AccessCal. AccessCal established in
1998 as a trusted messenger in the MENA community, and
has been over twenty-two years. We deliver wraparound
health and human services, and we are an advocate.

AccessCal works on a daily basis to help ensure MENA
community and Muslim population included at the table and
receive equal opportunity. And AccessCal works on the
federal level, state level, county, city, with the
community. We are the voice for the MENA community in
California, and government's been really great to us, and
we've been really included, especially, you know, after
Access California was established for the twenty-two
years.

We always see ourselves are included in everything,
and thank you for that, and we really -- thank you for
including me today to speak about the MENA community, and
we'd love to open the dialogues, and working toward
ensuring the MENA community is getting involved, and
please correct me, Isra, if you have anything that you
can add to my presentations.

Thank you, and thank you, Linda, for including me.
I really appreciate it. I covered a lot of things for you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Shukran, Nahla.

MS. KAYALI: Dr. Ray.

CHAIR KENNEDY: I lived first in Afghanistan, and then in Sudan, and then in Jordan.

MS. KAYALI: Wow. You covered the whole region. So what I said is correct, right?

CHAIR KENNEDY: It was great to have your presentation. Thank you.

MS. KAYALI: Thank you very much. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER FERNANDEZ: Okay. And then we'll have the next presentation. James, I think you said that -- was it going to be Kevin and Lanae? Okay.

MR. WOODSON: So yeah, I'll kick it off, but I certainly want Kevin and Lanae to weigh in. I think Kevin is sharing slides now.

First of all, good afternoon, Commissioners. Thank you so much for having us. Again, my name is James Woodson. I am the policy and advocacy director for the Black Census and Redistricting Hub, joined by my colleague, Kevin Cosney, who leads our coalition building and community engagement, and Lanae Norwood, who leads our strategic communications work.

As you know, you know, we sent a few materials ahead
of our presentation, so there's an overview of the Black Census and Redistricting Hub, unique challenges that face black Californians. We also included a report from our 2018 census message testing program, which we will actually refer to. We wanted you all to be able to check that out as well, but we will do our best to not just regurgitate those documents.

There's really two things I think we wanted to hone in on today during our presentation, so that you might get some insight, and maybe have a slightly different framework to view redistricting. Those two things are process and coordination, and that's to say that, you know, in many ways, in setting up the Black Census and Redistricting Hub, we were in a similar position as you. You know, California Calls, which me and Kevin worked for, Lanae is a consultant for, has done, you know, years of experience with community organizing, base building, civic engagement, integrative voter engagement. But of course, census and redistricting comes around, you know, once every ten years, and so you know, this was new for a lot of us. And so we had to set up an infrastructure around census and redistricting to make sure that we were meeting community needs, capturing information from community, and then integrating that into our plans. So we think there's some overlap and
some similarities there.

You know, I think that we also are involved in a couple of other broader coalitions, one of which is doing unity mapping, so we also need to take into account other communities and their needs and their views, and so we're going to talk a little bit about what our process is to make sure that we are responsive to that.

And while we are certainly focused on our black communities, and ultimately will do advocacy on behalf of those communities, again, I think there's a certain piece of our work that has some synergy with what you all are doing. So Kevin will talk about that, Lanae will talk a little bit about that, and I'll sort of wrap up with some of our recommendations.

Next slide, please, Kevin.

You know, first -- and so this is just a map, really quickly, of our coalition, so you'll see that we're in a few different counties.

Kevin, if you can go back for me.

We are in a few different counties. We have some statewide partners who actually have chapters in certain counties that are not necessarily reflected in this map, right? So for instance, Black Women Organized for Political Action has chapters in Alameda, actually in San Joaquin. Same thing with -- California Black Women's
Health Project has some presence in Sacramento and other places across the state, ACCE as well. So just wanted to note that, but you do get a sense of sort of where our coalition lies.

Next slide, please.

I think the next slide we can kind of go through quickly. These are just sort of the components and strategic partnerships that we formed around some of this, particularly on our data analysis and technical expertise. We're partnering with UCLA Bunche Center, which is the African American studies program, and also UC Berkeley's Othering and Belonging Institute, to help us have a data-driven approach to our work.

Next slide, please.

Really quickly, I want to -- just sort of why we started the Black Census and Redistricting Hub. You can see here there are over three million African Americans in the State of California. California has the fifth-largest African American population of any state in the country. And so we knew, obviously, that that was a sizable, you know, share of the population, and wanted to make sure that there was a voice there.

We also know that African Americans have historically been a key part of the socioeconomic and political fabric of California, you know, from really
kind of even before the civil rights movement, certainly in the '60s around the civil rights movement, to the black power movement of the '70s, and getting into sort of a reconfiguration in the '90s, when we saw a lot of black men and black serving organizations rise and still exist today.

We also know that the African American community is diverse, full of parents, young people, seniors, people with disabilities, LGBTQ folks, upper, middle, lower class, and so again, we wanted to make sure that we were responsive to the diversity of black Californians. With that, we also know that there are challenges, and different challenges with each one of those different sort of populations.

We know that, across the board, right, that black folks in California are disproportionately impacted by issues facing California, things like education outcomes, discipline, internet access -- particularly with COVID, employment.

There's health disparities, which, again, we've seen during COVID, but there's also, you know, things that are specifically geared towards redistricting that we certainly wanted to bring to your attention, things like housing, right, that there's been gentrification and displacement that have pushed black folks out of the
traditional sort of urban hubs of Oakland, LA, and into, you know, emerging areas like the Inland Empire, like Contra Costa, San Joaquin, things like that.

So I want to just make sure that that's on your radar, that, you know, over the last ten years, we've certainly seen black folks sort of be dispersed based on where they were in 2010, and certainly want to account for that.

There's also been mass incarceration, again, black folks being disproportionately impacted by that, and so when you're thinking about prison gerrymandering, counting folks where they live instead of where they're housed in prison, that certainly has huge impacts for the black community.

There's immigrant and refugee communities. I know PANA appeared before you about a week ago, so I won't regurgitate what they said, but certainly support what they said, and just want to point out that, you know, while there's 150,000 black immigrants and refugees in California, that's who we can count, right? And we know that there's traditionally an undercount of that community, for a lot of different reasons, but I want to make the note that that population is probably more sizable than the data would show.

And then there's government distrust and lack of
confidence. You know, hearing other folks sort of appear before you and talk about how, for instance, health providers might be a trusted messenger, that may not be the case for certain groups within the black community, knowing that, you know, there's been testing that's been done on black folks. That might make them more -- or less trusting in institutions like that. Same thing just with government overall, right?

So one of the things that Lanae is going to talk about is just the nuances of dealing with these sort of, you know, different views and different perspectives that black folks will come to this work from.

So with all that as a backdrop, that's really sort of why we started the Black Census and Redistricting Hub, to be able to capture, again, the diversity, but also navigate the challenges that black folks face in California. With that, I do want to hand it over to my colleague, Kevin, to talk a little bit more about the process we use to ensure, again, that we're capturing that diversity and complexity of the black community.

MR. COSNEY: Awesome. Thank you, James.

I'll basically cover a little bit, again, about our structuring process, particularly as we're pivoting from census into redistricting. I think there are some (indiscernible), some lessons learned, but I think there
is a significantly different approach that we're taking
to census -- sorry, that we're taking to the
redistricting process, than we are with census.

I think primarily the difference between our
redistricting work from our census work really centers
around the quality over quantity, and the deep need for
early and deep engagement and coordination, and so
hopefully, there's a couple slides that I have here that
really emphasize how we're approaching that, and also
give a little bit of insight of what may be helpful for
the CRC to think about as groups are engaging in this
work on the ground.

So first and foremost, just to flag, again, some of
the key differences that we're seeing in regards to
census and redistricting and how we're approaching that.
So you know, clearly, the census was really about broad
outreach to individual community members. It was about
getting folks to complete the form, a pretty simple
nine-question form that was really just based on your own
personal information, about your household.

It was really about one -- our kind of engagement
with our organizations was really focused on one-to-one
engagement in support of coalitions -- coalition
partners, outreach work, to inform as many people as we
could about the census and why it's important to
participate. And lastly, stakeholders really had a shared and common goal to get everybody counted, right? And so I think that there were certainly people of unity and alignment in that process.

You know, when we're looking at redistricting, I think we are looking at a somewhat different -- again, it goes to the quality versus quantity, so I think we are looking at -- rather than broad mass engagement, I think we are going to be looking at, how do we go deep and engage our basic community members and stakeholders in this process, right?

We want them -- you know, again, compared to just kind of filling out a form, we want them to participate in community forums and conversations, participate in technical or legal processes. That's not informed just by individual kind of household, but we did want to be informed broadly by community. As such, we -- rather than, again, the kind of one-to-one, direct support of our groups, really wanting to bring together kind of regional coordination and alignment so we can really make sure that we're synthesizing community input into something that's really solid and that's well informed, not only by that analysis but by community input.

And lastly, there's certainly different interests amongst community partners. I think -- as well we know,
right? This is certainly a bit more political work. I think the varying interests of different communities are different compared to census, of, let's get us all counted. So I think that we are approaching this with collaboration and coordination in mind, but there's certainly a need for us to, early on, engage with our folk and engage with other partners, allies, and stakeholders, as James mentioned, in these kind of wide regional and statewide coalition spaces.

So again, a lot of the focus is about going deep, really guiding folks through a technical process, and really building regional alignment, and emphasizing collaboration, where possible. What that looks like for us in regards to processing and how we're really thinking about this, you know, I think we're -- I think the big piece that's in front of us is certainly the community of interest, data collection, and line drawing, and really making sure, again, that we have deep community input here, but again, wanting to make sure that there's a process that makes that manageable.

So we'll certainly be leveraging grassroots organizations, local trusted messengers, and technical experts like the folks from Bunche and UC Berkeley, to really inform this and to guide our communities through a process that can generate the best outcomes.
I think we'll certainly, as James mentioned, be utilizing that analysis, as well as community input that we learn from our communities, to drive this process, and I think, for us, we'll be leading by providing templates, training, mapping skills, technical support to our folk on the ground, so again, they have a way to navigate. Again, this is a very kind of technical process.

I think, secondly, we're really looking at regional help structures. So again, as James mentioned, we have thirty-five partners across the state, some of them with various different chapters and affiliates across the state. And so we know that, rather than working with each one of those groups individually and developing a COI, and details and lines, that I think we'd be better off to coordinate across regions, and synthesize, and submit a kind of collectivized community input. So that way we're not submitting 1,000 maps that represent, you know, every individual that we've spoken to, but really that we can, again, funnel that insight from 1,000 different people into a set of a few maps that can be more manageable, but really hold a lot of weight and be solid in regards to how communities are seeing those pieces.

And so then, lastly, I think broad statewide or regional coordination, again, with regional stakeholders,
and making sure that, even outside of the black community, that we're in coordination with other folk. And then, as James mentioned, participation and coordination in some of these other statewide redistricting spaces.

Again, I still need to say that this is our thinking in how we're working to engage our coalition to really get good quality level of input. That also is from a whole lot of different individuals in the community, but it's somewhat consolidated, and also thinking about process, and the level of coordination and conversation that has to happen on the ground before we're getting ready and in a position to present.

So I think there's certainly some things to think about in regards to process, as well as the timing, and how the CRC is preparing organizations on the ground to facilitate these conversations with our partners, that can give you the best information to work with and inform your work.

With that said, I'm going to stop here and pass to Lanae to talk a little bit more about our approach to identifying the nuanced needs and strategies in engaging our black and African American communities.

Lanae.

MS. NORWOOD: Thanks, Kevin.
Pleasure to be with you all this evening and talk more in depth about our communication strategy with the California Black Census and Redistricting Hub. First of all, we approached our work with a baseline, a fundamental baseline, that black communities are not monolithic. This baseline is informed by decades of experience in civic engagement work led by California Calls and our strategic partners.

Black communities are really rich in diversity, from faith-based communities, black immigrants. We have justice-impacted individuals, community members who are college-educated, blue-collar. We have a houseless community, LGBTQ+ community, different household makeups, and multigenerational representation, wealthy, and impoverished. Black communities are diverse, rich, and definitely deserve to be celebrated for their unique representation in California.

So we committed very early on to create a campaign that reached into the households and hearts of black Californians. We realize that the census is not sexy. It was not something that was easy to get people excited about, but it literally shapes the way our communities look over the next ten years, and even beyond.

So we needed to create a way to develop content, messaging, and communications vehicles that really
shifted people's perceptions and engagement level about the importance of the 2020 census. And we did that, really literally by creating a campaign that celebrated the diversity of black communities.

When we began this project, though, we really started with a comprehensive analysis of data. That data was aggregated from multiple sources, and really started with the largest survey of black residents in California relative to the census, the 2020 census. That was the African American Civic Engagement Project, fielded by California Calls and led by Kevin and James on this call, and in that, we deployed -- they deployed, excuse me -- a very comprehensive strategy that canvassed black households throughout the State of California, led by our coalition, to really assess and gather information about their attitudes and intent with the 2020 census. And that was a collection of over 11,000 black residents.

We also assessed and evaluated several other pieces of data, message testing, focus groups, surveys, Census Bureau information and data, but in terms of sample size, the African American Civic Engagement Project was the largest sample of information collected on black residents in California. If you're in communications or any research work, you know sample sizes are significantly smaller. They're usually not into the
thousands for black residents in California. So this was very insightful information that helped us understand, you know, how we needed to approach this work, and really think through all of the different vehicles, and the multimedia approach we needed to take with our census outreach.

So a couple of top lines. You guys have that document that James has forwarded ahead of, you know, a summary of that survey, but we saw a difference in, you know, accessibility, where people had internet access, and some folks didn't, people being comfortable with using the internet to respond to the census.

And this 2020 census being the first to be delivered online, that was clearly a point that we needed to drive in, that, hey, there's multiple ways to take the census. So pivoting from data, and taking the findings from that data, and then incorporating into our strategy, we developed a very robust process that turned out to be pretty successful.

Also, you know, they fielded information to see, you know, who were the trusted messengers, who were the people that black residents were going to be most receptive to receive their census information from, and like the MENA and Latinx and other communities, government mistrust was very high in 2018. So imagine
now, even in the post-2020 election and the things that have happened, you know, since the pandemic and with our current administration, government mistrust is even higher now in black communities.

So those were some of the findings that just reinforced some of the things we already knew intuitively, things that have been consistently reflected in data and research, and that, again, informed our strategy. And also, the California Black Census and Redistricting Hub developed a proprietary index called the Hard-To-Count Index. That was an aggregate of data from the Department of Justice, the Million Hoods Project, the United States Census Bureau that really helped inform and prioritize our targeting, our approach, and our segmentation relative to our census outreach work.

So overall, our communications strategy was data-driven and informed, diverse and inclusive, positive, informative, and implemented, most importantly, by trusted messengers representing our coalition of over thirty black-led and black-serving organizations.

Those are a couple of top lines, and happy to dig in deeper and answer questions. With that being said, I'm happy to pass it back to my colleague, James Woodson, to conclude our presentation.
MR. WOODSON: Thanks, Lanae. Yes.

I certainly want to get to your questions. I think we wanted to just quickly go over our recommendations based on all of that.

Kevin, if you can go up to the next slide.

One is to really hone in on what Kevin mentioned, right, that redistricting is inherently rooted in community. You are asking people to talk about their community, to identify what their community is, and it's hard to do that when you're just doing that by yourself, right? This is not like census, where I know who's in my household, and I'm going to respond to this form. This requires people to be in community, in communication, in coordination.

So I want to make sure that, you know, as you all are thinking through metrics, that you take that into account, that, you know, one person, for instance, coming before you actually might have been part of a process that involved, you know, hundreds or thousands of people. And so it's important to make sure that you all understand how folks are doing this work, and how, you know, community residents are going to lift up their communities of interest and their district (indiscernible) in that framework.

The second thing that we had was just to be clear on
roles, right? Lanae just mentioned all of this sort of
nuance, and all of the thinking and years of experience
that go into being able to read communities,
particularly, you know, when you think about a diverse
community like black communities in California. And so
you know, your role is not necessarily to try to
regurgitate that process. Part of it is setting up a
system, right, where the folks that have done that work
are able to then give you information, and make that
accessible for the people that they work with, right?

So part of that, you know, part of helping us do our
job, is for you all to be clear with us on, like, what
are you actually looking for, helping us and empowering
us to then gather that information from our partners, and
then, you know, we will be able to work to make sure that
our partners are getting in front of you to lift up, you
know, what their communities look like and what,
ultimately, they think district lines should look like.

The third thing I'll say -- Kevin, if you could go
to the next slide -- is just to think about accessibility
for key constituents. You know, again, Lanae talked
about the diversity of the black community. We listed
four communities in particular within that group to think
about.

The one is, I guess, both currently and formerly
incarcerated residents, right, that if you're going to, for instance, count folks where they typically live, and not where they're currently being housed, they should also have a say in what that community will look like when they get back to that community, right? So think about ways that you're actually capturing what folks think about their communities of interest even though they might be currently incarcerated, right?

Secondly is houseless individuals, when they talk about internet access, right? We know that that's an issue. You know, we also know, you know, that the community of interest tool may not work well with, like, mobile devices, right, that the homeless folk may have mobile devices, but thinking about how they navigate, you know, giving you all input, thinking about how they watch these hearings and these meetings, I think, is going to be important.

We talked about faith communities. Those are huge in the black community, so thinking about how you can engage there. And again, African immigrants and refugees, everything that PANA mentioned last week, I think, is important as you all are thinking through this.

We also have some specific recommendations that we won't go into now, because we do want to get to you all's questions. I think the only one that I'll lift up --
Kevin, if you can go to the next slide -- is the importance of field testing new technologies.

You know, we worked with Census PDI, which was a tool to do outreach through census, and you know, certainly, I think our ability to really sort of early test that helped to develop it, so that other partners could then use it when it came time for them to do their outreach. And we were able to sort of, you know, work out kinks and bugs in it. So it's always important to make sure that any sort of new technologies that you're releasing are being field tested with the folk that are going to ultimately use it.

So I'll stop there. I'm happy to take questions, and apologies if we ran over.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Great. Thank you, James, and Kevin, and Lanae.

Commissioners, floor is open. Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you to both Nahla, James, Kevin, and Lanae for a fabulous presentation that was so informative. I have a couple questions, and I'm not sure if you want me to just ask them all at once or go one at a time, and so let me just -- okay.

So let me just ask at least -- the first question I have is, both of you mentioned training, and that was
interesting, and perhaps I could have you each -- if you
would -- you know, each of your -- from an organization's
point of view, you can talk about the kind of training.
Are you thinking about that the Commission would provide
training, and can you elaborate a little bit more on
that?

Also, I think it was either Kevin or Lanae talked
about, one, collectivized community input. I just want
to say that I think, from a Commission point of view, I
mean, part of our conversations has been about we want to
get as many, you know, individual inputs from different
people.

I hear what you're saying about being able to also
you know, be able to gather collective inputs, so that
then there's some heft behind it, I guess, in terms of
saying, this is what -- you know, as a broader community,
this is what we're also you know, wanting to see. I
think it would be interesting to hear a little bit more
of that, given, also I think, what we also have been
talking about, about trying to increase the individual
inputs.

And then the last thing was about -- it was
interesting that in the messaging part, Lanae talked
about that -- I thought it was interesting that forty-
eight percent of those that were surveyed preferred the
paper over the online forms, and that just struck me
because, you know, we've been spending a lot of time
talking about technology, and I'm wondering if we're
overthinking things, and if we need to also be thinking
about more old-fashioned methods of just plain old paper
to, you know, find ways to solicit input, or make it
easier for people to give input.

I wonder, you know, is this not only for the black
African American community, but Nahla, would you say that
this is also true for the MENA community as well, too?
Because, obviously, we heard from last week, too, that,
also -- and I know that this is probably similar in the
Asian and Latino communities as well, too, that the rates
of literacy are going to be different. So using
technology, even just pen and paper, may be different,
and so I think that would be interesting to hear.

So sorry. Those are my three big buckets, so I'll
just stop there.

MR. WOODSON: I'm happy to take on, maybe, some of
these questions first. You know, in regards to
training -- and we'd love to see if Lanae or Kevin have
thoughts on this -- but you know, I think that there are
community groups who are ultimately either going to do
train the trainers, or going to do training directly with
community residents, right?
So I think that goes back to what we were saying about clarifying roles, right, to make sure that there's not duplication of efforts. And I think, you know, again, what I'll say is that I think it's important for the Commission to just be clear about mechanism, and be clear about what type of information would help you all then, right, draw the lines, because then we can hear that, and then go and get that information for you, right?

But if we are sort of stuck in a place where we're not clear on that, I think that, you know, our time -- you know, we're only going to get a certain amount of time, face-to-face time, with community residents, and you know, we may not be able to get them back, right? So ultimately, it'll be important for us to go into that training that we do clear with folks, and being able to design what our training program looks like to make sure that we're getting at what you're looking for.

You know, I think that maybe there's some correlation there between -- also to the point you brought up, Commissioner Akutagawa, about collectivized sort of community input. You know, I would say that I think it's important to think about to what end you're looking for individual, you know, quantities of input.

You know, ultimately, I think what we were trying to
get at in our comments was that that actually may not be
the process that's happening on the ground, right? And
so what happens if you don't get back sort of what you're
looking for? The question would be, are we successful or
not? And I think -- I'm wondering if there's, you know,
a way to think about it where, really, the question is,
are we hearing from the communities that we need to hear
it at, right?

One of the things you'll see in our specific
recommendations is to think about the sectors that the
census office used, where they had regional, you know,
sort of breakdowns, and wanted to make sure that they
were covering geographical breakdowns, but they also had
sectors, so you know, labor, right, faith-based. And I
think the question is, are we hearing back in particular
regions from those communities that regarding those
different sectors, as opposed to, are we just getting
enough, you know, individual responses?

Maybe I'll leave it there, and let other folks jump
in.

MS. NORWOOD: I can address the question in terms of
accessibility with the juxtaposition of paper to
technology, right? A best practice, really, when it
comes to access and how to collect information, feedback,
participation is really the approach of, like, doing it
all, right?

I know that may seem a little heavy, a little cumbersome, but one thing that we were up against in the census is that some of the operations were being scaled back because there was a belief that if we created accessibility on line, that more people would be apt to respond on line, so we could peel back less in the field and the canvassing efforts, and that actually proved to be quite counterproductive.

So in terms of a recommendation and feedback around accessibility in applications, technologies, web interfaces, paper, phone, I would say definitely lean in on all of them and develop a robust communications strategy and vehicle to collect information and feedback wherever folks are providing it. I think the mantra should be convenience, and that is really, you know, how you can ensure that you're creating that accessibility for every people, all people, all walks of life.

MR. COSNEY: I don't want to take up too much of this, but maybe one or two more comments here, that (indiscernible) with what James listed here. I think that certainly, in regards to training pieces, I think our focus will be on the political ed piece, and facilitation, training of trainers, and the technical pieces. So again, I think, to James's point, for you
all, again, that early guidance on what's needed, you
know, how do we help folk navigate the technical pieces,
what should they do to (indiscernible) out, I think, will
be really helpful.

I think my response to the kind of collectivizing
community input and the paper versus online, kind of
speak towards the same thing. I think when we were
thinking about this, we were thinking, you know, some of
our groups have, you know, a base of hundreds of people.
What is it going to take to get hundreds of people to
take the Statewide Database tool and figure out how to do
GIS mapping by themselves, right? I don't know if any of
us want to embark upon that journey.

What we do think is reasonable is that community
organizers can certainly convene, you know, hundreds of
people or a few sessions with tens of people, facilitate
a community conversation where we're getting input,
synthesize that, and then submit that into a tool, where
we can train up a cadre of folk who know how to utilize
that tool, and then can facilitate conversations that
help drive that input, right?

So part of it is just, you know, how do we get folk
to use a deep and technical tool and probably a deep and
technical process? But I think our groups could take a
paper form and then synthesize that, incorporate that
into feedback.

So I think, for us, that's a way of getting over some of those technical hurdles, and being able to have regional point people who can really do that technical piece, and really it's just about community. We just need you to show up and talk about where you live, right?

The last thing that I'll say to that is that I think that, as we've been talking to folk at Statewide Database and others, just talking about these COI tools, I think that it's important, you know -- and I certainly respect, like, the idea of, like, we want as much input as possible, right? I like that because certainly you don't have to, and I'd certainly be opposed to -- we don't want that much input, right?

So I want to be clear about that, but again, I think it is about what's useful to you all. Do you want, like, 1,000 maps that just have one street difference, and you have to figure out, like, where does the street go? Or is there some way that we can help do that thinking and again, synthesize, you know, ideas from 1,000 people?

I think the idea that we've been pushing on the COI side, the tool side, is that, are there ways for us to indicate that this COI input or this community map is based on a conversation with fifty people or a hundred people, or just one person with some ideas? And I think
that would be really worthwhile capturing, so you're not
missing out on the quantity, but you're maybe actually
saving yourselves some time in having to consolidate that
quantity into something that's meaningful.

So I think that if there's ways for you to say --
for us to indicate, here's one COI, here's one COI, but
this is informed by, you know, hundreds of people. With
that said, I'll step back. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Nahla.

MS. KAYALI: Sorry. I was muted. We would love to
see training coming from Commissions, maybe one page of
information to be translated into different languages,
for the different MENA community can be able to
understand in their own language, to educate them about
the redistricting, and where they can see themselves are
included. Once they see the language, they feel like
they are included, and they're not excluded, and we can
be able to be a support for that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you all for your input.

It's all really helpful. I've spoken a little bit with
James about some of this. We're still in the process of,
you know, kind of figuring out, you know, who's on first,
who's on second, who's on third, and all those different
pieces.

I understand what you're saying about clarity, and I'll be honest. I have asked to understand what everybody is doing. So I did ask California Philanthropy for their -- kind of what have they funded, in detail, and basically they said, these are the people we funded. And I said, but what are they doing? And they said, one of these activities.

And so we really -- for us to be able to fill in the -- you know, to fill -- we need better communication between both. It can't be just, let us guess what's already out there, but we do need to know what's already been funded, what plan is already happening, and so we can know how to take place.

I also think that, at some point, it might be -- or this might be the time to have this conversation more deeply about unity mapping, and what are the pros and cons about unity mapping, because I really liked how you -- Kevin, when you were doing your presentation, I was like, oh, heck, no. And then, when you explained it, I was like, okay, I can lean into this a little bit more.

But there is a fear at the local level, and I'll be honest, because I've been talking to the local groups, that the bigger groups, the collaboratives and all that, translate things for them, and their voice is actually
lost, that other groups, you know, know more than they
do. I have a hard time with this. I keep hearing, oh,
redistricting is so much more difficult than the census.
I've got to be honest. Talking about your community is
not difficult for people, and we don't always have to put
it in a map.

We're looking at all these different ways to
actually get input, and so I feel like we set ourselves
up to fail when we're constantly saying this is
difficult, versus -- I was just talking to a woman who
works with farmworkers, and she said, you know, we tested
this whole idea of, can you tell us your community? And
with farmworkers, they had no -- they were very excited
to talk about their community. They learned some things
about it. They weren't even knowing if they were going
to do redistricting, but she said it wasn't a foreign
concept to talk about what is your community, and you
know, what are the lines?

So I want us to see if we can change the narrative a
little bit, and move away from, you have to be a
demographer; you have to understand this, to you are the
expert of your community, and we want to hear from your
community.

So the unity mapping, I like -- you know, we've
heard this several times, and here at the Commission,
we've discussed it as well, is, it's COVID now, so how do we think differently? And as you all are having meetings with community groups, and kind of facilitating the discussions and learning, you know, what they would like to see in a map, please consider inviting a Commissioner or two to listen as well, so that we don't have to figure out how to translate when you submit a COI and say there's fifty, but one of us would be able to say, yeah, I was at that meeting, you know, that's accurate, or, you know -- but do think of us as partners in this, and let us hear, so that we can be the voice, also when -- if you're not in the room.

So hopefully -- I think my only big question on this was -- two. One is, you know, is that a possibility, to invite us, because we have been thinking about how do we do different ways than the traditional meetings, and second, on the unity mapping, the pros and cons.

MR. WOODSON: Maybe I'll take on the second piece. One, I think it's important to really get a full sense of the landscape, right? So certainly there are, I think, maybe three or four groups in particular that are going to be involved in a unity mapping process, that I know of, but there's also other coalitions that are also going to be doing redistricting, questions on whether they will actually do sort of unity mapping and sort of that whole
process, but certainly folks are going to be doing technical assistance, community engagement, and things like that. And there will be coordination and communication even outside of the unity mapping space, where I think you can capture, you know, folks who may feel sort of left out of that process and things like that.

So we certainly encourage, for instance, to talk to Advancement Project about their coalition, which we were also a part of. And that's part of the idea, right, is that we don't want to be disconnected from what everybody else is doing, right? So we are already starting to have conversations with regional tables that are going to be doing this work, and other sort of community partners. So I know, for instance, for us, at least, it's important for us to make sure that we're including that in what we're lifting.

I guess the other point I'll just make is that I hope that we were not giving the impression that we thought that redistricting was too difficult for folks to understand. I do think, you know, the point that Kevin was making was that there's a technical piece, right, that requires a specific skillset, but certainly I think we -- and this is why we have this broad coalition, because we think that, you know, we need to be hearing
back from the people who know their community best.

So I certainly agree with you that the folks on the ground are the experts, and they can talk about their communities of interest, you know, freely, and are more than capable of doing that.

MR. COSNEY: The one other thing I would say is that I think there are certainly concerns around folks' voices getting lost, and I think that's certainly one of the reasons that some of these other statewide spaces have formed, to make sure that there's new skills being developed so folks can participate in different capacities in this work, and I think part of our structuring around regional structures, and making sure that we have go-betweens that we can, you know, get input from, but then, as we're having conversation with these other spaces, be able to kind of go back and forth, and make sure that it's still kind of run along throughout that process.

I think it will be a difficult thing to navigate. Again, there's lots of moving pieces and a lot of back and forth, but I think that also kind of speaks to the need for time and early coordination.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thanks, Kevin.

I have Commissioner Yee, then Commissioner Le Mons, and Commissioner Turner.
COMMISSIONER YEE: I'm sure Commissioner Turner was before me.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Turner.

COMMISSIONER TURNER: Thank you, Commissioner Yee.

I appreciate that. Yes.

Nahla and James, Kevin, and Lanae, thank you so much for your presentation today. It's been very important, critical information for us to receive.

And Kevin, one of the questions I was going to go to as far as collapsing the information -- thank you for taking the time and speaking about that, and I think, as a Commission, we'll still need to talk some more about that, weighing in the different approaches to make that happen and ensure that, if we take advantage of your kind of streamlining, or making sure that we're not just looking at more maps, one street difference, that we are fully aware of how much input went into that decision.

So I love all of that. I thank you.

Now, with the difficulty conversation, I come from a different perspective. I do think there is concern about difficulty, not because people don't want to talk about their community. I think, once they go through that door, I think people are all in, ready to talk about it.

However, that door that's marked "Redistricting", right, that's marked, you know, "Community Input Tools", ...
whatever the case may be, "Communities of Interest", that's where people, I think, will have to have the patience, the tolerance, the ability for all of those reasons that you named, why people can't necessarily have the luxury of just focusing on one more thing. I think that's going to be the major barrier, and so I'm really interested.

I think it might have been Lanie. You were talking during part of the presentation, or in your presentation overall, and Nahla, you can speak to this, too. We've talked about targeted strategies. And I know, with the coalition that you have -- I'm familiar with it -- I know that you've done lots of research, et cetera, and you outlined targeted strategies as it relates to those that were still incarcerated, those that are, you know, are houseless, are faith-based, all of those things.

If you already have targeted strategies that's differentiated for these particular target groups, it would be helpful for us to hear, to receive, when we engage this population, this is how we engaged them, so from an education standpoint, when we go out with coms and what have you, that we're not hitting and missing. We can learn from what has already been determined and has already been researched.

So that's the piece that I wanted to lift up for
Lanae and for (audio interference) and for the Black Census Citizens' Hub (sic), you know. So if we can receive information like that, yes, we want to train, but we're also looking for your groups, the previous groups that has presented before. If you found the magic, you know, bean that's going to get us to grow the giant tree or whatever it is, go ahead and tell us that up front, this is how we engage with this population, so that we can tap into that at the outset. Thank you.

MS. NORWOOD: Yes. Thank you for that.

MS. KAYALI: I can answer. The thing is, when I first started Access California Services, the community, they did not come forward to receive services, because of the culture barrier and the language barrier, but throughout twenty-two years, we learned that we need to meet each client where they are. We cannot generalize everything, like, this will work with this client, but that doesn't work with this client.

So we need to meet the clients where they are, in the culture, in the language, in the education, and especially we have the mental health department. It's a barrier. There's a stigma for services. So the thing is, we were very smart in doing that, where we can meet them where they are, in their own language and their own culture. We have sixteen languages here at Access
California this year. It's very important for them to feel empowered, and we speak their language.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Lanae.

MS. NORWOOD: Yeah, I think we want to just double-click on what Nahla said, 100 percent agree. You have to meet folks where they are. I really appreciate you raising that, Ms. Turner. You know, it's critical to successful outreach work.

There are so many generalizations that are, you know, perceived and approached with communities of color that really need to be disaggregated and dissected and segmented, because we all represent a wide variety of walks of life, and that is represented in the communities in which we live. So like the MENA community, the Latinx community, the AAPI community, we are not monolithic. There are different education levels, there are different socioeconomic factors, and experiences that shape how we are civically engaged and participate in these processes.

So happy to share and serve as a resource specifically for the African American community. We have been building on this work for many years, and have done multiple rounds of testing, survey, research, data, focus groups, targeting, both paid, organic, earned media, different multimedia facets that really speak to all black communities in California. So we'd be happy to
lend ourselves as a resource, alongside Nahla and other partners, to make sure that we are really being inclusive.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Beautiful.

MS. KAYALI: Great. And the thing is, when we start the conversation with the client, it's always we try to connect with them before we ask them, how can we help you, connect with them in the same culture, like, how long have you been here? And you have your family? And open a conversation, personal conversation, before we can start.

We try to gain their trust before we start helping them, so the help will be easier, and later on, within fifteen, twenty minutes, they'll put everything on the table for you, but the first two, three minutes to break the ice and build the relationship.

MS. NORWOOD: I want to double-click on what Nahla said. That's why it's critical. That's why our work was informed by a coalition of trusted messengers. That relationship has to be there. The trust has to be there. We're dealing with the reality in communities of color that government distrust is real.

So Nahla, you're absolutely right. You know, building relationship, building rapport, before even trying to collect information, is also a critical piece
in the process.

MS. KAYALI: Every year, we serve more than between 10,000 to 12,000 clients, and sometimes they see me in the parking lot and they say, do you remember me? I say, of course I remember you, and to be honest with you, I can't remember 12,000 people, right? I say, of course I remember you. Of course, yes. And this is how you build. I never say, no, I don't remember you. Of course I remember you. But that, building the relationship -- and the staff here at Access, sometimes they laugh. They say, do you remember them? I say, of course. They came to Access before.


MR. COSNEY: Thank you. Thank you.

You know, certainly I agree with all that's been said here, and I think that's why our approach, particularly in the selection of our organizations, really focused on trusted organizations and messengers. I think we talked about the geographic diversity, which is certainly informed by where we know black communities are, but I think, if you look at the selection of the groups, we really wanted to also make sure that there was a kind of wide array of different interests that each group was involved in, so again, we could kind of speak to those nuances and the diversity within the black
community.

So you know, when we're thinking about engaging Justice Impact folk, right, currently and formerly incarcerated folk, we're leveraging organizations across the state that directly deal -- are led by formerly incarcerated folk that are providing housing, reentry services for incarcerated -- for reentering folk, and a number of those organizations have been engaged in what we call inreach, when they're going in and registering eligible voters in county jails, and doing some education to turn them out to vote. So I think certainly models like that, where folk already have access to jails or prison sites for their program delivery, could certainly be useful in engaging those communities.

Similarly, right, we wanted to make sure that we were counting black folks who were impacted by the housing crisis, homelessness, and gentrification, so certainly we're partnering with groups like LACAN, who are housed in skid row, who are, again, ran by folk who have been impacted by housing, and have real, deep relationships, you know, with the folk in skid row and others, right, because certainly we know that -- and skid row is not the home of houselessness in LA or for the state, but again, it speaks to their ability to navigate those communities, find intuitive ways to engage folk.
You know, COVID kind of blew everything open, where we wanted to have robust street outreach to certain encampments. That kind of fell through, but because, again, our folk were on the ground, directly dealing with those communities, they were already pivoting for mutual aid, and then were incorporating census outreach and engagement in the mutual aid pieces. So I think similar pieces could continue to play out in dealing with groups that are dealing with houselessness, dealing with housing advocacy, could play a direct role in engaging folk.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you, Kevin.

So I have Commissioner Yee, then Commissioner Le Mons, and Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER YEE: So thank you for these presentations, and these organizations, on all the wonderful work you're doing. We're so fortunate to have you helping us in our work.

I have a question for the Hub, and I have to phrase this a little bit strangely to stay within the agenda item as announced. Since the 2010 Commission looked at LA specifically with a question of whether to create an African American VRA district, and you know, a lot of discussion, a lot of back and forth, ultimately, the decision was not to, and all the reasons for that are in the final report for 2010.
I'm wondering if that decision is still in the air, and if it is, whether the sense is that there was adequate access to the process from the community, that the ultimate decision was adequately informed by the access that was given in that process.

MR. WOODSON: Yeah, I'll certainly take this one. I think it's a little early for us to answer that question, right? I think that, you know, again, we are trying to take a very sort of data-driven approach. We don't know, right, what census data is going to look like, and how accurate it's going to be.

We certainly, you know, have concerns about, you know, just the Census Bureau's sort of approaches to counting folks, particularly once COVID hit, and think that that's going to have an impact on what we see, but it's certainly early for that, and I think we want to do some more analysis before we sort of start deciding on things like that. So happy to come back and speak more about that in a few months, once we have a better sense of kind of what we're dealing with.

COMMISSIONER YEE: So the current census, yes, but I'm wondering, you know, ten years ago, the decisions that were made then.


Yeah. You know, I don't know that we can necessarily
speak to that. I mean, certainly that's something that we're going to be looking at.

Again, you know, we have our demography team that's made up of UCLA Bunche and UC Berkeley Othering and Belonging Institute, that are going to be doing some of those data analysis pieces. We certainly are not going to try to relitigate the past. I think we, again, want to look at what currently is happening.

I think, you know, we raised some of the factors that I think we've seen over the last ten years, and so I would question if that's even something that we're looking at, right? I think we may be looking at some other kind of scenario. But again, we want to do a little bit more data analysis going into that, and certainly wouldn't want to comment on the past, but I think we want to look to what's happening this year.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Le Mons.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: I want to just thank you all for the presentation. I think the takeaway for me was the distinction that you made between the objective and goal of the census, versus the Commission. I think that was a salient point, and I don't think it can be emphasized enough, and I think where the complexity that you spoke to comes in is absolutely accurate, and I think our earlier this morning presenter spoke to a very
similar distinction between what they were charged with, what their message was, which was a simpler message than our message.

So I think that can't be overemphasized, quite frankly, and I think part of what we're going to need to do is to hone in on our goals and our objectives, so that we know exactly what we want. Yes, we want to hear from as many voices, but we want something a little bit more specific than that, and I think that specificity is yet to be defined. And so I think that this presentation is excellent, coupled with all the other presentations that we've received as well, in shaping how we should be looking at our work.

A lot of my comments are more for my fellow Commissioners post-this. I don't have, really, a question. I just wanted to acknowledge those points and lift those up, and I wanted to thank you. And then I also wanted to say that, you know, we're looking forward to working with all of the different groups that have come to us, and what I don't think we are trying to do, and if we are, we shouldn't be trying to do -- we can't, in the period of time that we have, replicate all of the efforts that all of the community organizations and groups at the regional level, local level, state level have been doing over the years. It will be -- and what I
hope my fellow Commissioners are hearing is it will behoove us to establish a framework and a system that these groups can easily plug into, and then we can use the resources that we have to help support that.

This is not like the Commission is about to run out and do all of this. It is no way it is conceivably possible. So I hope that, in some ways, these presentations have been sobering for some of my fellow Commissioners, and help to inform our approach as we get into our conversation. In all fairness, we haven't really had our outreach conversation yet, so all of this has been very helpful in preparing us for those outreach conversations that are to be coming up in our next meeting and beyond. So thanks again for your contribution.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Akutagawa.

COMMISSIONER AKUTAGAWA: Thank you so much, Chair, and I just want to build upon what Commissioner Le Mons said. I thought, wow, this is a perfect segue going to the question that I've been wanting to ask. And I just want to also acknowledge that this is, I think, going to really build into the work that Commissioners Sinay and Vazquez are also doing.

So with that said, one of the things that I feel like I've heard throughout all of the presentations that
we've had from the groups is this idea of the trusted,
you know, the trusted relationships and representatives
that all of the presenters and the organizations that --
at some of the organizations, because they're
collectives, that they represent.

So with that in mind, I think one of the things that
we have not really fully talked about, but I want to
bring this up now -- because I think we've had enough
presentations, but also I think both Nahla and James,
Kevin, and Lanae, you kind of alluded to it a little bit,
and that's this idea of -- I think I'd be interested
in -- and Commissioners Sinay and Vazquez, I'm going to
say, you know, please let me know if this is on your
agenda, so maybe this may not be -- this may be
premature, but I'm kind of thinking about, how can we
best work with the various community-based organizations
in directing the resources that we have through the
organizations, in a way that doesn't put us in this kind
of role of trying to do the work with all of you, when
you all are the experts?

And I'm also mindful of a comment that we heard -- I
think it was this morning or it was yesterday -- you
know, from a commenter, Lori Shellenberger, who did say
that having the Commission directly involved in it,
versus having a third party direct the resources, you
know, kind of puts us into a different place, and may not be in our best interests as a Commission, to, you know, not only grant out all the money, but to manage, you know, what is going to be done with it, and what we expect.

I think there's a little bit of that from what you were saying, James, you know, about being clear about what we want, but at the same time, I am also conscious that I don't know if we want to be able to, you know, manage, like, a bunch of different organizations ourselves. So I'd be interested to hear from both Nahla and James, Kevin, and Lanae your perspectives on this question about, you know, what we should be thinking.

What would be your comments or perspectives on, you know, what is the best ways that we can work with your organizations -- or perhaps, you know, is there, you know, a bigger, even, entity that we grant through, and then they regrant through all of you? Sorry. That was kind of a longwinded way to get to that last question.

MS. KAYALI: I really like the way you did phrase it, of how you're going to be able to work with us, and it would be great if you can be able to develop, maybe, a Survey Monkey, or where we can answer and put our thoughts of how we can be able to help you, and then you can gather that information to see how you can be able to
work with us, and what are you looking for, and we can
guide you.

   We can meet halfway. We can, you know, collaborate.
We can start talking, start the conversation, and once
you start the conversation with us, we can come up with a
strategy together of how you can be able to help with
that.

MR. WOODSON: Let me just say quickly -- I will
mention three things in particular. One, granting, and
making those sort of decisions, is complex work, right?
And I think that goes back to, you know, the point I made
about roles, right, that we need you all to be clear on
what you're looking for, and as much time as you can
spend sort of doing that for us, I think, would be
helpful, and if there is a sort of third party there that
can take this sort of granting on, and reviewing
applications, and things like that, certainly we would
welcome that.

   Two other quick things I'll mention is that, you
know, one, I think it puts you all in a position where
you may be granting to certain groups over other groups,
and might, you know, cause conflicts there, but it
also -- you know, there's a thing about us as well,
right? Like, if we are a grantee, we have to be able to
look our constituents and the communities that we're
working with in the eye, and be able to say, we are
looking out for your best interests, not necessarily the
Commission's, right?

Our job is to advocate to you. Your job is to sort
of listen to what, you know, we bring you, and then make
decisions from that. But I think it may put us in a
weird position, as community groups, to say that we've
taken, you know, funding directly from the Commission, as
we're doing advocacy as well, right? So I wanted to also
just kind of lay that out.

That's actually one of our recommendations. I think
it's the first specific recommendation in our slide, is
we would recommend, you know, going through a third
party, and I think that you can put parameters on how
that grant money is used, right? You're looking to get
to specific types of groups. There's ways that you can
work with that third party to make sure that that
happens.

MS. KAYALI: To be honest with you, when I first
received the email from Linda, I was very honored. I was
very happy that, oh, we are included. Oh, they think
about us. And that's a great approach, and to start the
dialogue, it will be great, and we can always come up
with a great strategy. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Next, Commissioner Sadhwani,
and then Commissioner Sinay, and Commissioner Le Mons.

COMMISSIONER SADHWANI: My question itself was really around unity maps, and it was really already covered, but I did just want to say thank you for coming and presenting. This was awesome. Unfortunately, I missed the first part, so I will be sure to go back and watch the videorecording of it.

Just a couple thoughts. I loved, loved, loved, loved that you all uplifted the geographic dispersement, particularly within the black community, that has occurred over the last ten years. I think that's really crucial, and will be extraordinarily important as we move forward.

I am really excited to take a closer look at the document that you all provided about the survey. When Lanae was talking about survey sample, I was like, oh, you're speaking my language. This is great. And certainly, I know -- I heard you say many times, the black community is not a monolith, and I was like, oh, yeah, I've written about this at length in much of my research about BIPOC communities in general. So you know, yes, right on.

I think the one piece, however -- and this is just a comment, and feel free to respond if you'd like -- when it comes to VRA compliance, right, the piece around
racially polarized voting is actually looking for the opposite, right, so in what ways is the community similar in voting patterns?

So I would offer that as, hopefully, a helpful reminder that, as we explore all of the diversity within so many different communities, that we're also continuing to think about the ways in which communities continue to be similar, particularly as it relates to vote dilution and the need to continue to think about VRA compliance.

So you know, I just kind of put that out there. That is certainly something that I spend a lot of time thinking about, and we certainly look forward to the partnership with your organizations as we move forward. You know, I think that there's much for the Commission to figure out and decide in terms of granting and external organizations and all, but we certainly look forward to that partnership. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. It is my unfortunate duty at this point to say we have a required break. It's been an hour and a half since we came back. So my question to the Commissioners, do you want to come back and continue the discussion after the break, and go ahead with public comment after that? If so, are our presenters are willing to stick with us and come back after the fifteen-minute break?
VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Commissioner Kennedy, I can withdraw my question -- my comment, actually. I'll withdraw my comment.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: My comment's really quick, if it's helpful.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Kristian, are we able to go just a few more minutes?

MR. MANOFF: Certainly, Chair. I think, if you wanted to conclude comments and do public comment, just to wrap it up, the team will stick with you for that.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Thank you so much.

Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I know that there's been some confusion, especially in the community, about our goals, and we did meet -- you know, one of the things we did do as a Commission was kind of look at our outreach goals, and we created -- you know, that was the day we did the mural. We had fun. It was the virtual whiteboard.

We are looking -- it feels like I've heard a couple of times from community members saying, don't get stuck on the number. Make sure that you're looking at it broader. And we did -- and when we created -- when we looked at it, we did say, you know, .01 percent, you know, or 1 out of 1,000 people we'll be able to reach out
to -- that we've heard from at least 1 out of 1,000 people in whatever geographic area, be it a city -- and it has to be at least 1,000 people, so it can't be a census tract.

But we also said that it had to be reflective of that community, and what did we mean by reflective? And then we had a third goal that we came up with, which was accessible, and we kind of defined what we meant by accessible. So we are going from the broad, the number, and looking at it very -- you know, keep moving -- moving forward, so that we're constantly looking at all that information, and so I did want to share that we do have those outreach goals, and we worked around them.

Commissioner Le Mons, that was one day, unfortunately, that you missed.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: This has nothing to do with that, Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Okay. I'm sorry.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: My goal statement remains, and what you just described, in my opinion, is not our collective and exhaustive list of goals --

COMMISSIONER SINAY: No, not at all.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: -- and it's not even what I'm talking about. And the fact that you felt the need to even comment on that, when we're looking at time and need
public comment, I don't understand, to be quite frank
with you.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: That's okay. It's because it's
come up before in my conversation.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Legitimately. It should have
come up, and it should have come up today. There's
nothing to defend.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: I'm not defending. I was
just --

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: You are defending. That's
exactly what you're doing, the fact that you felt the
need to reclarify, to tell our guests that we have goals,
like we don't have goals. We have not laid out what it
is that we exactly want from the community, those goals.
That's what we're talking about. So I'm going to stop
there so we can get public comment.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Yes.

Katy, would you please read the instructions.

MR. MANOFF: Yes. Just a moment, chair.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: In order to maximize
transparency and public participation in our process, the
Commissioners will be taking public comment by phone. To
call in, dial the telephone number provided on the
livestream feed. The telephone number is 877-853-5247.

When prompted, enter the meeting ID number provided
in the livestream feed. It is 91505532099 for this week's meeting. When prompted to enter a participant ID, simply press the pound key.

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

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

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

These instructions are also located on the website.

The Commission is taking public comment on the presentation that has just occurred.

We do have someone in the queue.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Invite them to join us.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes, I will do that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It won't let me --
MS. NORWOOD: Thank you, Kevin.

MR. MANOFF: Thank you.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Good evening. This is Lori Shellenberger, L-O-R-I, last name S-H-E-L-L-E-N-B-E-R-G-E-R.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Please go ahead.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Are you (indiscernible)? Good evening, Commissioners. I'm calling in regarding when -- first of all, I appreciate the presentations today; they were great -- and your thoughtfulness, again, in considering how to approach reaching communities that have historically been hard to reach.

I'm actually calling in regarding a portion of the discussion related to the possibility of subgrants to community organizations for outreach and education, and again, I'm calling as the redistricting consultant to California Common Cause, as well as I consult with the national redistricting team at Common Cause, which promotes independent redistricting across the country.

And I know it's not lost on you all that California stands as a model for commissions across the country, and is watched incredibly, incredibly closely. And I know you're also aware of the history of the last Commission, and the ways in which people will, in the future, attempt to undermine the integrity of your process, as well as
the ultimate maps that you adopt.

I would just echo some of the comments -- and Commissioner Akutagawa, it was actually not me who had spoken about this issue previously. I think you may have been thinking of Helen Hutchison from the League of Women Voters, which, like Common Cause, was a sponsor of the initiative that created the Commission, and has concerns about the integrity of the Commission, and the impact that making subgrants could have, and how it could politicize the process, even though it would be inadvertent on your part.

I would encourage you to give that serious thought, and to consider giving the funds to a third party to administer those. This will become an incredibly political process regardless of how well you run it. It's inevitable.

And this is very different from giving money to census groups for outreach. You know, giving money to census, there's not a -- the only loop back is data, you know, with the census. People are reporting their data back up, based upon their outreach.

This is very different, and it's not objective. It's going to be very subjective, and you could end up with even groups who you funded being critical of you for giving more money to groups who perhaps advocate for
lines that then get adopted. There are just so many
permutations of the ways in which this could really
unravel, in, I think, ways that are difficult to foresee
if you haven't been through a redistricting process, and
how tense that can get.

So I just would encourage you to really consider
that very carefully, and to consider finding a third
party that could administer the grants program to remove
that from you all, and even consult with the prior
Commissioners who went through the process and heard lots
of community groups come before them, and may have some
insights into what the pitfalls of making those grants
yourself could be.

I can stay on for a minute if you have questions,
but you also have your esteemed panelists as well. All
right. Thank you.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Katy, do we have other callers?
PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We do not.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. Commissioner Le Mons.
VICE CHAIR LE MONS: I believe she hung up, but I
was going to ask her -- I guess I'm curious, and maybe
somebody else can speak to this, is it seems like, every
time we mention the word "grants", it's taken as this
assumption that we wouldn't use a third party.

Our team is looking into how we can best support
communities in helping us in our efforts. We have our legal team, as well as our staff, looking into our various mechanisms to be able to do that. So I just was going to ask her, what is it about us using the word "grants" that creates this assumption that it is a direct -- that we would be managing the grants?

So I was just curious about that, so maybe she'll call back tomorrow, or somebody else will call back, but we understand that we need to make sure that we aren't putting ourselves in a position to have battles that we have to fight legally on the back end, and that's why we're consulting our attorney, we're consulting our team, to figure out what is the best way for us to meet the objective.

So that's just where we are at this point, and if people have ideas about how we might be able to do it in a grant fashion, as opposed to contract, it's what we're trying to explore. We haven't said that we won't do contracts, but we're trying to explore expedient ways that allow us to be able to support. So I just wanted to put that out there, and unfortunately, the caller wasn't -- I didn't move quick enough to be able to ask her directly.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: We do have a caller in the queue now. I don't know if they called on that.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Okay. If you could invite them in.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Yes. If you'll press
star 6. Yes. Please state and spell your name for the
court reporter.

MS. BANH: Hi. This is Tho Vinh Banh again. It's

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Please share your
comment.

MS. BANH: Okay. I thought the presentation was
really well put together and provided a lot of good
information. I think the thread that could connect --
and I sent some information. I don't know if it was
received -- was ensuring informations are in plain
language. I think it's going to help the MENA community.
I think it's going to help the black community. It's
going to help people with disabilities.

So I know I sent an email -- I'm not sure it was
received -- just for information related to resources
connected to that, so that, as you share -- to echo
James, as you put together information about how
different communities can do this work, that you start
thinking about it in that way, with plain language, and
then, for me personally, just like, there are lots of
folks with really deep relationships on the ground with
different communities, with the Commissioners, there's
not enough of you to do that ground -- to do that work.

So really plug into organizations like the Black Census Hub, and the one that Nahla mentioned, and then, for us, Disability Rights Education Defense Fund or the California Federation of Independent Living Centers, who have done this work related to civic engagement, so that -- you know, I'm just trying to echo James and his team, and Nahla, to really concentrate on how you best think those who have trusted relationships and have community ties can plug in. Thank you so much.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Thank you.

I believe Ms. Shellenberger's called back. Hold on one moment.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Have her join us. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Please press star 6.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Yes.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Is this Ms. Shellenberger?

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Can you hear me? Yeah. You know it's bad when you start recognizing my number.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: Well, we're happy to hear back. Mr. Le Mons would like to speak with you.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Yes, especially this late in the day, but I was calling back in just to respond to
Commissioner Le Mons, because the impression I had was from -- and several others who had read it, but we may be jumping the gun -- was, in the communities of interest strategy map that was posted yesterday, for proposed action item 1, it said for staff to create a grant-making structure to fund local groups.

I guess that could be read as, perhaps, staff would decide to give the funds -- recommend giving the funds to a third party, but I read that as a proposal that the staff be administering that grant-making program. And I can stay on.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Commissioner Sinay.

COMMISSIONER SINAY: Thank you for that clarification. It's meant to be broad, for staff to look at all different options, and give pros and cons for all different options, and look at cost-effectiveness. And we'll be discussing it more tomorrow, so I know we'll hear from all of you. But yeah, we tried to write it as broad as possible, and sometimes, when you write something broadly, it doesn't come out that way. So thank you.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: And thank you --

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Thank you for that clarification.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: Yes. That one is --
MS. SHELLENBERGER: I'll share that with other stakeholders.

VICE CHAIR LE MONS: This is Commissioner Le Mons. I just wanted to thank you for taking the time to call back in and answer my question. I appreciate that, and I understand now where you were coming from.

MS. SHELLENBERGER: Yeah, I appreciate it. All right. Thank you.

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: And that is everyone in our --

CHAIR KENNEDY: Katy, do we have anyone else?

PUBLIC COMMENT MODERATOR: No. That was everyone in our queue.

CHAIR KENNEDY: Very good. Well, we have imposed on our technical team well beyond the normal limit. So we want to thank them for their patience. We want to thank our presenters for joining us this afternoon, giving us of your time, your wisdom, your experience. We really appreciate it. I can imagine that we'll be back in touch with all of you any number of times in the months coming forward, but again, thank you. It was great to have you with us, and have a nice evening.

MS. KAYALI: Looking forward for the collaboration.

MS. NORWOOD: Thank you. Have a good evening.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you.
CHAIR KENNEDY: Excellent.

And, Commissioners, unless anyone has anything urgent at this point, we will see you at 9:30 tomorrow morning.

(Whereupon, the CRC Business Meeting adjourned.)
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